DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION—TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT

10 GEORGE VI, 1946

VOLUME I, 1946

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF MARCH, 1946, TO THE SECOND DAY OF MAY, 1946, INCLUSIVE

BEING

VOLUME CCXLIX FOR THE PERIOD 1875-1946

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1947

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Thursday, March 14, 1946.

SECOND SESSION—TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT—OPENING

The parliament which had been prorogued on the eighteenth day of December, 1945, met this day at Ottawa, for the dispatch of business.

The house met at three o'clock, the Speaker, The Honourable Gaspard Fauteux, in the chair.

Mr. Speaker read a communication from the Governor General's secretary, announcing that His Excellency the Governor General would proceed to the Senate chamber at three p.m. on this day, for the purpose of formally opening the session of the dominion parliament.

A message was delivered by Charles H. Larose, Esquire, Acting Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the house went up to the Senate chamber.

And the house having returned to the Commons chamber:

OATHS OF OFFICE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 1, respecting the administration of oaths of office.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

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

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

It is just over six months since Canada emerged from six long years of war. The turmoil which has followed in the wake of war has created new problems for governments in all parts of the globe. The world is full of unrest. Hunger, privation and suffering, have become the lot of millions. Other millions are homeless, many of them in exile. The problems which face the statesmen of every nation are formidable indeed.

It is only in the light of the world situation that all our problems can be seen in true perspective. The future of our own and of every country depends upon success in the task of world reconstruction, and the establishment of an enduring peace. Many of the measures you will be called upon to consider at the present session will be concerned with this wider aspect of human affairs.

Of world problems demanding immediate action, the most pressing is the provision of food to those peoples facing acute shortage, and, in some regions, widespread famine. The chance of a peaceful reconstruction of the world depends on food. The shortage at the present time is very great. The problem, moreover, is not only for the next few months, but also for the next few years. Unless the need is met, grave disorders, endangering peace itself, must be anticipated.

The government is seeking by all practicable means to make available for export the maximum supply of foodstuffs. Every encouragement is being given to increasing production. The gravity of the situation demands, on the part of the people of Canada, a united and wholehearted effort.

The maintenance of a high level of employment and national income is a fundamental aim of government policy. Employment and income alike are bound up with the restoration and expansion of world trade. To the productive employment of vast numbers of Canadians, export markets are essential.

The government has steadily pursued its efforts to restore former markets, to secure new markets and generally to expand peace-time exports. In pursuit of this policy, export credits, for which additional provision was made at the last session, have been extended to several of our war-time allies.

At this session you will be asked to approve an agreement, recently concluded, for a loan to the United Kingdom which will help maintain the British market for Canadian food products and other exports. The agreement will also contribute to the steady development of trade between the two countries, the removal of trade barriers and the free use of currencies for international trade.

While Canada, in common with all countries, continues to experience dislocations inevitable in a period of transition from war to peace, in no other country has the transition proceeded more speedily or with less friction.

Conversion of war industries to civilian production is progressing steadily, with a minimum of industrial strife, and increased cooperation between labour and management.

REVISED EDITION

War-time restrictions and controls are being removed as rapidly as conditions will permit. Price ceilings on many articles have been suspended. Wage and salary controls have been relaxed. Certain subsidies have been discontinued. Only such controls are being continued as are deemed necessary to prevent inflation and to safeguard the public welfare.

Except for the forces still employed in connection with the occupation of Germany, practically all of our armed forces are now home. Demobilization of both men and women is taking place rapidly. Every effort is being made to ensure the orderly reestablishment of veterans in civil life.

To complete consideration of the "Veterans Charter" you will be asked to reconstitute the special committee on veterans affairs.

You will also be asked to make provision for the permanent armed forces, to the composition of which much consideration has been given.

In our own as in other countries the demand for housing continues greatly to exceed the supply. Despite shortages of materials and labour, a very large number of houses have been constructed since V-E day. Special efforts are being made to expand the supply of building materials to meet the demand for permanent housing, and, meanwhile, to provide emergency shelter. The Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has been established. Its activities are being closely coordinated with those of War-time Housing Limited and the Veterans Land Act administration, with a view to having all matters relating to the construction of housing brought, as largely as possible, under the administration of one minister of the crown.

You will be asked to make provision for the redistribution of representation in the House of Commons.

Among other measures to which your attention will be invited will be bills to revise and clarify the definition of Canadian citizenship, and to bring the legislation respecting national status, naturalization and immigration into conformity with the definition of citizenship; bills to place in statutory form a number of orders in council to which it is desired to give permanent legislative effect; also a number of amendments to existing statutes.

Since the close of the last session, the initial meeting of the general assemply of the united nations has been held in London. The assembly will conclude its first session in New York in September. The security council, the economic and social council, the commission on atomic energy, and the international court of justice have been established. Our country was represented at the general assembly by a delegation including ministers of the crown, other members of parliament, and leading officials of the public service. Canada was elected to the economic and social council and to the commission on atomic energy. A distinguished Canadian was elected a judge of the international court.

It is the policy of my ministers to see that the utmost support is given by Canada to the united nations organization.

The problems of peace-making are exacting and arduous.

Germany and Japan continue to be under allied military control. Early in the year, a Canadian mission was established in Berlin to safeguard Canadian interests in Germany. Canada's interests in Japan are being watched through Canadian membership on the far eastern commission, which recently visited Tokyo. The commission has its headquarters in Washington.

Time will be required for the drafting of the treaties of peace. A conference is to be held in Paris later in the year to consider proposed treaties with Italy, Finland, Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria. Canada will be represented at this conference.

A meeting of the coordinating committee of the dominion-provincial conference was held in January. Progress was made in the consideration of proposals submitted by the dominion and provincial governments. The committee will meet again on April 25.

As a result of the conference, there may be further legislative proposals.

Members of the House of Commons:

You will be asked to make financial provision for all essential services, and for credits required to maintain export trade and a high level of employment and national income.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

My term of office is now almost at an end. You have already been informed of the appointment of Field Marshal Viscount Alexander of Tunis as my successor. Lord Alexander will arrive in Canada early in April. As this is the last occasion on which I shall have the honour to address you, may I be allowed to strike a personal note.

In 1914, I was unable to succeed His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught in the position of governor general, for the simple reason that I was at that time a serving soldier. The disappointment I had sustained was, however, more than compensated for by my reappointment in 1940, strange to say, during another world war. It was for me a great honour to have been chosen. The intimate association with my prime minister, ministers, parliament and the people of this great country has brought you all very close to the hearts of Princess Alice and myself.

The years we have been in Canada have been the most eventful years in world history. It has been with profound admiration that we have witnessed the great part Canada has had in the preservation of world freedom, in the relief of suffering peoples, and in helping to lay the foundations of a new world order.

Princess Alice and I will ever recall that in these momentous years it has been our proud privilege to share in your anxieties and rejoicings. Throughout our lives we shall cherish an abiding affection for Canada and her people.

May Divine Providence continue to bless this nation, and to guide the parliament of Canada in all its deliberations.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both houses of parliament be taken into consideration on Friday next, and that this order have precedence over all other business, except the introduction of bills, government notices of motions and government orders, until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved :

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose standing committees of this house under standing order 63, said committee to be composed of Messrs. Mackenzie, Chevrier, Casselman, Johnston and Weir.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) presented the following message from His Excellency the Governor General:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a certified copy of an approved minute of council appointing the Honourable Ian Mackenzie, Minister of Veterans Affairs, the Right Honourable J. L. Ilsley, Minister of Finance, the Honourable J. A. MacKinnon, Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the Right Honourable L. S. St. Laurent, Minister of Justice, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of chapter 145 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, intituled: An Act respecting the House of Commons.

OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO PROCEEDINGS OF ROYAL COMMISSION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): No doubt the house will wish to have as early as possible the documents relating to the proceedings of the royal commission established by order in council P.C. 411 of February 5, 1946. For the convenience of hon. members I have arranged to have these documents printed in advance of an order by the house, but I assume that the house will be agreeable to ordering copies once the documents have been tabled. The documents included in the booklet I have in my hand contain the statement which was made by myself on February 15, 1946, with reference to the appointment of the commission to investigate alleged violations of the Official Secrets Act; text of order in council P.C. 411 of February 5, 1946, establishing the royal commission; letter of the commission counsel to the Minister of Justice of February 23, 1946; text of order in council P.C. 6444 of October 6, 1945; and the first interim report of the royal commission to His Excellency the Governor General in council, of March 2, 1946.

Mr. COLDWELL: Does the Prime Minister intend to make a statement to the house on this situation within the next few days?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had expected the house would be anxious to have a statement at as early a date as possible. I shall be speaking on the address on Monday next and will avail myself of that occasion to make a statement to the house.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to take this opportunity of complimenting the Prime Minister on having arranged to let us have these documents. I believe he mentioned first the documents having to do with the loan to Britain. I was about to ask as a matter of fact that copies of the agreement be made available to us. I am satisfied with the provision which the Prime Minister has made. We are glad to have as well copies of the documents in connection with the espionage matter.

I had planned also to ask the Prime Minister a question with respect to that. Perhaps I might ask it now; he has partly answered it by intimating that he would have something to say about it when he comes to speak on Monday. My question is this, and I ask it because of a feeling of unrest and criticism which is abroad through lack of understanding of the procedure followed by the government in this case. My question was this—perhaps the Prime Minister will take it into account and deal with it when he comes to speak on Monday, if not before:

In view of the extraordinary procedure followed by the government in holding certain Canadians incommunicado in connection with this matter, will the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice take an early occasion to clarify if possible their justification of this procedure?

Everyone in Canada will want to support the government in trying to stamp out espionage in this country, but some of us find it difficult to explain, let alone to justify, the extraordinary character of the procedure followed.

I would like the Prime Minister to take that into consideration. I trust he will see the wisdom of making a clear explanation because a great many thoughtful and honourable people in Canada find it difficult to understand why that particular type of procedure has been followed.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the request which has just been made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) is one which I anticipated he would make, and I share with him the feeling that it is desirable that the country should be given the fullest explanation of the reasons which have caused the commission to detain a certain number of persons before making their final report. I

understand, in fact I know, that the commission has made a second interim report to His Excellency the Governor General. That report has been made to-day, and I hope to be in a position to table it to-morrow. The house will then have before it two reports from the commission before this matter is discussed by the house generally.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To-morrow it is intended to table further reports, departmental reports and other returns, and, if the house is agreeable, we shall proceed with the debate on the address, the mover and seconder speaking, and then have the debate adjourned until Monday, when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition will follow.

We have just heard from His Excellency the Governor General that he will be taking his departure almost immediately, on Saturday in fact, and I have felt that hon. members of both houses of parliament would wish to give some expression of appreciation of the services which His Excellency has rendered Canada in such a splendid way during the time that he has been His Majesty's representative in this country. I purpose therefore to-morrow, if it meets with the approval of the house, at the beginning of our sitting to introduce a motion in the nature of a farewell address to His Excellency, which I know my friend the leader of the opposition will be pleased to second, and which hon. members will be free to speak to if they so desire.

There is nothing further to announce. I would therefore move that the house do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 4.35 p.m.

Friday, March 15, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT

ARREST OF MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT—SECOND INTERIM REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the business of the house I wish to rise to a question affecting the privileges of this parliament. I do not intend to discuss their historic background, or to refer to the usages of the British parliament or the statutes of this parliament by which they are established. They will be found sufficiently outlined in the introduction to Beauchesne's "Parliamentary Rules and Forms", third edition, 1943, part of which I will quote:

Several acts suspending for a time the Habeas Corpus Act have been passed in Great Britain with the special provision that no member of parliament shall be imprisoned during the sitting of parliament until the matter in which he stands suspected shall be first communicated to the house and the consent of the house obtained for his commitment, or if parliament be not sitting, then immediately after it reassembles in like manner as if he were arrested on a criminal charge. This is the general rule. The house is usually apprised of the cause of commitment of a member after his arrest and whenever he is in custody, in order to be tried by naval, military, air or courts-martial, or after he has been committed for any criminal offence by a court or a magistrate.

The newspapers report today that Mr. Rose, representative in this House of Commons of the division of Cartier-Montreal in the province of Quebec, has been taken into custody by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. This house has no knowledge of the charge or charges against him. If the suspected offence is indictable under our criminal law, either under the criminal code or by a special statute, then I submit that this house should be informed now of the nature of the charge, in conformity with the established usage.

If the newspapers are correct in stating that the action arises out of a disclosure of secret information laid before parliament, during the war, the offence would appear to be a breach of the privileges of this house and should be a subject of inquiry by the appropriate committee. I am confident that no member of this house, certainly not I or any member of our party, would condone improper or illegal action by any other member. But the privileges of this parliament must be safeguarded no matter who may be involved.

In my opinion the house should require a satisfactory statement from the government now, and I therefore raise the question so that we may receive it today.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before coming into the house I received word from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) that he intended to ask a question which I believe would be very similar to the one which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Coldwell) has just put to me. Naturally I anticipated that a question of the kind would be immediately raised when the house met this afternoon, and therefore I shall proceed at once to make a brief statement—not the statement to which I referred yesterday, but a statement which I hope will help to explain the cir-

cumstances attending the absence of an hon. member from his accustomed place in the house.

Perhaps I might be permitted to proceed by first of all tabling the second interim report of the royal commission that has been appointed to investigate the unauthorized disclosure of secret confidential information. I have now copies of that report in printed form, in both English and French, and I should like to table them immediately so that they will be before the house at this time.

In the statement which I made on February 15 in reference to the investigation by the royal commission, I said it was the intention of the government that prosecutions should be instituted in cases in which the evidence warranted it. I have been advised by the Attorney General of Canada that charges have been laid against the four men named in the second interim report of the commission, namely, Doctor Raymond Boyer, Harold Samuel Gerson, Squadron Leader Matt Simons Nightingale, and Doctor David Shugar.

The charge against Doctor Boyer alleges conspiracy with an intermediary, who was not named in the commission's report because he had not been examined by the commission. The intermediary referred to in the report by the cover name Debouz is believed to be the hon. member for Cartier, Montreal. I am further advised by the Attorney General of Canada, who has taken the advice of counsel whose opinions I wish to lay on the table of the house, that effective prosecution of the charge against Doctor Boyer requires similar action in respect of the hon. member for Cartier, against whom an appropriate information has been laid and a warrant for his arrest executed.

In accordance with parliamentary practice, I have taken this first opportunity of communicating to the House of Commons the reason why the hon. member for Cartier is prevented from taking his seat in the house. I may say that I had intended to make this statement before being asked any question. I intimated yesterday that I would table today the second interim report and the proceedings that have arisen therefrom.

Perhaps I should now read the letter to which I have just referred, namely, that from counsel consulted by the Attorney General of Canada with reference to the question of the possible arrest of an hon. member of this house.

I have in my hand a letter signed by the counsel for the commission, E. K. Williams, Gerald Fauteux, and D. W. Mundell, addressed to the Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent, K.C., Minister of Justice, Ottawa. It is dated March 14, which was yesterday. This letter must help to answer in part at least the question that has just been addressed to me:

Ottawa, 14th March, 1946.

The Honourable L. S. St. Laurent, K.C.,
Minister of Justice,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Minister,—

When we reported to you the gist of the evidence developed against Doctor Raymond Boyer and the fact that it seemed to implicate a member of parliament you asked us to consider the two following questions:

(a) Whether a federal member of parliament who would have committed a crime under the Official Secrets Act can be arrested either during the coming session of parliament or within the few days which remain before its opening on the 14th instant?

(b) Whether taking into account the whole of the circumstances surrounding this investigation it would be advisable or inadvisable to obtain the issue of a warrant of arrest against this member at the same time as that to be issued against the individual who divulged to this member certain important war secrets for the benefit of a foreign power?

Our answers to these questions are:

(a) Yes.

(b) It would not only be advisable but the interest of justice would not be served and the other trial would be prejudiced if a warrant were not issued against the member at the same time as that issued against the individual.

Our duties before the royal commission made it impossible to consider this question as thoroughly as we should have liked to do and we requested Hon. F. P. Brais, K.C., counsel appointed by you to prosecute the other individual, to assist us with his opinion.

We have now received it and it confirms the views we held in this matter and sets out the authorities upon which the opinion is based. We are enclosing it with this letter as we entirely concur in it.

Each of us will be available for further discussion if deemed necessary.

Yours very truly,

E. K. Williams,
Gerald Fauteux,
D. W. Mundell,
Counsel for the Commission.

I have attached to this letter the legal opinion given by Mr. Philippe Brais, K.C. Perhaps I need not read it at the moment. I should like however to table it, and have it printed and appear with the other documents, with the interim report and the communication from the commission's counsel.

Mr. COLDWELL: Even if the Prime Minister does not read that important opinion, I think it should appear in *Hansard* with the general discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had better read it:

Brais & Campbell

Royal Bank Building,
360 St. James Street West,
Montreal, March 12, 1946

E. K. Williams, Esq., K.C.,
G. H. Fauteux, Esq., K.C.,
Justice Building,
Ottawa, Ontario.
Secret and Confidential

Dear Sirs:

You have asked my opinion whether:

(a) A federal member of parliament who would have committed a crime under the Official Secrets Act can be arrested either during the coming session of parliament or within the few days which remains before its opening on the 14th instant?

(b) If question (a) is answered in the affirmative, whether it would be advisable or inadvisable to obtain the issue of a warrant of arrest against this member at the same time as that to be issued against the individual who divulged to this member certain important war secrets for the benefit of a foreign power:

(a) I have not been informed of any of the activities of the member in question save what appears from the deposition of the individual whose arrest we discussed over the week-end.

That statement does clearly show that the member obtained important information and declared that it was for the use of a foreign power.

It would appear clearly, therefore, that a charge could be laid against the member under section 3 C and probably 4(1) A and B, 4(2), 4(3), of the Official Secrets Act.

No specific penalty is provided in the act for the commission of the above offences and the offender would therefore be subject to section 14 which declares them to be indictable.

Chapter 147, R.S.C., "An Act Respecting the Senate and House of Commons," sections 4 and 5 provide:

> "4. The Senate and the House of Commons respectively, and the members thereof respectively, shall hold, enjoy and exercise,
>
> (a) such and the like privileges, immunities and powers as, at the time of the passing of the British North America Act 1867, were held, enjoyed and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom, and by the members thereof, so far as the same are consistent with and not repugnant to the said Act; and
>
> (b) such privileges, immunities and powers as are from time to time defined by Act of the Parliament of Canada, not exceeding those at the time of the passing of such act held, enjoyed and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom and by the members thereof respectively, R.S.C., 10, s.4.
>
> 5. Such privileges, immunities and powers shall be part of the general and public law of Canada and it shall not be necessary to plead the same, but the same shall, in all courts of Canada, and by and before all judges, be taken notice of judicially. R.S., c. 10, s.5."

Bourinot's "Parliamentary Procedure", third edition, page 143, chapter 2, under the heading "Privileges and Powers of Parliament," discusses "the privileges, immunities and powers" to be enjoyed by members. After discussing the origin of privileges, he declares that it is a general principle of English parliamentary law that . . . "the privilege has been always held to protect members from arrest and imprisonment under civil processes, whether the suit be at the action of an individual or of the public; but it is not claimable for treason, felony, breach of peace or 'any indictable offense'."

Bourinot further states that a member may be committed for contempt of court when it is of a quasi-criminal nature, "and the English house has not of recent years deemed it expedient to interfere in cases of an open or gross character."

The right of courts to enquire into the question of privilege is discussed by Bourinot at page 147 as follows:

> "As parliamentary privileges rest on statutory as well as customary law it follows that they can be inquired into and determined by courts of law like any other rights. In the words of an authority: 'It seems now to be clearly settled that the courts will not be deterred from upholding private rights by the fact that questions of parliamentary privilege are involved in their maintenance; and that, except as regards the internal regulation of its proceedings by the house, courts of law will not hesitate to inquire into alleged privileges, as they would into local custom, and determine its extent and application'."

It would appear clear that a member who has committed an indictable offence is therefore liable to arrest at any time and any place except on the floor of the house when it is sitting.

(b) Would it be advisable or inadvisable to charge the member at the same time as the individual from whom the information was obtained.

The failure to charge the member at the same time would appear highly inadvisable. The origin of the trouble, the cause of the temptation and downfall of the individual in question arises entirely and exclusively from the actions of the member. The failure to charge the latter at the same time and bring him before the courts if possible would inevitably give rise to a reaction which in my opinion would be entirely prejudicial to the proper disposal of the complaint.

Obviously at the present time and in so far as my information goes, the only evidence against the member would be the testimony of the individual who gave him information. The member might see fit to offer his own testimony and deny the whole story. The court might then have to decide between the credibility of a witness and an accused. The fact, however, that the witness has incriminated himself by the story and is himself separately charged should, in my opinion, lead any judge to conclude that the version cannot be untrue, the more so in that there is nothing to indicate any unfriendliness whatsoever between the two persons.

Obviously they would have to be separately charged. There should be in my opinion, added a count of conspiracy referring to the substantive offences themselves.

I have not before me all the information arising out of the cases and it is quite possible that certain facts may lead one to another conclusion, but relying for the moment solely on

the deposition which I now have, I feel quite definitely that the non-arrest of the member would not only be prejudicial to the other case but to the interest of justice in general.

Yours very truly,
F. P. Brais.

I should like now to table copies of both the communications I have read.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not think the Prime Minister gave the date of that opinion.

Mr MACKENZIE KING: The first was, Ottawa, 14th March, 1946; the one from Mr. Brais, which I have just read, Montreal, March 12th, 1946. The letter from Mr. Brais, it will be noticed, is in reply to the communication from the commission's counsel. That is how it came to be written before their letter to the Minister of Justice.

While I am dealing with this matter I might perhaps answer, from the report of the commission which I have just tabled, the question which is very much in the minds of us all—I can assure hon. members, in the mind of no one more than my own, namely, why it is that certain individuals should have been detained for the length of time that some individuals have been detained in connection with this inquiry. The commissioners themselves have doubtless seen that the public, as well as parliament, wished to be informed on this matter. I shall read the concluding paragraph of the second interim report which I have tabled. It is as follows: I quote from page 20:

> In conclusion we may add that we regret not having been able to complete as yet the hearing of evidence with regard to the five other persons who are detained under the provisions of P.C. 6444 passed on October 6, 1945, but we hope that we will be able to do so shortly. On February 14 last we concurred in the advice given by counsel for the commission to the Honourable the Minister of Justice that certain named persons should be detained, and we did so because of the serious nature of the disclosures then indicated by the evidence we had heard, and the fact that cover names of persons who had not been identified appeared in the evidence which indicated that the ramifications of the disloyal practices and the persons engaged therein might be even greater than then appeared and might well be continuing. In effect the matters with which the inquiry was concerned appeared to us to be of so serious a nature from the national standpoint that we believed the course advised by counsel should be pursued in the exceptional circumstances existing. The further evidence which we have heard has not caused us to change this view but, on the contrary, has confirmed it.
>
> In a case of this nature where the evidence has revealed the existence of an organization constituting at least a threat to the safety and interests of the state, as evidenced by the fact that some witnesses holding strategic positions have made the significant statement under oath that they had a loyalty which took priority over the loyalty owed by them to their own country, and for that reason they acted as they did, and would unquestionably have continued so to act had they not been detected, we are of opinion that should these persons be allowed communication with outsiders or between themselves until their activities have been fully investigated, some of the basic purposes of this inquiry would be entirely defeated.
>
> Respectfully submitted,
> **Robert Taschereau,**
> Royal Commissioner
> **R. L. Kellock,**
> Royal Commissioner.

There is a further point which I might clear up, and that is the impression that those who still remain to be interrogated feel that as no charge has been made against them they should not for that reason be detained. May I make it clear that those who are being detained by the commission are being detained for purposes of interrogation, for the purpose of getting their evidence under the section of the Inquiries Act which authorizes the commission to take that course. There is no charge against them at the moment. The purpose of the interrogation is to see whether or not, in the light of all that is known, a charge should be laid. When the commissioners come to the conclusion that a charge should be laid against anyone who has been interrogated, they bring before them the persons being interrogated and so inform them and ask them if they wish to retain counsel and if there is anything further they would like to say to the commission before the commission expresses the view that a warrant ought to be issued for their being taken into custody. All of those who have thus far been taken into custody have had that opportunity before the commission. Those against whom charges have been laid, of course, will have their case investigated by the courts and will have all the opportunities which are accorded to persons so situated to retain counsel and to take the course which they deem most advisable and which may be justifiable in the circumstances. I think that answers what the leader of the opposition had intended to ask and what the leader of the C.C.F. party has asked.

With the permission of the house I should like to introduce a motion which will permit of the printing of the documents which I have just tabled.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Perhaps the Prime Minister would permit me a word before he makes that motion?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: The Prime Minister has tabled the interim report of the commission to which he referred yesterday. In doing so

he also referred to the arrest of a member of this parliament. He read certain legal opinions with respect to the procedure followed in that arrest, and he referred to a question of which I had given him notice and which I intended to put at the proper time today. I believe everyone will agree that these important developments have justified the bringing up of this matter at this time; therefore, I think I should put on record the question that I had proposed asking. The Prime Minister has only partly answered it. The question was as follows:

> In answer to questions directed to him yesterday, the Prime Minister indicated he would make a statement on Monday next in connection with espionage.
>
> Since that time a letter has appeared in the press, reported to have been directed to certain members of parliament from one of those already detained in this investigation, complaining of a disregard of his constitutional rights; and, in addition, this morning's press carries a report of the arrest of a member of parliament, while parliament is in session, in connection with a matter related to this investigation.
>
> My question is: In view of these incidents and in view of the consequent mounting public interest in this matter, will the Prime Minister make to-day the statement he proposes to make rather than delay it until Monday?

As I said, the Prime Minister has made a statement referring to these matters in part. If my question had been answered in the affirmative we would have had a fuller statement. I presume, the matter having gone this far, that the Prime Minister does not feel that he can say any more at the moment. Whether he does or not I should like to say this further word, that the refusal of habeas corpus proceedings, the holding of men without a legal charge against them, without the right of bail and without the right to have counsel, is a serious matter to all who pride themselves on the principles of British justice. The Canadian people will be behind the government in searching out and in punishing crimes against the state, but the Canadian people are not in sympathy with any departure from the regular procedures of our courts, established over long years, for dealing with matters of this kind, unless the circumstances are most unusual, such as, for instance, the safety of the state being in danger.

I am sure the house appreciates the information which the Prime Minister has given us to-day; whether he cares to say anything further now is a matter for him to decide.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to say a further word. I thought I had pretty well answered or adequately answered the questions which my hon. friend had intended to ask me; but may I say to him at once that with what he has said about the importance of securing the freedom of the individual, his right to habeas corpus proceedings and anything else that will seek to preserve individual liberty I am in complete accord, and I would be the last person in this country to wish to see the liberty of any individual curtailed in any way at all that it is possible to avoid, short of, to use my hon. friend's own words, the safety of the state being the main consideration.

Yesterday I stated that I would wish to make a statement at length on Monday purposely in order that hon. members might have an opportunity before my statement is made to read the interim reports of the commissioners, the two reports which have been tabled. One report has been tabled only this afternoon. Hon. members have not yet seen that report. I do not believe they have seen any reference in the press to what it contains, and I do ask that hon. members of this house read that report from beginning to close before Monday's discussion on this very serious matter takes place. I would also ask that hon. members read the first report from beginning to close before we proceed with further discussion. I believe that hon. members will be very deeply impressed by the statements which these reports contain. I would also ask hon. members to remember in reading these reports that they have been prepared by two justices of the Supreme Court of Canada, gentlemen who, above all, would be anxious to maintain in every way possible the full freedom and liberty of individuals in our country.

With the permission of the house, Mr. Speaker, I move:

> That two thousand five hundred copies in the English language and one thousand copies in the French language of the documents relating to the proceedings of the royal commission, established by order in council P.C. 411 of February 5, 1946, and including the first and second interim reports of the royal commission, laid on the table of the house on the 14th and 15th of March instant, be printed forthwith, and that standing order 64 in relation thereto be suspended.

As I mentioned yesterday, I arranged to have these reports printed without waiting for the authority of the house, feeling quite sure that authority would be given, inasmuch as I took the course I did for the convenience of hon. members.

Motion agreed to.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

REQUEST FOR TWO-DAY RECESS

On the order for motions:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether immediate provision will be made for a two-day recess so that hon. members of the house and our friends can properly celebrate the seventeenth of March without interfering with our work? I may say that this has been denied us during the war years, and now that peace has come we hope that this matter will be given consideration.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I can imagine of no better way for my hon. friend to celebrate the day of which he speaks than to attend church on that day.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

FAREWELL ADDRESS BY BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As hon. members are aware, His Excellency the Governor General and Her Royal Highness the Princess Alice will be taking their official departure from Canada to-morrow. I intimated yesterday that I thought it would be the wish of all hon. members that some expression should be given by both houses of parliament to the appreciation which we all feel of the great services which His Excellency has rendered Canada during the years that he has represented His Majesty in this country. I stated at the time that I proposed to introduce a motion which would give expression to the feelings which we cherish in common. I have the motion before me and I will introduce it in a moment.

Before bringing forward the motion in a formal way may I say that I am sure all hon. members were impressed yesterday by the reference made by His Excellency in a personal note in the speech from the throne to the relations which he had enjoyed with the ministers of the crown, with members of parliament and with the people of our country. Those relationships, as Lord Athlone stated, have extended over many years and have in many ways been quite intimate. His Excellency said that they had endeared the people of this country to the hearts of the Princess Alice and himself. This afternoon I should like to say that the sentiments thus expressed by His Excellency are I believe warmly reciprocated towards himself and the Princess Alice by the people of Canada, and, in particular, by their representatives in this parliament.

Speaking personally, if I may be permitted to do so, I cannot begin to say what a privilege, what a pleasure, what a help in every way it has been to me to enjoy the close association which I have had with His Excellency during the years he has been His Majesty's representative in this country. All the relationships to which His Excellency referred, his relationship to the Prime Minister, to the ministers, to the members of parliament and to the people, have been in most complete accord with the spirit and the letter of constitutional procedure and constitutional practice. They have in addition been of very great assistance to the ministry and to the country at a time of its greatest need.

To mention only one of many good offices, I doubt if one can begin to appreciate what it has meant to have at Government House in these years in the persons of His Excellency Lord Athlone and Princess Alice, the Countess of Athlone, two persons who have given so generously of their time and their thought, not only to matters immediately concerned with the war effort of Canada but also have done so much to welcome to our country in Canada's name so many of the distinguished personages who have visited our country during the last six years. There never has been a time when so many have come to our land from other countries. As an instance of the growth in international relations in that period of time I might mention that when His Excellency arrived in Canada there were only nine missions, four headed by high commissioners from other nations of the British commonwealth and five from foreign powers in the nature of legations or embassies. To-day there are some twenty-six in all, five from other parts of the commonwealth and the remainder from foreign countries. This serves to indicate the extent of the development of Canada's international relationships. In connection with important aspects of that development no persons have played a more helpful part than have His Excellency and Her Royal Highness.

I should like to say many things in bidding farewell to His Excellency and Her Royal Highness. I have however expressed something of my own feelings in this address which I am about to ask the house to approve. I believe the sentiments there expressed will accord completely with those of all other hon. members of this house. As my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), who

has seen the proposed address, has kindly said that he would be pleased to second the motion which proposes it. I shall not say more, but will immediately move:

That whereas the houses of parliament desire to present an address to His Excellency the Governor General on the occasion of the termination of His Excellency's official connection with this country, it be resolved by this house that the said address be presented in the following words:

"Farewell address by both houses of parliament to His Excellency the Right Honourable the Earl of Athlone, Governor General of Canada.

To His Excellency Major-General the Right Honourable the Earl of Athlone, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, a member of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Grand Master of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, one of His Majesty's Personal Aides-de-Camp, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of the Dominion of Canada.
May it please Your Excellency:

We, the members of the Senate and of the House of Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, beg leave to convey to Your Excellency an expression of the general feeling of regret with which the people of Canada have learned of the approaching conclusion of your official relationship as the representative in Canada of His Majesty the King.

Your Excellency's period of office has extended over the most eventful years in the history of the world. It must be a source of profound gratification to you, on your retirement as Governor General, to realize that your years in Canada have witnessed victory over the enemies of freedom, and the emergence of Canada as a world power, with a foremost place among the united nations.

We cannot bid Your Excellency farewell without expressing our grateful appreciation of your helpful cooperation in the tasks of government through these years of constant anxiety. You have, throughout, given unsparingly of your time and thought to sustain and strengthen the morale of the nation at war. By word and example, you brought courage and cheer to the armed forces, to the auxiliary services, and to the workers in all the fields of wartime production and supply. You lent your support to every worthy national appeal. Universities, schools, hospitals, and other agencies of health, and welfare, have all benefited from your personal interest and concern.

Your extensive travels have given Your Excellency an intimate knowledge of our country, its resources and its potential future. You have seen Canada at work under the tragic stimulus of war. You have also watched its industries being converted to the purposes of peace. We are pleased that you have been able to glimpse the broad expanses of our country and that you have found delight in its scenic grandeur. Your journeys to all parts of Canada, including many remote areas, have been greatly appreciated. Wherever you have gone, you have been warmly welcome and will be long remembered.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

At no time in Canada's history has our country been visited by so many of the leading personalities of the world. Both at Government House in Ottawa, and at the Citadel in Quebec, you have extended warmest hospitality in the name of Canada.

Throughout your life, Your Excellency has given constant proof of devotion to public service. We do not forget that for seven years you were His Majesty's representative in the Union of South Africa. In Canada, as in South Africa, your unfailing courtesy, your broad and generous sympathies and your wide experience of constitutional government have helped to further the ideals of tolerance and good-will. You have thereby helped to strengthen national unity, and the ties which bind, in close attachment to the crown, the nations of the British commonwealth.

The presence of Your Excellency and Her Royal Highness in Canada has also strengthened the place which the royal family holds in the hearts of the Canadian people. We would ask Your Excellency, on your return to the United Kingdom, to convey to Their Majesties the King and Queen, the assurance of Canada's fidelity to the crown, and of the devotion and affection felt by the Canadian people for Their Majesties. We should be pleased if you would also convey to Queen Mary an expression of our kind remembrance. We hope that in the near future Canada may be honoured by a visit of Their Royal Highnesses the Princess Elizabeth and the Princess Margaret.

In saying farewell to Your Excellency, we cannot express too warmly our appreciation of the helpful part so graciously taken by Her Royal Highness the Princess Alice in the discharge of Your Excellency's high responsibilities. The active, generous and sympathetic cooperation of Princess Alice in the performance of your public and social duties has won for Her Royal Highness an enduring place in the admiration and affection of the Canadian people. Your Excellency and Her Royal Highness have been as one, in all you have sought to foster of a high sense of public duty and social responsibility.

To Your Excellency and Her Royal Highness we extend, on behalf of all Canada, the best of wishes for the future. We hope that, in the eventide of life, you may enjoy together, in health, strength and happiness, the reward of your many years of devoted public service."

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there are not many occasions when I can generously support a motion made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). This however is one time when I can. I regard it as a very great honour and a very great privilege to support and to second a motion of this kind.

With what the Prime Minister has said about His Excellency our Governor General I am in entire accord. The present Governor General of Canada has brought distinction and dignity to a position which in the last few years has required unusual tact, and poise and judgment. During his term of office he has ably represented the crown and maintained the great respect for that institution which is

everywhere prevalent in Canada. And as for his consort, Her Royal Highness the Princess Alice, she has brought to her position a grace and a charm which will be long remembered particularly by the women of Canada who have had the privilege of meeting her.

Mr. Speaker, had I been drafting this resolution there are two or three things I would have added. I would have asked His Excellency, for instance, to take back to Britain the general appreciation of the people of Canada to the British people for the way they faced the perils of the last six years and for the way they are facing the problems of to-day. I would have asked him to tell them that we recognize they have given not only the blood of their sons but also a quarter of the total of their material wealth in order to head off the domination of the world by a false philosophy. I would have asked him to tell them that we shall not forget that twice in a generation they have stood between Canada and defeat in war. Finally, I would have asked him to tell them that we in Canada shall not fail to remember these things in the fateful and challenging days upon which we are entering.

As I said, it is a privilege to have the opportunity of seconding this motion. I trust that they will take back with them happy memories of Canada, and that they will live long and further cement the ties which bind this country to Britain and to the British traditions of justice which everyone in Canada so much admires.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should very much like to associate this group with the motion which has just been made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and also perhaps with the suggestion of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) as to the expansion of the terms of the resolution.

As the Prime Minister has said, we have been well served in Canada by His Excellency and his charming consort. They have followed the constitutional procedures of our country and the traditional usages of the land from which they came and whose institutions we follow so closely.

Saying good-bye to them takes me back a good many years. When I was a lad, the first time I ever saw any members of the royal family was when the present Governor General of Canada and his young and beautiful lady visited the small college in which I was a student. At that time it was known as Exeter university college; to-day it is the university of Southwest England. I well remember the charm of that visit, and, perhaps because of that, I have been interested in watching Their Highnesses for some years. I have been glad to notice that they have always taken a profound interest in the welfare of the people. I recollect that when they were in South Africa they were most active in assisting in every way possible the re-housing of the people who dwelt in the depressed areas around Cape Town; and in our own country they have long advocated, with constitutional circumspection, improved educational facilities, and in these respects have shown judgment and breadth of vision. While I find it very difficult to discover any logical reason for the continuance of a royal house, none the less I feel that as long as we have members of the royal family who conduct themselves as Their Majesties the King and Queen, and as the Earl of Athlone and the Princess Alice have done, the institution will serve a useful purpose in our commonwealth of free nations. I am therefore very glad to join with the Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition, and I am sure, all other hon. members in wishing them godspeed and many years of happiness in what is a probable retirement.

Mr. SOLON LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, members of the Social Credit group are thankful that Canada has been privileged to have the Earl of Athlone as Governor General during the years of the war. We are mindful of the splendid and devoted way in which he has conducted the affairs of his high office. Now that the time has come when we must bid farewell to the Earl and the Princess Alice, we join with other members of this house in wishing them godspeed, and we want them to know that our best and sincerest wishes for their future health and happiness go with them. We are glad, therefore, Mr. Speaker, unanimously to join with the Prime Minister in supporting this motion.

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, may I be granted the privilege of adding a few words in French in support of the motion which has just been moved and seconded with such good taste by the hon. members of the house who spoke before me.

His Excellency the Governor General and Her Royal Highness Princess Alice have very often and with complete mastery expressed themselves in the language used by Canadians of French descent to convey their feelings towards us and to encourage us in our loyalty to our traditions and institutions. Therefore, it is fitting, and I feel sure everyone will agree, that, using the same language,

I should tell them that we unanimously and heartily endorse the congratulations, thanks and good wishes expressed in the farewell address which we have just heard.

There is no need for me to repeat them nor to attempt any amplification, but I wish to say to Their Excellencies that the last but one paragraph of yesterday's speech from the throne moved us very deeply. The words referred to are the following:

> Princess Alice and I will ever recall that in these momentous years it has been our proud privilege to share in your anxieties and rejoicings. Throughout our lives we shall cherish an abiding affection for Canada and her people.

Their Excellencies know that the motto of my province is "Je me souviens". We too will forever treasure the imperishable memory of these two impressive figures who upheld with such personal dignity and éclat our inalienable loyalty to the monarchial government which is at the same time democratically constitutional. During the dreadful war years, this loyalty was a constant inspiration to our people, and the presence of Their Excellencies among us, as well as their continuous participation in all our efforts have forged bonds of admiration and affection, and we are proud to register the fact in the records of parliament.

Motion agreed to. (The members standing.)

ALASKA HIGHWAY

QUESTION AS TO OPENING FOR PUBLIC USE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) a question. I notice that the hon. gentleman is not in his seat, but perhaps the question can be brought to his attention and he can answer on Monday. Is the Alaska highway to be opened soon to the public?

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): The matter is one that comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of National Defence. I shall be glad to bring it to his attention, but I should think the highway would not be closed to the public.

FOOD

FACTORS OPERATING AGAINST FULL PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question, of which I have given him notice. In view of the critical food situation throughout the world, will the minister please inform the house what steps have been taken to remove those factors in Canada's food production which have worked against the use of the country's full productive capacity?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I am sorry I did not receive the notice. I know of no such interruptions to the production of food.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: You will hear of them.

SUGAR

ALLOWANCE TO BEE-KEEPERS FOR HONEY PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Finance or of the hon. member representing him in the house. In view of the sugar situation obtaining in western Canada, will the Minister of Finance not consider advising the sugar administrator to increase immediately the allowance of sugar to Canadian bee-keepers sufficiently to stimulate honey production in 1946? I should like to have the question answered on Monday.

Mr. R. W. MAYHEW (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance): I will see that the question is brought to the minister's attention.

POSTAL SERVICE

RATES ON FOOD PARCELS OVERSEAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM BRYCE (Selkirk): Will the Postmaster General consider the advisability of establishing a temporary reduction in the rate of postage on food parcels to Britain and the devastated countries?

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Postmaster General): These rates are determined by agreement between the British postal authorities and ourselves, and they could not be reduced without first having a conference.

Mr. BRYCE: Will the Postmaster General be prepared to do it?

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY, MOVED BY MR. FERNAND VIAU AND SECONDED BY MR. R. H. WINTERS

The house proceeded to the consideration of the speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of the session.

Mr. FERNAND VIAU (St. Boniface) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour for me to have been chosen to

move the adoption of the address in reply to the speech from the throne; I am a young Canadian making my first steps in this House of Commons, this honourable house where many eminent and enlightened men have, since confederation, discussed and debated economical, social and political questions which have helped to mould out of Canada a nation true to the longings of our fathers of confederation. Numerous valorous and unforgettable Canadians, of British and French extraction, have come into this house to find means of ensuring a lasting welfare for their generation and our own.

The honour which is bestowed upon me is rather an homage to the veterans whom I represent in this house. Although the war is over many veterans are still returning from overseas and I avail myself of this opportunity for thanking the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the government for honouring the veterans in this house by asking me to speak on their behalf.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the fact that I have been chosen is also a mark of respect and gratitude to the population of St. Boniface county which I represent here. St. Boniface is not a historical county, from the political viewpoint, but it is representative of the growth of the Canadian west. It was at St. Boniface, at the confluence of the Red and Assiniboine rivers, that the first explorers of the Canadian west arrived over a century ago. The first settlers and first missionaries landed on the shores of the Red river, at the very place where St. Boniface is now situated, to establish the first post which was instrumental in the growth of the Canadian west.

Today, St. Boniface is the largest industrial city in Manitoba. It is a cosmopolitan city, where the great races of this country live in harmony and I may add that the city itself is setting an example of good understanding for Canada as a whole.

The population is not very large as yet. However, I would like to say a few words in regard to my city and my constituency. Here, in St. Boniface we have the two largest slaughter-houses and the two largest flour mills in the British empire in addition to a large number of other industries. Not only do those industries serve the rural sections of Manitoba but they serve the whole of western Canada. My constituency comprises two important sections, one rural and the other urban. In several French-Canadian villages our farmers have for a great many years grown wheat to meet Canada's needs as well as those of the whole world.

If the Prime Minister has kindly chosen the humble representative of that constituency to move the address in reply to the speech from the throne it is in recognition of the fine work done by all the citizens of St. Boniface and the place which this city now occupies in the economic and social development of western Canada.

On behalf of the citizens of St. Boniface, I wish to thank the Prime Minister for this unforgettable gesture.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss for a moment a single question, namely, the loan which the Canadian government has just made to the British government to enable them to pull through the post-war transition period and reach that enduring peace so highly desired by all nations of the world.

Several Canadians wonder whether the government has acted wisely in making to England a loan of $1,250,000,000, when it is considered that the Canadian government has already agreed to loan $750,000,000 to other allied nations: France, Belgium and Holland who have already received a portion of this sum.

Mr. Speaker, in examining this loan to England, every member of this house must keep in mind two things:

First, from the standpoint of brotherhood. I use this word because inasmuch as Canada is a member of the British commonwealth of nations, it must be admitted that Great Britain deserves our esteem and our admiration. Let us not forget that in 1940 when the nazi hordes invaded the whole European continent and vanquished France, that great Catholic nation, Great Britain with the assistance of Canadian troops stood firm and almost single-handed fought the enemy, thus enabling the other nations of the commonwealth to arm themselves not for the defence of England but to save the world from a tyranny bent on destroying the principles of Christianity and to guarantee to each and every one liberty, peace and happiness. We must not forget that England, by her fortitude, her courage and her tenacity, by her self-denial and her sacrifices has enabled the Canadian armies to join the armies of the other allied nations not only in pushing back tyranny to the place where it had originated but to force the tyrant responsible for that revolting doctrine to destroy himself with that same sword which he brandished for so many years and with which he intended to destroy the social order and the peace of Christian nations.

In this grave hour, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that any Canadian, who is a member of the House of Commons, will be happy, when the bill dealing with the loan to England is introduced, to give it his approval in order to

enable the British nation to reestablish itself economically and to regain the credit which it enjoyed so freely before the war. It is our nation's duty and such, I am sure, is the unanimous desire of all our soldiers, sailors and airmen, both French and English speaking, who have gone overseas and fought so courageously and so valiantly and who are now returning to Canada, happy in the thought of the great victory which they have achieved. They have been a credit not only to their nation but to their racial group, whether of British or French descent.

Secondly, I should like to emphasize that, apart from being a brotherly gesture toward Great Britain, that loan primarily confirms the determination of our nation to fulfil its pledges in regard to financial and other assistance, and to abide by the resolutions agreed to at the San Francisco conference.

The financial assistance granted to allied nations will enable them to recover their moral, economic and social balance in the post-war period. However, from an economic standpoint, and in conformity with the agreement made between our government and that of Great Britain, the credit extended to the latter nation will be used for the purchase of Canadian goods. It goes without saying that such a sum of money spent in Canada for the purchase of our products will also enable us to restore our industrial economy and provide Canadians with work that is so essential to the welfare and prosperity of this country; it will ensure Western Canada and all our farmers the markets that are so necessary for their products such as wheat, cheese, milk, butter, cream, meat and other foodstuffs. When the prosperity of industry and agriculture is assured, every Canadian, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, benefits thereby.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that, when, very shortly, this bill is introduced in the House of Commons, it will meet with the unanimous approval of every member from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Before concluding, I wish to say a few words to my fellow-citizens of the province of Quebec, this wealthy and gallant province who has ever played an admirable part in the development of our great nation. Recently, I have attended the sessions of the second annual meeting of Radio-Ouest francaise and have had the opportunity of witnessing the efforts and devotion to duty of my fellow-citizens from the west to promote this gigantic enterprise which will put them in a position to tune in on concerts, speeches and plays in their mother tongue. Needless to say that such a worthy undertaking could not be realized without financial assistance. The members from the noble province of Quebec, who have the privilege of sitting in this house, have no doubt noticed that, last fall, a subscription campaign was organized through the various parishes, under the auspices of both religous and civil authorities to help the western Canadians of French origin. You have been very generous, the total subscriptions being in excess of $200,000, and I take this opportunity, as a member of the constituency where the first French radio station will shortly be inaugurated, of thanking you from the bottom of my heart.

(Text): Mr. Speaker, in being accorded the privilege of moving the address in reply to the speech from the throne, I do not view it as a personal tribute, being one who has just taken his first steps in Canadian politics and who has yet to give proof of his wisdom in such an important duty, but rather is a tribute to the fighting forces of our dominion, an honour bestowed upon them, and I take the liberty to extend sincere thanks to the Prime Minister of this government for the honour so bestowed upon a veteran. I am sure that every man and woman who wore His Majesty's uniform during the long years of war would wish me to convey their thanks in these simple terms.

Yesterday the members of this House of Commons proceeded to the Senate chamber to hear the reading of the speech from the throne, which was the last official duty of His Excellency the Governor General, the Earl of Athlone. His Excellency has been with us and laboured with us for the well-being of our people and those of the commonwealth and empire through what history will probably record as the most crucial years that humankind has ever known. His Excellency the Governor General and his gracious consort, Princess Alice, will soon depart from our midst to return to the land of their birth where they may enjoy a well-earned rest. It is with deepest regret that we of this Canadian parliament see them leave. It is with deepest regret that thousands of Canadians who have come to know them as friends will look upon their departure. The counsels of His Excellency in all those things which contributed to the good of our people, to the well-being of men, women and children, have only served to emphasize his concern for the welfare of this our land and for the well-being of the people of Canada.

The kindness which Her Royal Highness Princess Alice has brought to the many arduous tasks and duties which she has so graciously undertaken has only served to endear her to the hearts of Canadians everywhere.

In the departure of Their Excellencies we shall pause for a moment of thankfulness for their having come into our midst, and to wish them godspeed, a happy journey and joy upon their return to their home in those isles which have throughout the ages stood for the glory and dignity of man and the freedom of the human soul. We pray that God will be with them and bless them in all the days to come, and I am quite sure that all Canadians will unite with me in repeating those words so graciously used by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth on her departure from Canada on her royal visit in 1939: "Farewell; au revoir".

But as they leave, Canadian people welcome to this dominion one of the greatest soldiers of our time, one of the greatest military leaders of the second world war, Viscount Alexander. The Canadian active army in the field had the honour of fighting under his command, and I know that our people will join with our Canadian soldiers in extending to Viscount Alexander, his lady and family, a heartfelt welcome with the hope that they may be long with us and that their life in our midst may be a happy one. Above all our thanks will go to His Majesty the King who has so graciously seen fit to appoint to this high office this great man of our time.

Mr. Speaker, as this second session of the twentieth parliament convenes, we still find a world of unrest not only in the economic, financial and social fields but also in the minds of the people and of the legislators of the world at large. As a young Canadian who has endeavoured to make a very careful and close study of all problems affecting not only my nation but also other nations of the world, I consider responsible legislators to be men and women of good will, although most of us differ as to the methods and means of translating that spirit of good will into concrete action.

One thing has impressed me most vividly and it is this. Speaking for my nation alone, I think every man and woman in the House of Commons to-day is intensely aware of the critical times in which we live, of the great issues that prevail, of the necessity of action and of the urgent need to put into practice the principles of the four freedoms as expounded by the ex-Prime Minister of Great Britain and the late President of the United States some five years ago during their meeting in mid-Atlantic. Those four freedoms were not an idle dream but a living reality which, in my opinion, is attainable for all of us. It is for us, the living, to translate those ideals into concrete attainment. I wish to say emphatically: It can be done. We differ as to the ways and means of doing it. Therein lies statesmanship, or lack of it. We cannot hope to build a fruitful, free world on mere tenets of sectionalism. We cannot hope to create a united Canada by pinning up banners of race, creed or narrow provincialism and sectionalism, and then shouting from the housetops. Our outlook will have to be broader, kindlier, and exemplified in the spirit of good will to all men. Statesmanship that is not exercised in this spirit is of no lasting importance; it does not stand the test of time or the indulgence of thinking men.

Canada, among other nations, has now emerged from a second world war, the most widespread and fierce that has ever been known in the history of mankind. Canada has emerged from this war with honour, dignity and the thanks of the civilized world. She has done her part nobly; Canadians now enjoy the honour and respect of thinking people in every part of the globe. Canada has stood four-square within the British commonwealth of nations for right and justice. History will prove that her contribution has not been merely that of lip-service. Her contribution has been in human lives, in material and in a spirit of fellowship with all men and all nations who had the courage to stand up against tyranny and oppression when these threatened to engulf the whole earth. Canadians are coming home from the war in this knowledge. They are resuming their peace-time vocations with a view to a future of good will that is not merely on paper but is rather a living thing for the Canadian people and all people elsewhere.

The members, new and old, of this House of Commons have assembled also in the same spirit; and here I may state that in this twentieth parliament the Canadian people witness the appearance of a very great number of fine young Canadians eager to ensure that the new ideals will be translated into active legislation, and all have come to this capital city with the firm purpose of building a still better Canada, a land of decency, of freedom from want, fear and futility. It is up to us all to make it so. We cannot deny that we have in Canada everything that living man could desire. We enjoy the fruits of the earth in its fulness, for all that is within our borders. In this period of recovery from war we must share those fruits with the less fortunate in those lands who by our side fought the nazis, the fascists and the Japs, and we shall see that this is done.

The British isles have sent to our shores many great people who have inculcated in the thought and culture of this land the great and broad principles of character which belong to the British people. Their ideals of freedom

have become our ideals of freedom, their love of liberty has become our love of liberty, their sense of tolerance our sense of tolerance, and by the very token of this which will one day become a universal brotherhood, their cause has been our cause through the years, in peace and war, to stand as a beacon of hope and a symbol of survival in the world's darkest hours. No living man or woman will ever forget the time when the commonwealth stood alone, when its armies stood off the hordes that had enveloped a whole continent in slavery and torture. No person will ever forget the courage of our people, who by nature are kindness personified but who, when the flame of war swept across Europe, stood their ground with fortitude never before matched in the history of the world.

We, and all the world, owe such people a debt, one that can perhaps never be paid. But our sense of admiration and gratitude persuades us to do such things as are within our power to sustain them in their hour of recovery from the awful conflict. Thus it is fitting that Canada, as a partner in the commonwealth and an ally in the war, should see fit, through a unanimous vote in this House of Commons, to approve and sanction the loan recently arranged to assist the United Kingdom in her post-war rehabilitation. I know that I voice the sentiment of all Canadians, whatever their race or creed, when I say that this token of admiration and gratitude is given by unanimous consent.

The main factors to be remembered in granting this loan are simple, even if they are difficult of solution. The first factor to be considered is that the reestablishment of Britain as a solvent trading unit in a post-war world cannot be done too hastily. Every Canadian who has followed her history during the years of war will remember that Britain placed her whole industry on a war footing from the start of the war, and it will take many more months before this industry can return to a position to swing freely into peace-time production and thus increase her exports, which would allow her to pay the great debt she has contracted during the long struggle.

Canadians from coast to coast, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, no matter of what race or creed, must realize that we do owe a debt to Britain and that during this war, on account of her valiant stand, she lost a large part of her foreign investments, which were liquidated to pay for war supplies which she urgently needed. Canadians must remember that foreign currency used to be available to Britain in many countries, on account of her credit established over many centuries by investments of her surplus exported abroad. At present that great nation is not able to purchase goods abroad as simply as it used to do, which is why Canada extends a hand to her, a credit of $1,250,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that all members of this House of Commons, Canadians not only of British descent, not only of French descent, but also Canadians of foreign extraction who have been chosen by the people of Canada as their representatives in this House of Commons, will by unanimous consent approve the attitude of the government in granting the loan to this former creditor nation, a loan which will also benefit Canada during the years to come in an increase of export trade and markets, and also will ensure to the world that Canada stands behind those four freedoms, as expressed in the early part of my speech, thus guaranteeing one of the most vital keynotes of the world's happiness and prosperity—freer trade among nations of men of good will. We shall watch with hope and increasing faith as the British people attack the problems of recovery as they did the problems of war. May good fortune attend their labours.

While we view with joy their return to the normal ways of peace and freedom, we turn to those problems which face this country and for which we are now assembled to find the solution. One of the most important events in the months to come will be the third session of the dominion-provincial conference, which convenes next month. When the problems that come before that conference have been dealt with and the functions of the dominion and the provinces defined for the purpose of the orderly and effective application of measures to carry this country through the reconstruction period, we may feel confident that we shall ourselves be on the way to recovery from the ravages of war which for more than five years disturbed the economy and life of our people. I suggest that we and the people of this country should face our problems with the calm and calculated firmness with which we attacked the problems of war, and that we should so cautiously build the framework for the future that it may be sound when the time comes for its application to the governing of our affairs. Things lasting and things worth while are not accomplished in a day, but rather by careful planning and repeated consultation. Thus it is that we should view with patient understanding the deliberations that are taking place and will take place in the months

to come in bringing mutual understanding and respect among the governments of the provinces and the dominion.

Thus will the welfare of our people be enhanced, a return to normal national life accomplished, and the future of Canada made the more secure because care and caution ruled the day when plans were being laid. Let Canadians beware of haste, but pursue with determination and courage the problems which are before the country and for which within months we shall have a solution that will stand the test of time and circumstance.

Canadians must be aware, that is all those who have given time and study to our own national problems, that the purpose of the present Canadian government in convening the heads of the nine provinces forming our confederation, is not to centralize all economic powers, but to establish an economic programme by which the nine provinces of Canada will share all benefits equally and give to the people of Canada, from coast to coast, on an equal basis, the economic, social and financial securities which have been long desired and which were the aims and aspiration of the fathers of confederation when in 1867 the great British North America Act was drawn.

The world situation is still disturbed and will remain so for many months. People everywhere are restive, alarmed, living in fear of this ism and that, in fear of the future. But wars have all through history brought such periods, and the leaders who have piloted their peoples through those years have become the great men of history. We and our allies held firm through the years of war, and although disagreement and misunderstanding have arisen in these months of post-war recovery, we may look with faith to the future, and with our allies of the war period hold firm the torch of liberty and freedom for all people.

We should carry on the fight for freedom from all the doubts and travails of life for all people everywhere, and in God's good time the nations of the world will embrace those principles so nobly stated in the Atlantic charter and blue-printed at the San Francisco conference.

In this dominion of ours we have had sound administration of the country's affairs through all the war years, and that soundness of administration is carrying us into the years of peace. This has been due in great measure to the leadership of one who will go down in history as one of the statesmen of the world one who more than any other man or group of men is responsible for the fact that under God, Canada's status to-day among the free nations of the world is greatly enhanced. This love and devotion, not only for his country, but also for the world at large, stem from a sincere love of freedom, a hatred of foreign undemocratic control which animated also the soul of his revered grandfather, that leadership which has led our country during the years of war and peace, a man who has a tenacious, strong and virile belief in freedom not only for the two great peoples which form this dominion of ours, but also the same philosophy for all mankind irrespective of creed or colour. This leadership is in our midst, this leadership rests with one man who parallels this high quality of heart and mind with devout faith in the cohesion of the British people united in their own commonwealth of nations, a pattern for all nations. Mr. Speaker, this leadership rests but in one person, the leader of the present government, the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Winters):

That the following address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada: May it please Your Excellency:

We His Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in parliament asembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both houses of parliament.

Mr. R. H. WINTERS (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and great honour to second the resolution so ably presented by the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau). I would compliment him upon his splendid address, and particularly upon his fluency in Canada's two official languages.

The mover of the resolution and I are fully conscious of the honour that has been conferred upon our respective provinces in western and eastern Canada by virtue of this invitation to speak on the resolution. In constituencies, situated at a great distance from Ottawa as the capital of the dominion, as is Queens-Lunenburg, on the Atlantic seaboard, frequently there develops a feeling of remoteness and detachment, and sometimes even of neglect in the over-all picture of national affairs. But I am sure that the people of Queens-Lunenburg will construe this honour accorded their member as recognition of the part they have played and are continuing to play in the development of Canada. On their behalf I wish to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his colleagues.

On the eve of their departure for England, may I say what a great privilege it has been for Canada to have had Their Excellencies, the Governor General and Her Royal High-

ness the Princess Alice, with us for the past nearly six years. Since their arrival in June, 1940, they have worked tirelessly in the interests of Canada, during a period full of stress and grave concern. To be obliged to be absent from England whilst their country was undergoing such great tribulations was not easy. Their Excellencies made a great sacrifice on behalf of Canada. They have taken their place in the life of this country and the hearts of the people. They will not soon be forgotten.

We are indeed sorry to have them leave, but are grateful that they were able to be with us for even a comparatively short period and that they made such an outstanding contribution to Canadian life. We wish them long life and happiness in the future.

In casual thinking it sometimes seems that the war is a long distance behind us, and we tend to be impatient when in these days of peace some condition arising out of the conflict appears to be unfair or to impose hardships. When it is recalled, however, that Japan surrendered only a little more than six months ago, we must realize that much has been done by way of restoring normal conditions in a short period of time.

The programme of reconstruction in Canada is going forward smoothly. This is due in no small measure to the inspiring and capable leadership of the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe). It was expected that there would be temporary dislocations, with some unemployment, during the reconversion period; and it is, in fact, true that in some instances these conditions have manifested themselves. But when we compare progress made and present conditions in Canada, with progress and conditions in any other country of the world, there is good reason to feel that our problems are being handled competently. The desirable condition, of course, is full employment and a high level of production, and every effort is being made to attain those ends. There are no grounds for pessimism in the light of results to date.

In a consideration of the problem of reconversion the generally satisfactory relationship obtaining between labour and management in the dominion should not be overlooked, especially in the light of less favourable conditions in this regard prevailing in many other countries in recent months. Due credit for this favourable state of affairs must be given to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), whose honesty of purpose and forthrightness are widely recognized. The evident desire on the part of both labour and management to cooperate in solving their problems on a mutually satisfactory basis in the interests of the country as a whole has been commendable. It is hoped it will continue with the minimum of interruption in the difficult days ahead.

War-time controls, regulations and restrictions are being removed as rapidly as present-day conditions warrant. The recent steel situation wherein shortages were brought about by strikes across the border served to illustrate that controls can still be relied upon to further the nation's interests under unusual and emergency conditions. The government's record in the field of national economics during the war and since stands as the best evidence of its desire and determination to exert its special powers in the interests of the national good. Canadians in all walks of life know that these regulations are applied to their advantage and that the government is most anxious to remove what remains of them at the earliest moment that conditions permit. It is very difficult for individuals to look beyond their own immediate problems. Isolated cases of hardship, brought about by regulations, are undoubtedly encountered, but when they are integrated into the national pattern the over-all result is beneficial.

During the war Canada grew, not only internally but in the assumption of a more important and vital part in world affairs. Internally our output of products of all kinds rose to a level believed unattainable prior to the war. This expanded production was brought about through demands generated by the war. Britain and other allied nations relied heavily on Canadian production and we met our commitments. Many of our plants turned out warlike stores which have no place in a peace-time economy. Other facilities produced an expanded volume of their normal run of commodities to meet these heavy external demands. Except in isolated instances we had sufficient man-power to develop the full output of these enlarged facilities, and a condition very close to full employment resulted. Our output was far in excess of that required to satisfy Canadian requirements alone.

The demand for warlike stores has fortunately now virtually disappeared and the need for other of the commodities has decreased. As a further consideration hundreds of thousands of our service men have now been discharged from the forces and have entered the labour market. Therefore, unless we can convert those of our plants which were devoted to this expanded programme to produce goods for which there is a demand, and develop foreign markets, we

shall be faced by the danger of unemployment. To sum up, we must replace war-time markets by peace-time markets.

One obstacle in the way of foreign trade is the poor economic conditions prevailing in most potential buying countries. This government has taken steps to circumvent this situation by making available credits or loans on a large scale to many western European and other countries. These loans will serve the two-fold purpose of assisting in the re-establishment of the ravaged countries of our allies and ensuring a foreign market for our products. To date, loan agreements have been entered into with England, Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, The Netherlands, The Netherlands East Indies, Norway and Russia. Furthermore, negotiations are well advanced toward making a very large amount of money available to France. Except in the case of England, these funds will be used entirely to purchase goods in Canada and will be paid back in due course at normal rates of interest.

The credit to Britain is also a loan which will be repaid with interest. As I understand it, it is basically a business proposition, intended to give Britain an oportunity of buying Canadian products, and as such it will be enthusiastically endorsed. Except for this loan, and a larger one from the United States, Britain might, and probably would, be forced to do most of her export and import business with countries dealing in sterling, thereby increasingly excluding Canada from this important market.

Moreover, loans of this kind to Britain are needed if she is to be able to pay for her imports in currency that can be used in other countries, as we wish her to do and as the Bretton Woods agreement requires if it is to work properly. We want to be able to sell our products in Britain for money that we can spend not only in Britain but also in France, in the United States or elsewhere. We want Australians who sell wool in Britain to be able to use the money they receive to buy goods in Canada. This credit to Britain, together with the larger one from the United States, will help to make this possible.

The loan to Britain, accordingly, does not oblige the British to spend all the proceeds in Canada. But the fact is that the British within the next two years expect to spend considerably more than the amount of the loan on purchases in the dominion. It would be generally recognized as fit and proper for Canada to wish to help England to the greatest possible extent, in the light of her extreme and disproportionate war-time sacrifices. But at the same time it is well to remember that the loan is greatly to Canada's interest from the point of view of business and post-war trade. The government is to be commended for its forward looking policy in extending these credits, which are proving, and will continue to prove, of such great advantage to Canada—the lender—as well as to our allies—the borrowers.

As was pointed out in the speech from the throne, Canada's internal problems must indeed be viewed in the light of world conditions to be seen in true perspective. This country's status among other nations is continuing to grow under the splendid and outstanding leadership of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). We must now be prepared to play our part to the fullest extent called for by our obligations. We anticipate a fair share of the world trade and we want, of course, to live in peace. Therefore we must expect to contribute in full measure to any programme necessary for the readjustment of commerce and to the organizations established under the general assembly of the united nations, with a view to avoiding future wars.

We can well be proud of the part the Canadian delegation, headed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), played in the first meeting of the united nations organization in London. They brought great credit to Canada, as we knew they would. It is gratifying to know, further, that Canada is to participate in the forthcoming peace conference in Paris, and this House is well aware of the part the Dominion is taking in conferences dealing with international finances. These are all problems of an international nature which have a very direct bearing on our Canadian standard of life and we must be prepared to view them in that light.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say a few words about the armed forces and the veterans. Except for the occupational forces in Germany, the bulk of our troops have returned from foreign theatres. Considering the strengths of our forces abroad in the three services, the number of nations requiring troop carrying facilities and the fact that there were two separate theatres of war, one cannot avoid being impressed by the amazingly outstanding success of the repatriation programme. I would take this opportunity of expressing to the ministers of national defence our admiration and commendation for the vital task so well performed under difficult conditions. We do not overlook the fact that many of our soldiers are bringing war brides and families with them to Canada, and we wish to assure them of a welcome in this country. They are

desirable citizens and will play an important part in our future. This intake will serve to offset to some extent our losses through emigration. We must bear in mind that this country needs in increasing numbers immigrants of the right type.

Many of our soldiers, sailors and airmen have been discharged from the services, and either they are deriving educational or other benefits under the veterans legislation, or they have been rehabilitated. Others will remain in the services to seek their careers. Some, already discharged, will be reattracted to the forces, and there will also be new enlistments.

Members of this house have frequently emphasized the value of modern weapons and equipment for the peace-time services, both permanent and reserve, and have insisted on pay comparable with what could be obtained in civil life for employment at corresponding levels. We have also asked for a generous programme of retirement benefits, and are anxious to make life in the services attractive since it is desired to have the best type of men in our forces.

On the other hand there is a heavy responsibility devolving upon the chiefs of staff, and right down through the chain of command, to see that the services, in turn, make the maximum contribution. We want to see in our forces officers and men who are well turned out and proud of their uniforms. They must be kept busy, interested, and made to feel that they are important units in the pattern of Canadian life. That the forces can make a worth-while contribution to our national life goes without saying. We have but to refer to their contributions and initiative in scientific developments and exercises such as musk-ox to remind us of the vital roles they can play. Full advantage should be taken of the great fund of knowledge and experience accumulated in the past few years. Further and continued progress must be encouraged.

Veterans who have been rehabilitated are pleased with the consideration which has been extended to them through this government by a grateful nation. On the basis of the splendid legislation enacted thus far and exemplified by the War Service Grants and War Veterans' Allowances Acts, they have the greatest confidence that at the earliest possible date this house will consider all outstanding veterans' matters and promulgate a veterans' charter which will be a credit to them and to this country.

The importance this government, and indeed this parliament, has attached to the welfare of veterans, was reflected by the spirit prevailing in the special committee on veterans affairs last session. As a new member, it was a pleasant revelation to me to see how representatives of all parties and groups on this committee forgot party politics and worked together in the common interest of the veteran. In my opinion this attitude does great credit to this house and raises its esteem in the eyes of the country. It is hoped it will set the pattern for greater unity of purpose in other phases of legislation.

The throne speech sets forth the urgent food situation obtaining throughout the world, and states that food is the key to peaceful reconstruction. Canada's accomplishments in the field of food production during the war were magnificent because of the untiring efforts of thousands of men and women, many of whom had passed the normal age of retirement, but who carried on in the absence of their sons and daughters in the armed forces or in munitions plants.

Under the continued outstanding and forceful leadership of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), the Canadian farm community can be relied upon with confidence to face the new peace-time challenge of maximum farm production to alleviate the current critical world situation.

Canadian fishermen wish to emphasize that any and all food negotiations should include fish, which is an important item on all food programmes. We feel that we can rely upon the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bridges) to safeguard our interests in this field.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say a few words about the dominion-provincial conferences. To date, there have been three meetings, and the fourth is scheduled for April 25. In my opinion the importance of these conferences is vital and we in Nova Scotia hope that they will produce satisfactory results. The dominion proposals are laudable, and such objectives as the improvement of the tax system, encouragement of employment and advancement of social services, such as medical care and old age pensions, in particular, are in the nation's best interests.

Nova Scotians commend this government for recognizing the dominion's great fishing industry by declaring in its proposals that it plans to do research on fish biology, utilization of fish products and transportation of fish. The proposals involve consideration of means by which credit can be provided for improving the catching, processing and distribution of fish. In fact, they offer every assurance that this industry will be encouraged.

By virtue of heavy foreign demands for fish, Canadian fishermen have enjoyed a well merited measure of prosperity during the past

several years, and they are, of course, most anxious that all precautions be taken to ensure maintenance of present standards. Conditions must not be allowed to deteriorate to the point where fishermen will be faced by poverty such as they encountered for so many years prior to the war.

The main contentious problems to date in the dominion-provincial discussions have been in the fields of taxes and subsidies or grants. I must express agreement with that part of the January submission by the government of Nova Scotia which stated:

> The ideal condition would be found when all the provinces of the dominion would have such revenues and such levels of economic well-being among their people as to make the granting of subsidies by the dominion government unnecessary.

This is undoubtedly the ideal condition. But in a country the size of Canada, with economic, geographic and climatic inequalities throughout its entire length and breadth, the ideal may quite likely never be attainable in all provinces. Under these circumstances, if we are to be a nation in fact as well as in word, these inequalities must be levelled out to the greatest possible extent, and subsidies or grants then become of great importance.

We speak today of nationhood in Canada, and we are to discuss this session a bill on citizenship, as well as to give consideration to the design of a distinctive national flag. These are healthy evidences of growth, but we must keep in mind that if we are to be a nation we must go forward as one unified country and not as nine separate and loosely coordinated provinces with boundaries closely drawn. To the greatest possible extent the same fruits of nationhood should be available for enjoyment by all citizens regardless of where they happened to be born or dwell. The government is to be highly commended for its forceful leadership in this direction through the medium of its proposals.

To Nova Scotians, being located as we are, at the end of a long, slow rail haul from central Canada, this is of the greatest significance. Nova Scotians want to be part of Canada as a nation, and they want to have Canadian citizenship. They want, also, to enjoy all the benefits accruing from these factors. Among other things they are justifiably eager to have access to central Canadian and foreign markets on a fair, bilateral basis. They are looking forward to faster rail transportation to and from central Canada, and to having better facilities, both rolling stock and road beds, within the province. The important project now under consideration, of linking up the Nova Scotia mainland with the highly industrialized island of Cape Breton, by means of a bridge or causeway, should be a vital part of any programme of improvements in our transportation system.

We do not expect that any common ground reached between the dominion and the provinces will provide the basis for a cure-all, but we do look forward hopefully to an understanding, because we feel that it would be a great stride forward, whereas failure to reach any understanding may well prove a step backward.

The speech from the throne reflects in good measure the progress being made in Canada and by Canada. It bears repeating that to a great degree that progress is directly attributable to the Prime Minister. He is a great leader, a great Canadian and a great world statesman, of whom all our countrymen are justifiably proud. His place in Canadian and world history is assured.

There is one other word I would say about great men, Mr. Speaker. I would feel that I had not discharged my responsibilities to all Nova Scotians, and indeed to all Canadians, if I did not say a word in appreciation of the services of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). In Nova Scotia we take full and justifiable pride in our minister. No man has worked more diligently, more sincerely and to better advantage for his native province and his country than has the Minister of Finance. He has established a reputation for integrity, even in a field which is sometimes unpleasant to himself as well as to the rank and file, which is unsurpassable. He has carved in our history a place which ranks him among the great public men of the nation.

In closing I would say, having in mind the incomparable war record of the dominion, with its population of only some twelve million people, that we have a splendid background of experience and accomplishment upon which to build in meeting the challenging and complex problems of peace.

The keystones of our war effort were initiative, determination and unity of purpose, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Nothing less than the same spirit on the part of all Canadians will suffice if Canada is to discharge her enhanced responsibilities as a nation at home and abroad.

With the full knowledge that in the spirit of unity we did it under conditions of war, we can go forward now in complete confidence that we can and will do it again in peace.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): The speech from the throne is

an old institution in British parliamentary practice. It is a speech which is prepared by the government and read by the representative of the crown. The debate upon it is one in which custom gives the honour of moving and seconding it to two of the junior members of the house, junior members on the government side. It is a debate in which both tradition and custom favour, by these two men, speeches which shall not be too controversial, which see nothing to commend in the opposition and which see only virtue in the government. I wish to commend both speakers for the manner in which they have maintained the tradition so long established.

If they see only virtue in the government, this is one occasion when we can excuse them. If they see nothing to commend in the opposition, this is one occasion when we can forgive them. Without further comment on that particular aspect of the matter, let me say quite sincerely that this is one occasion upon which, without agreeing with all that these hon. gentlemen have said, we can commend them for their effort, and personally I wish to extend my congratulations to them on their contribution to the debate.

I shall refer to only one matter to which they made reference, namely, the departure of our present governor general and the coming very soon of a new one. Earlier this afternoon we paid our respects to Lord Athlone, who is shortly to leave us. With respect to the coming governor general, I am sure we shall all extend to him a sincere and generous welcome. He comes to us as an outstanding British citizen and a great soldier as well as the representative of the king. I am sure that all Canadians will welcome him in all three of these capacities, and I am equally sure that his duties here will be carried out in a manner which will bring credit to himself and to the crown which he will represent.

As custom provides, I shall reserve my further remarks until the next sitting of the house. I wish, therefore, to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

Monday, March 18, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

WILD LIFE

PROVISION FOR APRIL 10 AS JACK MINER NATIONAL WILD LIFE DAY

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, respecting the Jack Miner National Wild Life Day.

[Mr. Bracken.]

He said: I deem it a high privilege to move the introduction of this bill, seconded I may say by another great friend of the late Jack Miner, the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette), which proposes that April 10 be proclaimed as The Jack Miner National Wild Life Day. It would seem to me that April 10 is a fitting day on which to initiate and proclaim such an act. At that time of the year all varieties of insectivorous birds return to Canada from their winter resting place in the south. Everyone knows the value of insectivorous birds to the country's production. At the same time these great wild fowl, the Canada goose, and ducks as well, are leaving their southern winter home and flying back to our own Arctic ocean area to nest. I cannot do better than quote what the late and celebrated Irvin S. Cobb said with reference to the late Jack Miner, because many words at this stage of the bill would be superfluous. Mr. Cobb said of Jack Miner that he was "the greatest practical naturalist on this planet." He was indeed the greatest conservationist of wild life on this planet, and in his memory I am very happy to move the introduction of this bill. I heard Jack Miner say on more than one occasion: "I am not so much interested in the number of spots on the woodpecker's tail as I am in the preservation of the species." That was his life work—conservation. He was Canada's greatest conservationist, and April 10, when the birds are coming back, would be a fitting time for schools, humane societies and other organizations interested in wild life to inform their pupils or members of the value to Canada of wild life conservation.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT

POWER TO PROHIBIT SOUND SIGNALS AT CROSSINGS IN OR NEAR CITIES AND TOWNS

Mr. RODNEY ADAMSON (York West) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 3, to amend the Railway Act.

He said: This bill is identical with the one I introduced at the last session of parliament. It merely extends the power of municipalities adjoining or contiguous to cities, but which are in fact physically part of the same metropolitan area, to pass by-laws dispensing with the statutory sound warning, by bell and whistle, at specified level crossings within the confines of the said municipalities. It confers the same power on urban municipalities which may be designated as townships or villages as on those designated as cities or towns, which have this power by authority of the Railway Act as it now reads.

The amendment does not constitute a blanket authority, as every crossing covered by such enabling legislation must be inspected by the board of transport commissioners, who must be satisfied with the safety measures provided at each crossing so designated.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

INMATES OF INSTITUTIONS FOR THE POOR

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 4, to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1938.

He said: This bill is exactly the same as bills I have introduced on other occasions, seeking to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1938. The purpose is to remove the disqualification imposed on inmates of institutions for the poor where such persons are disqualified from voting at a provincial election. The removal of this disqualification will enable all such worthy persons to vote at federal elections whether they are qualified or not to vote at provincial elections.

The paragraph proposed to be repealed reads:

(k) in any province, every person who is an inmate of an institution which is maintained by any government or municipality for the housing and maintenance of the poor, if such person is by the law of that province disqualified from voting at an election of a member of the legislative assembly of that province, and did not serve in the military, naval or air forces of Canada in the war of 1914-1918.

The disqualification which I am trying to have removed is one that should have ceased to operate many years ago. We are supposed to be moving into a new world, and the fact that some people have been or are housed in any institution maintained by a municipality, county or province, should not disqualify them from voting at a dominion election. There are now only three provinces that adhere to the old law—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario—and they ought to be modernized by parliament so far as the Dominion Elections Act is concerned.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

COMMISSIONS TO AGENTS IN CONNECTION WITH SALE OF WHEAT

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 5 to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1935.

He said: This bill also is one that has been introduced before. It was talked out at the last session. I do not know what its fate will be this session, but the purpose is to amend the Wheat Board Act of 1935. Under that legislation the wheat board is at present restricted and the board has to use the facilities already available for the sale of wheat, as provided by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. In my opinion, and in the opinion of every farmer organization as well as of many other organizations in western Canada, this is not desirable, nor is it in the interests of the Canadian people as a whole. I should like to have the support of the house in order to have this bill carried at the present session.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

AMENDMENT OF ACT RESPECTING MINISTERIAL HEAD

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 6, to amend the Department of External Affairs Act.

He said: When the Department of External Affairs Act was passed in 1912 it was provided that the position of Secretary of State for External Affairs should be filled by the Prime Minister. That section still remains. The purpose of this bill is to revoke the section so that the position of Secretary of State for External Affairs may be filled by any member of the government.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

WHEAT

INITIAL PAYMENTS FOR 1946 CROP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In order to assist Canadian farmers in formulating plans for seeding of the 1946 crop, will the minister state what the initial payments for 1946 wheat crop and other grains will be?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I spent the morning in a discussion with the Canadian wheat board and my colleagues of the wheat committee of the government, and I hope to be able to make a statement within a day or two.

GASOLINE

INCREASE IN MAXIMUM PRICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the widespread protest

from the prairie provinces against the proposed two-cent increase in the price of gasoline, effective to-day, would the government be prepared to reconsider its action and rescind the order permitting such an increase?

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): This is an increase in the maximum price which may be charged for gasoline, and was the result of an order made by the war-time prices and trade board. However, since the withdrawal about January 1 of part of the subsidies paid on importations of petroleum it has been well known that this increase would necessarily follow.

I should explain to the hon. member that the subsidies were by no means entirely withdrawn; that from now on currently we are paying $3,500,000 a year in subsidies which all goes in reduction of the price of petroleum products in the prairie provinces, and that no subsidies are payable in respect of similar products in other parts of Canada. It was our feeling that if we are ever to reduce our subsidies with a view to eventually getting rid of all of them, to continue to pay very large sums for the subsidies which would be necessary in this particular area would not be justified. Therefore there was a partial withdrawal of the subsidy resulting in this price increase.

I have had so much correspondence about this matter and so much consideration has been given to it already that I am afraid I cannot promise the hon. member any reconsideration.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

The house resumed from Friday, March 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fernand Viau for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last His Excellency read to us the government programme for the session. On Friday a motion was made for its approval. The debate on that motion affords hon. members an opportunity to discuss not only what has been outlined in the speech from the throne but any other matter that may be regarded as of importance. But before I proceed with the subject matter of my remarks may I refer to the fact that since we last met here two among our members have been signally honoured by His Majesty the King: the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) have been made members of the imperial privy council. I wish in all sincerity to extend to them both my most hearty congratulations. I know of no two men more worthy of that high honour, and I know of no honour the bestowal of which has been more acceptable to or more generously received by the Canadian people.

My remarks this afternoon will not be brief.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am glad I have one supporter. Before I get through I shall be making recommendations that the debate on the speech from the throne be shortened, but to-day I am not going to practise what I preach, because I expect it will take about two hours to persuade this house that it should shorten the debate.

First I shall touch upon the subject matters mentioned in the speech from the throne; then I shall deal rather briefly with the business side of government. After some discussion of the procedure in this house, I shall refer to a matter that has been of very great public interest in this country during the last few weeks, namely, the espionage charges. I shall close with a discussion of foreign relations, a question which has an important bearing upon our success in dealing with our own domestic problems.

The speech from the throne indicates that a high level of employment is the fundamental aim of the government. I am sure it is the aim also of every hon. member in this house. But, is the government achieving it?

In these days it is the duty of the modern state so to organize its economy that every individual able to work and desiring to work shall have an income from his efforts commensurate with his contribution and adequate for a reasonable standard of living.

In spite of all its promises to give full employment the government is failing to do so. The records of the bureau of statistics indicate that as of the middle of February last there were more than 250,000 unplaced applicants registered with the national employment service across Canada. The number of live claims for unemployment insurance was 145,000. The number of unemployed veterans drawing out-of-work benefits was 37,000. In addition there are still in the armed forces large numbers of men not engaged in productive service, and there is an unknown number of unemployed who are not registered. In these days of astronomical figures these amounts may not impress this house, but when I say that in the thirties, in the ten years of the worst depression this nation ever knew, the average number unemployed was about 450,000, these figures do become impressive. The plain fact is that Canada now has an unemployment problem of serious proportions on its hands.

The whole reconversion programme has bogged down. It is not a reconversion programme; it is a status quo programme, a

bits and pieces programme. Let me illustrate. On May 22, 1945, before the election, the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) is reported in the press as having said:

> There are 180,000 high priority jobs at present unfilled in Canada.

Then, after paying a compliment to hon. gentlemen to my left, he said:

> Our C.C.F. friends have been predicting general unemployment during the transition period from war to peace in Canada.

Then he continued:

> There is no such situation existing, and I see no signs of there being any in the future.

He went on:

> Reconversion is about fifty per cent finished in Canada.

That was last May, nine months ago. On February 11, 1946, according to a press report, the same minister had this to say, on the same subject:

> "Canada's reconversion job is about fifty per cent done," Hon. C. D. Howe said at a press conference to-day. The Reconstruction minister painted a bright picture for production, employment and national prosperity over the next few years. "Our exports are good," Mr. Howe asserted, "far above the level required for full employment. They will remain high during this year and next. This is mainly but now wholly due to loans to buyer countries, including China."

Apparently, as I said, the Minister of Reconstruction believes in the status quo. Reconversion was about fifty per cent finished last May and to-day is still about fifty per cent finished. Well, at least we can be thankful that we have not gone backward in the meantime.

The fundamental criticism of the government is that its approach is negative rather than positive. It seeks ways in which to correct the ills of unemployment, but does little to prevent unemployment by the creation of new opportunities for work. That I regard as the basic weakness of the government's approach to the problems it is facing to-day—attempting to cure them rather than to prevent them.

Recently the government issued a publication on the future population of Canada. I am surprised that the government has given no evidence that it has examined the implications of this report. On page 32 of bulletin F-4, "The Future Population of Canada," it makes the astounding prediction that even at the end of the century, fifty years from now, the Canadian nation will have no more than fifteen million people, or only three million more than it has now. On page 9, this document indicates that in 1971 the total population of Canada, based on present trends, will be only 14,600,000. In the whole of the maritime provinces there will be only a million and a half people; in Quebec, 4,700,000; in Ontario, 4,400,000; in Manitoba only 850,000; in Saskatchewan only a million, in Alberta only a million and in British Columbia less than a million.

If that is the goal this government accepts for Canada, it is a doubtful compliment to the initiative and enterprise of the Canadian people. I wonder if this had anything to do with the "middle-power" philosophy of the government, which it proposed in the days before San Francisco. The Canadian people ought not to rest content with this challenge to their future.

On another page in this document it is indicated that after the end of the present century the population will begin to decline. Not merely is it going to be only fifteen million, but at that time it will begin to decline.

Either this country is capable of maintaining more than fifteen million people or it is not. If this is to be the extent of our future, it is time we knew it. If this prediction for our future is erroneous, we should find it out. I do not believe Canada's future is limited by any such narrow horizon. It anticipates an increase of only 100,000 people a year for the next thirty years. The natural increase is 150,000 a year. If these figures are true we shall not be able to maintain our own natural increase. I have travelled over every section of this country; I have seen its developed and undeveloped resources, and I say to the government it ought not to rest content under this indictment of our future.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Those figures take no account of immigration.

Mr. BRACKEN: This is a document from one of the government's own departments, and I say if it is going to take that objective as our aim we ought to find out what is wrong with things in Canada and make some plans to correct the situation. The government has been making economic examinations by fits and starts. Is it not time the government undertook an examination of our economic structure as a whole, with a view to relating our problems and policies to our economic possibilities? Are we to sit still under the suggestion that on one-half of this continent we are going to be content with fifteen million people.

What the government is achieving is not higher incomes by increased production, but a partial redistribution of existing wealth on the basis of scarcity. What we should be aiming to do is to place the emphasis on raising standards by increased production rather than by the division of a restricted production. Production alone is the source of material

goods or wealth. Some of our Canadian laws discourage production, thereby lessening the supply of material goods and thus working against a high standard of living for our people. Canada is not now giving to all men who want to work, and thereby produce, an opportunity to do so.

One of the chief weaknesses is the lack of team play between workers, business, agriculture and the government. There is no spirit of unity or sense of partnership between these four segments of Canadian enterprise. The government's policies have not given us a harmonious working arrangement, and the government alone is responsible for not having brought these different interests into a closer and friendlier relationship. When Canadian laws are such as to bring about a sense of partnership and team play in Canada, production and wealth will expand for us all, and the standard of living will be raised.

With respect to the rehabilitation of returned men, the speech from the throne suggests that the government proposes to reconstitute the committee on the "veterans' charter". There is widespread criticism of the manner in which the government is carrying out its responsibilities in connection with the rehabilitation of returned veterans. Many veterans are out of work, and many of these unemployed veterans are not in receipt of benefits. Furthermore, a great number of those who are in employment do not find themselves in satisfactory work.

A survey of reestablishment trends was published by the rehabilitation information committee covering the Montreal area. If this is a typical sample of rehabilitation trends throughout Canada, it is no wonder that the Canadian information service so severely criticizes the government's administration of veterans' rehabilitation. *Maclean's* magazine of March 15, 1946, summarizes what it had to say in this way:

> Frustration and disappointment, borne with fortitude—that's the typical condition of the demobilized veteran; and it's our own fault, not his.

The magazine is quoting a report of a committee appointed by the government. The report means that in spite of all the eloquent phrases and glowing promises made by the government, the government is failing to bring about a satisfactory rehabilitation policy.

I come now to another serious matter, namely, housing. The speech from the throne tells us that the demand for houses exceeds the supply—as though that were news to anyone. Among the major failures of government administration is that of housing. In no field has its ineptitude been more glaringly apparent. The government's housing policy, from the beginning, has been characterized by lack of cabinet teamplay. People seeking houses have been bombarded and confused with political promises made by cabinet ministers. But still they cannot get houses. The shortage of houses in Canada has been variously estimated at from 300,000 to 700,000. There were insufficient new houses constructed in the ten years before the war; and during the war there was not enough building to offset obsolescence or to meet the needs of new families. The result is greatly accumulated needs at the present time.

The government's own reconstruction committee estimated Canadian requirements at at least 60,000 houses a year for the next ten years; and this estimate in my opinion gave too little consideration to the needs of rural Canada. But even on this estimate, the government is falling pitiably short of the objective.

It is beyond my comprehension to understand why the government should have applied controls to almost every other thing within the economy of this country, and allowed the price of houses to get so much out of hand that it is far beyond the means of the returning veteran or the average man to buy one.

The government parades its generous rehabilitation allowances for returned men. But it fails to parade the fact that these allowances, however generous, are all lost to the veterans who, under these conditions, are forced to pay inflated values for houses, whether produced under government plans or otherwise.

From what I can gather, the housing situation to-day is worse than it was a year ago, and offers little promise of a satisfactory solution. The failure of government administration on housing has been complete. The present situation in Canada to-day is a disgrace, and the government cannot help knowing it.

Housing is our number one national emergency. Many veterans returning from the fighting fronts are unable to find homes. Many families are living in hovels and garrets. The consequences to the nation are little short of disastrous. How can we build a healthy, contented nation in such a condition of unrest?

It is not that the situation could not have been avoided. Even the government itself believed that it could have been avoided. Do hon. members remember the election posters which proclaimed to all and sundry that Liberal policies meant 60,000 homes immediately? Yes—not next year, or even next

month, but immediately. This was last May—ten months ago. Some of them promised a million new homes in ten years.

Do you remember those advertisements, Mr. Speaker? I am sure you do. You probably used some of them yourself. Do you remember the beautiful advertisement protraying a house which would appear to be worth at least $8,000, and alongside which appeared the caption: "What! You're buying that lovely little home for only $13.82 a month?" I have a copy of this advertisement in my hand, and I should be pleased to show it to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and to the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) so that they may refresh their failing memories. Here is what this Liberal election advertisement says:

> We are planning for at least 600,000 housing units, and perhaps 1,000,000. No matter where you live, you will be able to reside in a comfortable home of which you can be proud.
>
> The Liberal government believes that it is the right of every family to own its own home—and live in it. The new housing plan is one of many brought about by the Liberals to provide the people with genuine social security now.

That was last May. This copy advocates the election of the distinguished hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Sinclair). I wonder what the people of Oshawa think of it to-day. I wonder how many are buying homes at $13.82 a month. I wonder how many veterans are getting suitable homes at all.

The housing situation is a festering sore on the body politic, an inexcusable blot on Canada's war effort. Could it have been avoided? Certainly it could have been. When one assesses the causes of the situation, he realizes that this government during ten years of office could have avoided the trouble.

What were the causes? They were lack of planning in advance; lack of coordination of government agencies involved; divided authority; divided responsibility; failure to tie in with provincial and municipal authorities; government frustration of private builders; the monopolizing of building materials; rigid controls holding up production of necessary fixtures. In addition there was the usual story of laws against production impeding recovery.

I have no words in my vocabulary adequate to condemn the lack of unified and aggressive action in this matter. A national emergency exists. During the war we met the national emergency courageously and forthrightly. Surely we shall not be less resolute in peace.

I now come to a discussion of agriculture and food. The speech from the throne tells us that the most pressing problem demanding immediate attention is the food problem. That is a fact we have known for months—that is, everybody except the government. We heard about their new policy first in the speech from the throne. Then instead of taking the advice that he gave to the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) to go to church on Saint Patrick's day, the Prime Minister comes out on that day with a new programme on agriculture.

It is only a few weeks since the government held an agricultural objectives conference with the provincial governments on the subject of the agricultural programme for the coming year. At that conference there was no substantial change made from the programme of last year, yet since last year the world picture for food has changed very greatly for the worse.

Every one will recognize that a nation of 12,000,000 people cannot be expected to prevent starvation all over the world, but no one expects it to. We are only expected to do what we can. Famine can be offset only by food, and food can be saved by those who have it and increased by those who grow it. Canada should be helping in both directions. Our criticism of the government in this respect is that it has made no major effort to revise its last year's plans to meet the more pressing demands of this year. We have heard nothing since we last met of an organized plan to save more food until, as I said, we had this announcement in the speech from the throne and then the present announcement made yesterday by the Prime Minister.

The stubborn attitude of the government in connection with the food prices is in sharp contrast with the action of other important food producing nations. Only three weeks ago the United States government made important upward revisions in its food objectives for 1946. They have raised its goals for wheat, corn and soy beans by at least one million acres each. Increased seedings of other crops are also called for. Australia has requested her farmers to bring her wheat acreage back to pre-war levels by seeding four million acres more this year. Except for the belated statement of the Prime Minister issued on Sunday we have heard nothing since we last met of an organized plan to save more food. We have heard nothing of any plan to increase the production of food.

In his long prepared statement on the food crisis the Prime Minister spent more than half his time extolling the productive efforts of the farmers of Canada during the last four years. I join with him in that, because they did a good job. It is all very well to talk of the past, but what we want now and in the immediate future is more food. The government admits that the food crisis will last for from

two to four years, but in all that long statement there was not one word about the efforts being made by the government to increase food production. The government confines its efforts to increasing the amount of wheat and oats exports immediately available out of the present crop. Surely the government realizes that this is a more serious emergency than that kind of policy will meet. The greatest needs are for this year, and the second greatest needs will be for the year after this.

Commenting upon the dominion-provincial conference objectives the Prime Minister says that no further statement is required in respect to the target for the 1946 wheat acreage. The farm population is urged to plan its farming so as to produce the maximum quantity of food during the next three or four years. There is only one saving grace. Even if the government does not know how to produce more food, the farmers do, and that is by producing more wheat. So we can look for a greater seeding of wheat this year, not because of the government's recommendations but in spite of them, just as the farmers will produce less hogs and dairy products this year in spite of the government's asking, recommending, and hoping for more. Just so long as the government has a so-called objectives conference and puts out pious hopings, recommendings and askings and does not give any other incentives to change, then just so long will the farmers of Canada pay little heed to them.

The government called the agricultural conference of last December an objectives conference. As I said, they put forth recommendings, askings, estimates and mostly hopings without any clear guidance in the form of varying price relationships to guide the farmer into the required or hoped for production.

The ridiculous results have been these. The government asked for four per cent more hogs; they will get twenty per cent less. They asked for two per cent more milk; they will get two per cent less. They asked for five per cent more butter; they will get five per cent less. They asked for the same wheat acreage, but the farmers are ignoring them and will soon seed more acreage. Our reports indicate that that is what they are planning to do. Is it any wonder that the farmers do not accept the government's agricultural suggestions? Unless there are some material incentives in the place of mere suggestions and hopes, they will not change their plans to suit the government.

We have had no call from the government until to-day's announcement in the house for a major effort to save food. There has been no call at all for a major effort to produce food. Those are the only two ways in which we can help. I believe that the Canadian people, if appealed to in a national drive for the conservation of food, will respond generously. I believe if the farmers are given the lead and the necessary incentives in the way of more farm labour and, in some cases, increased price, a considerably larger volume for export can be achieved. The amount that will be obtained from this request to save more food will be considerable, but it will be infinitesimal when compared with the amount that could be obtained by an increased acreage of wheat.

I believe the people of Canada can save enough food and produce that much more to raise materially the standard of nutrition in Britain, or, if it is used elsewhere, to make a material contribution to the lessening of the ill effects of under-nutrition and semi-starvation that exists in some areas. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), according to press reports, holds the view that the acreage of wheat ought not to be increased in this emergency . As I have said, the Prime Minister has taken the same position on behalf of the government.

I hold a different view. I hold the view that wheat acreage can be increased, and that it can be increased without serious risk to good farming practice and without lessening the normal acreage sown to feed grains. I hold the view not only that wheat acreage can be increased to a considerable degree to help meet this need, but that it ought to be increased for this emergency and that the government ought to come out and say so.

I know that there are lingering fears of the depressing effect of wheat surpluses on wheat prices and wheat deliveries. I know the arguments about the need for cereal grains for feed for live stock. I know the argument that in dry areas a certain proportion of the land should be allowed to lie fallow to conserve moisture for next year's crop. It has been my business for thirty years, both in research and in practice in connection with farming, to understand that. But I know also that the only way to get extra food for hungry people is either to share what we have or to grow more. We have done splendidly in both directions, particularly in the line of production, during the last few years, but we can do more.

I know we need to encourage live stock production. I suggest no diminution in efforts in that direction, but this is not the time to be increasing it or trying to maintain it on the basis of war-time demands. To-day in western Canada nearly one-third, thirty per cent, of the cultivated land devoted to growing cereal crops lies fallow each year, producing nothing. Prior to 1941 the normal

amount lying fallow for that purpose was about twenty-five per cent. We have increased the percentage of fallow land lying barren every year since we started paying people to grow less acres of wheat. The wheat acreage of western Canada can be increased by nearly four million acres by going back to the percentage of summerfallow that was used prior to the time we started paying people to summerfallow and not to grow so much wheat. We do not need to reduce the acreage that is being used for feed crops for animals.

Just in that connection let me point out to hon. members one fundamental fact. An acre of land devoted to the production of cereals and producing fifteen bushels of wheat to the acre will provide a million calories, one of the chief measures of nutrition in human food. If that same amount of cereals is fed to hogs, then the calorific value of the bacon and other hog products produced will be reduced to 250,000 calories; and if it is fed to beef cattle the calorific value will be reduced to less than 100,000.

In thickly populated areas famine is not overcome by feeding to live stock cereal grains that can be used to feed people. The cereal crops fed to human beings give more than four times the amount of food value than the live stock products grown from the same amount of cereals would give to them.

I am not suggesting that we should get out of the live stock business. We need it to balance our agriculture. But we have to-day 19,400,000 acres of summerfallow out there growing nothing. The acreage in fallow under pre-war conditions would be about fifteen or sixteen million. By going back to that amount of summerfallow we can get three or four million acres more to grow wheat, which would give us thirty or forty million bushels; and in this way we will do many times more to help correct famine conditions in Britain or somewhere else than will be accomplished by all the effort to save food—though I am not discouraging the government in that policy. Save food by all means. I know that summerfallowing is good farming practice in dry areas, but in time of need it may be better to summerfallow a little less and grow more wheat to help supply this need.

The Prime Minister's statement on food policy will be a stunning blow to the food producers of Canada. It is a defeatist statement, and it places Canada in an embarrassing position compared with what other nations are doing. The dairy farmers were looking for higher returns to encourage them to increase milk production, which would not necessarily call for a very largely increased use of grain. The wheat farmers are willing to seed more wheat in the 1946-47 emergency. They are looking for more positive action.

Under present policies, food production in Canada this year will decline. Farm labour is scarce and dear. Farm costs are rising. The price ceilings and subsidies that were sufficient during the past few years are not high enough to-day to call for an expanded food production. This is the simple fact. Why are people going out of these lines of agriculture which require a lot of labour? Because of the very greatly increased cost. If the government is really anxious to help starving Europe it must provide for increased returns to food producers. The dairy farmers must have higher prices to stem the decline in milk production. Wheat farmers need to be allowed to get more of the world price if they are to seed three or four million acres of this land which will otherwise lie fallow this year, if they are to decrease the amount of fallow land from 19·4 million acres to about 16 million acres. All they have to do is, instead of summerfallowing a hundred acres, to summerfallow eighty and use the other twenty for crop.

I trust that the government's new plans will be revised further and that they will encourage greater production of cereals than their objectives conference accepted. I am pleased to note that the government's plans will include a programme for the prevention of waste of food in Canada, and I trust the government will revise its system of subsidies to provide the price incentives needed to bring forth additional production.

That means more labour for Canadian farms. Labour has been tempted away by high wages. A good many farmers feel that they cannot pay those high wages to get them back, and a good many people do not want to go back. It means price incentives which will meet the increased costs of that labour and encourage, while the scarcity of food exists, the greatest production of food that it is possible to achieve in Canada. This does not need to bring about any continuing change in farm practice. Farmers could increase the amount of summerfallow later on, from twenty-five per cent of the total to thirty per cent if there is reason for doing so. They can easily change now from letting thirty per cent lie idle to letting twenty-five per cent lie idle and thus produce more. They did not change from the old practice of letting twenty-five per cent lie idle because they thought it was wise; they changed because they were paid to change. We paid the farmers to sow fewer acres. Naturally they sowed grain on the best prepared land, and so, after paying them to grow less, we actually got more. They sowed

on the better land and, with better weather and other conditions to help, the smaller acreage actually gave more wheat.

I come now to the question of restrictions and controls. The speech from the throne indicates that the government is planning to remove certain controls but to continue certain others in order, as it says, to prevent inflation. For the purposes of war this government established a system of price and wage and other controls. The nation was behind it in this principle, if not in all the details of its application. These price controls were applied in war time for the purpose, among other things, of discouraging the use of labour in the production of unessential goods where more essential things were required for winning the war. The war is now over, but the controls in considerable degree still remain. The government's policy of decontrol is so slow and so lacking in skill and foresightedness that the dangers of inflation increase. This danger threatens because of one or both of two causes—too much purchasing power, or too little goods.

I do not need to tell this house about the vastly increased purchasing power now in the hands of the Canadian people. The Royal Bank of Canada states in its monthly letter of February of this year, that bank deposits in currency alone totalled $458 per capita compared with $224 per capita in 1939. In 1939 the average monthly deposits amounted to $2·6 billion; in October, 1945, this had increased to $5·6 billion. Notes in the hands of the public increased between 1939 and October of last year from $216 million to $999 million. Eleven victory loans were floated, in which twenty-three million individual applications were made. The total bonds purchased amounted to some $12 billion. Additional surplus purchasing power was invested in $170 million of war savings certificates and war savings stamps, and $225 millions of compulsory income tax savings. A great deal of this surplus purchasing power cannot avoid being released over the next few years, and thus increase the danger of inflation.

The second danger arises from a continuing shortage of goods. A measure of control on some things is necessary; but what the government seems to forget is that by its policy it is perpetrating the very conditions that it seeks to correct, namely, the shortage of goods. The people of Canada want goods, and they want work. They do not want to see machines lying idle while those who can operate them go without work, while those with the money to purchase goods have to go without them.

[Mr. Bracken.]

The government seems not yet to have learned that price controls in peace time are laws against production. What is required more than anything else to-day to head off threatened inflation is increased production. With all respect I suggest to the government that in perpetuating unnecessary controls they are defeating the very objectives they seek to reach and are postponing the early restoration of normal peace-time conditions. I do not urge the government to engage in rash efforts of decontrol, but I do urge the government to prepare and make public, now that the war is over, a planned programme to relax wage controls on low-wage people and to free the productive processes of the country by relaxing those price control laws against production, which were made necessary in war but which in times of peace discourage what is most essential to the production of needed goods.

The speech from the throne indicates that the government is going to ask the house to approve the loan to Britain. A few days ago the government announced that it had negotiated a loan to Britain in the amount of $1,250 million, interest free for five years, and had made certain other adjustments in British-Canadian financial relations.

From the point of view of the selfish interests of Canada, the loan is amply justified. On grounds of simple justice to an ally and senior member of the commonwealth, which had suffered more severely than any other in this war, as well as on the grounds of reestablishment of good will and faith and peace in the world, no reasonable alternative is open to us. Britain sacrificed not only the blood of her sons but a quarter of her material wealth. Now, having done perhaps more per capita than any other people in the world, they find themselves having to pay tribute to other nations because they have to borrow from those nations in order to buy the goods they need. I think we have every justification for supporting this loan; we see justification for it on purely selfish grounds. The money will be spent here to give employment in this country. As a matter of fact, it is an unemployment measure for us as much as anything else. From our point of view we support the loan, not alone on the ground of British and world welfare, but on the ground of our own self-interest.

But we might as well understand what we are doing. The public has been allowed to think of this as a loan of $1,250 million. The facts are that, apart from the loan, there are several other agreements and transactions having to do with our financial relations with

Britain. Among these are the cancellation of the United Kingdom debt to us of $425 million, arising out of the commonwealth air training plan; also provision for the extension of the 1942 interest-free loan to Britain until 1951, a loan which originally, I understand, was $700 million and which has been reduced now to $500 million. In addition there is the settlement of war-time claims and counter-claims between Britain and Canada, including the cost of food and other supplies furnished Britain since V-J day.

Speaking of these huge transactions, we sometimes overlook their full implications. What this loan in fact means is that for five years the Canadian taxpayer will pay interest on it which, even at 2½ per cent, will be $30 million a year, and at the same rate on the extension of the 1942 interest-free loan he will pay $14 million. On the $425 million obligation which has been written off, the Canadian taxpayer will still have to pay $10 million a year in interest, and eventually the principal as well. These figures total an annual payment exceeding $50 million for each of the next few years.

At the same time it is well that we appreciate that after all it is a contribution to prevent unemployment in Canada till trade is once more resumed. We have unemployment now. I ask anyone in Canada who opposes this measure, what unemployment would be like if we did not lend this money to Britain and have it spent in Canada in order to give jobs. As I said, it is in fact an unemployment prevention measure, to be paid for by the Canadian taxpayer to the extent that interest and principal are not fully paid by the borrower, the British taxpayer.

With some members of the government I went through the difficulties of the depression years of the thirties in Manitoba—the difficulties encountered in connection with unemployment—and I suggest that if we had been doing then some of the things that we are doing now we would have come through that condition much better than we did. In the whole of those ten years this government spent only one thousand million on relief. Now, in one loan to another country, to buy goods from us, which will enable us to give jobs to our people, it is raising and giving a loan of $1,250 million.

I come now to export credits. The government says they have extended certain credits. There is on the statute book an Export Credits Insurance Act giving the government power to advance credits to foreign countries to an amount of $750 million. I believe—

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: Since the house prorogued, it is reported that a number of credits have been extended to different countries. I make no comment on this. We support the idea in principle. I should like, however, to ask three questions which I hope the minister will answer in his budget, though I would appreciate it if he could give the answer sooner. I wish to ask that the Minister of Finance advise us, at the next sitting if possible, all the countries to which credits have been advanced and the amount advanced to each. We see reports of these things in the papers, but I would ask the minister to inform us of the interest rate and terms of payment under each of these loan transactions. I also ask that the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance advise us of the financial position as between this country and Russia, what mutual aid has been given and received, and what credits or other transactions have occurred since the end of the war.

The speech from the throne refers to trade —exports and imports. This country, like many others, is seeking to save itself by increasing its exports. Somebody has told us that three persons out of every eight have jobs in Canada because we have an export business. In this connection I trust the government has learned the lesson that the last two decades have taught so clearly, namely, that nations cannot continue to export and be paid for their exports if they do not import. The nations of the world are all trying to export. Only in recent months has there been a general recognition that we have to import if we are to export.

In connection with trade matters I have two questions to ask the government. The United States government has announced plans for calling an international conference on trade. The government of Canada has been invited to attend. The United Kingdom government has invited the commonwealth countries to a free conference on the same matter, and I presume Canada will attend. In this connection I wish to ask, and I think that parliament is entitled to know, what attitude the Canadian government will take at those conferences with respect to the question of empire preference.

We are hearing much about trade agreements which the government has been negotiating with other countries. I would ask the government to make a statement at the earliest possible moment as to the terms of any agreements made since the last report was made to the house, and the present state of any negotiations now under way.

I want to refer briefly to a matter not mentioned in the speech from the throne, the question of cartels. The government tells us it is entering into agreements with the governments of other countries to permit a wider volume of international trade. The government tries to do this with a view, among other things, to increasing employment. At the same time the business of production and trade is, in some instances, falling under the domination of cartels and other production and trade agreements. Those who enter into such cartel agreements have no primary responsibility for employment, and may in some instances be defeating the purpose of constructive trade laws. This government appointed a commission to inquire into the question of cartels in Canada, and that commission has presented a report. Recommendations have been made. I am surprised that, having this report in its possession, the government has made no reference in the speech from the throne as to what it proposes to do about the recommendations the commission made. What the Canadian people will want to know, and what this house will expect to be told, is what steps the government proposes to take to implement any or all of four or five recommendations the commission made.

I should like to refer to one other item not mentioned in the speech from the throne which has to do with another report. Last year the government set up two commissions, one to deal with the taxation of family corporations and annuities, and the other to deal with the taxation of cooperatives. Both these commissions have reported. The findings of the commission dealing with the taxation of family corporations were implemented in full in so far as the commissioners were in agreement; but upon the other report no action has been taken and none has been suggested. I am aware that this is a matter to be more fully dealt with in the budget. I am referring to it now to suggest to the Minister of Finance that we shall expect some statement from him upon it. What I wish to ask is that the government advise us what it proposes to do with respect to the findings of the commission on the taxation of cooperatives. I do not want to anticipate what the minister will say in his budget, but this is one of the things we shall expect to hear about.

The taxation laws on the statute books of Canada are an accumulation of makeshift measures of over a quarter of a century and are based on no scientific taxation principle whatever. Like Topsy, they have just "growed"; and they have outgrown the capacity of the government for effective administration.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Generally speaking the taxation structure is obsolete. I think I am only saying what the government itself knows. The administration has been driven into becoming autocratic. Not only have the taxation laws become a hodgepodge of hit-or-miss measures improvised to meet the pressing needs of revenue and without regard to their effect, but many of them are fundamentally unsound in that they are regressive, discourage production, and thus defeat their chief legislative purpose, that of securing the maximum revenue with the least damage to our economy.

I am sure we were all glad to hear from the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann) that a major reduction in taxation is to be effected in the coming budget. In its report of his address at Renfrew on March 11 last, the Ottawa *Citizen* quotes him as follows:

> The budget for the coming year will be reduced. It is hard to say how much. We cannot know until after the dominion-provincial conference, but it should be down some fifty per cent.

This is an important statement, especially when it comes from the Minister of National Revenue. I presume that a statement of this importance was not made without the approval of the Minister of Finance. With such a big reduction as has been promised, we will expect that when the budget is brought down it will announce an all-round tax reduction of fifty per cent. When the Minister of National Revenue accomplishes that, I think we shall be prepared to replace the present Minister of Finance and appoint him.

I come now to the question of labour relations. During the war, both organized and unorganized workers played a great part in our success. Since the war, labour in Canada on the whole has displayed commendable patience in waiting for the government to complete its reconversion programme, which the election advertisements told us would make "jobs for all". It is to the credit of labour and its leaders that during the period of waiting for the fulfilment of election promises, Canada has suffered from labour disputes in a lesser degree than some countries. But, despite labour's patient waiting, nothing is suggested in the speech from the throne to help bring confidence to labour in its search for a secure position in our economy. Nor is there even a word of tribute to labour for the part it played.

In the past the British North America Act has been cited by the government as the reason for our having no national labour code. To an extent this does present some difficulties, but there is nothing to prevent parliament at this session from passing a national labour code covering government services, crown companies, government contractors, transportation services, such as railways, steamships, canals, et cetera.

A proper labour code covering these employments would be an indication of good faith on the part of the federal government and would lend encouragement to the provincial governments to join in the national code, or to make their own in conformity with it. It would constitute an example and a model. It would help greatly to achieve industrial stability and industrial peace throughout Canada.

The national code should provide for the certification of trade unions; make possible collective bargaining in keeping with present-day trends in harmonious labour-management relations; provide for minimum wages sufficient to establish decent standards of living, maximum working hours, a minimum age for those entering employment, equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex; vacations and statutory holidays with pay, and the setting up of administrative machinery truly representative of labour, management and government.

I do not suggest that the obligations of the government would be concluded with the passage of such legislation. I believe that there rests upon the federal government a responsibility to give leadership, and that the government should at once summon a dominion-provincial conference on labour relations to set in motion plans for what might be called a charter of industrial peace and progress of Canada. This is a matter distinct from the taxation problems now occupying the attention of a dominion-provincial conference, and should be considered separately. At such a conference, an attempt should be made to secure agreement on the major principles of labour relations on their merits, and an agreement on the part of the provinces to pass the required uniform statutes to bring about a standardized procedure from coast to coast in Canada. It is not enough to pay lip service to the cause of labour. Definite and specific action is required if labour is to be brought into that real partnership in our economy without which harmonious and proper national development is impossible. The goal of full employment can be achieved only by a true partnership of labour, industry, agriculture and the government. This goal cannot be achieved unless we can find a way to lessen the losses of time, wages, money and production that arise, if our economy is constantly disturbed by strikes and lockouts.

I come now to another matter not mentioned in the speech from the throne, a matter which was the subject of a good deal of discussion here last year. I refer to the question of orders in council. The Canadian government claims to be a responsible government. Parliament delegates sparingly its authority to the government, yet in war time much of its legislation was enacted by order in council, sometimes behind the back of parliament and even when parliament was sitting. Once the war was over it was expected that this practice would cease. We fought this issue in the last session of parliament. Parliament nevertheless granted the government a modified form of this authority. In doing so we were assured by the government, or so we understood, not only that orders in council would be made available to us but that there were no secret orders in council. It now transpires that there was at least one secret order which had been in existence for two months at the very time the government gave us the assurance that there were none. We were misled generally on the question of there being no more secret orders, and we were misled specifically when the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) stated, as reported in *Hansard* of December 6, 1945, at page 3026:

> That is not a secret order, and there are no secret orders.

I feel sure the Minister of Justice did not mean to mislead this house, but I say quite frankly that when that statement was made we were misled, because there was then in existence a secret order in council which came to light only a few weeks ago. Last session parliament granted the government special emergency powers, but these were granted in the expectation that no orders in council would be withheld from us. We certainly had a right to expect that the government would not mislead us in so serious a matter. Whatever justification the government can now make for having passed this secret order in council, it certainly misled this house last year. Will the government say now whether there are any other secret orders in existence?

The speech from the throne states that demobilization is proceeding rapidly and that most of the veterans are home with the exception of a few in the occupation army. This government has had much to say about the status of Canada as a nation. It has spread abroad the idea that Canada is to play its part as an important power in the maintenance of international peace. It has sub-

scribed to the united nations organization, committing this country to do its fair share in the maintenance of peace. In that spirit it undertook to share the duties of occupying enemy territory in Europe, but it has recently announced that we will no longer share these duties.

With the policy of bringing back to Canada those who went abroad to fight the war, we are in agreement; but according to peace-time plans announced by the Minister of National Defence we are to have a standing army of 25,000 men. Meanwhile the government gives us no indication as to whether the occupation forces that are being withdrawn are to be replaced by any other troops. This government committed itself at San Francisco to sharing in the responsibilities of peace. Having sent an occupation force into Germany, it now withdraws that force, leaving Britain to assume Canada's self-imposed task. What the people of this country expect and what parliament desires is a satisfactory explanation of that procedure—not as to bringing home the boys who went away to fight the war, but as to the government's sudden change of policy in respect to sharing the occupational duties with our allies. What we want to know is whether the government is backing away from the international responsibility it assumed at San Francisco, or some other explanation that will justify leaving to Britain alone the burden of occupying the British zone in Germany.

Now I should like to say just a brief word on dominion-provincial relations. The speech from the throne tells us that the coordinating committee met in January, and progress was made. It is to meet again on April 25, and we are told that we may have some legislation arising out of that meeting. Throughout the life of this government this problem has been before the Canadian people. For ten years it has been before it in an intensified form, yet the government has been scarcely able to keep abreast of the problem, let alone accomplish its solution. The government knows the problem; it has known it for years, yet it has permitted inequities to continue. This parliament, if I do not misjudge it, will expect the government to see to it that whatever weaknesses are inherent in our dominion-provincial set-up are corrected in such a way as to assure a reasonable standard of social services for Canadian citizens in whatever part of the country they may happen to live. I think the parliament of Canada will support such a policy, and I sincerely trust that the representatives of this government and the representatives of the provinces will be able to accomplish an understanding that will achieve this objective.

I have now referred to most of the matters touched upon in the speech from the throne, but parliament and the House of Commons has more to do than pass and administer laws. The parliament of Canada is a big business institution. The business of government in Canada is the biggest business in Canada, and it affects us all very intimately. For five minutes I want to refer to that business. I referred to it a year ago, and the Prime Minister did not like it. He thought it was a matter for the budget, but this is the last opportunity to raise these matters before the budget is brought down, hence I want to leave these suggestions with the government before that time.

Before the war the government's annual expenditures were, in round figures, $500,000,000. In the last fiscal year they were ten times that amount, over $5,000,000,000. I am not at the moment criticizing that. In 1950, with the war five years behind us, it has been estimated that unless the government mends its ways we shall be spending between $1,500 million and $2,000 million a year; in other words three or four times what we spent in the peace-time years shortly before the war. At the moment I am presenting these facts only in order that we may look at them and try to figure out how best to meet the situation.

In the war years about half the cost of the war was paid out of taxes; the other half became a mortgage on the taxpayers in the form of debt. In the last year before the war our gross debt was $3,700 million. At the end of the fiscal year ending in 1945 it had grown to $15,700 million, or more than four times the pre-war amount. At the pace at present indicated by the government, the gross debt in 1950 it has been estimated may approach $20,000 million which, even at 2½ per cent, would carry an annual interest burden approaching the total of all government expenditures in the year before the war.

With respect to taxes, the government collected from all sources in the year before the war, in round figures, the sum of $500 million; and in the 1945 fiscal year it collected more than five times as much or over $2,600 million.

What is the result of all these increased expenditures, increased debts and increased taxes? In 1929 the government took just eight per cent of the people's total income in taxes. In 1939 it took over twelve per cent. In the war years it took much more, for which we make no complaint. But when the end of the war is five years distant, if we are

to judge by the way government commitments are piling up now, the proportion of the people's income taken in taxes by the government is likely to approximate twenty-five per cent. This may vary four per cent or five per cent either way. What the taxpayers will think of that tax load, when they protested so vigorously against paying eight per cent before the war, it is not difficult to guess.

I have four general criticisms and one suggestion with respect to the government's conduct of its business affairs.

1. The government is going too deeply into debt, and conducting its business too extravagantly, having in mind the possibility of a lower national income or a set-back in our economy, once the immediate domestic and post-war needs are met.

2. The weight of the taxation to carry the heavy load imposed upon us by the government is discouraging production, both on the part of workers and on the part of business.

3. Government extravagance, inexcusable at any time, is criminal at a time like this; and the government has shown no evidence that it is capable of checking that extravagance. In this connection I trust that the committee dealing with war assets will be set up early and that it will get to grips with a situation which is far from satisfactory in the minds of many people in Canada.

4. The government has completely failed to live up to its election promises with respect to reduced taxation and, in this regard, has misled the people. They were promised reduced taxes, and this condition has not been forthcoming. I suggest that, whatever else it may do, it is imperative that the government increase the exemptions allowed to the lower income groups.

I now approach a question which may be somewhat of a surprise to hon. members—although I do not think it will. This is a matter which has been considered from time to time for many years and about which very little has been done. I refer to the matter of government procedure. I have been discussing legislation and administration, and have touched briefly upon the business arrangements necessary for the carrying out of that legislation. I should like now, in a constructively critical way, to look at the procedure we follow in the house to get our work done.

I watched carefully last autumn the procedure of the first session of the twentieth parliament of Canada, and tried to appreciate its maze of forms and conventions. After faithful attendance and critical observation throughout the whole session I formed several definite impressions. I had already learned to respect the necessity for rules based on the precedent of long years of British parliamentary practice. But British parliamentary practice has left us far behind. Our Canadian practice is still in the ox-cart stage of half a century ago. The theory seems to be that because these were once regarded as good and because they came to us from the mother of parliaments, there is not much we can do to effect improvements.

I found that the procedure followed was centred too much around legislation; that it invited talk to occupy too much the right of way. I found, also, a too-meticulous worship of outmoded rules, and I found that the business of government was relegated to a secondary place. We know the brief time that was allowed to consider the expenditure of about $5,000 million of the people's money.

I found that this worship of outmoded rules was leading us into dictatorship in the form of order in council government, and this to the detriment of a really effective and responsible parliament. My impressions and suggestions can be briefly stated as follows:

1. I found the procedure to be slow, clumsy, wasteful of time and excessively conventional.

2. I considered that the rules required simplification and modernization, and to be made more democratic and more practical.

I trust that the government will not take offence at my next impression. It is this:

3. I reached the view that the government allows itself to perpetuate these antiquated forms because they enable it the better to thwart the opposition and to protect its own interests as a party in control of the procedure of the house. I am frank to say that I was in the position the government now occupies, for more than twenty years, and I know how these complex procedures get in the opposition's way. I was convinced that, whatever merit these rules may have as a whole, they succeed in frustrating private members of the house.

4. I reached the conclusion—

(a) that the debate on the speech from the throne should and can be shortened;

(b) that the legislation brought before the house should and can be expedited;

(c) that the budget and the estimates both should receive far more consideration than government procedure allows.

5. It is my view that—

(a) The debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne could be shortened by agreement among the parties as to the disposition of time. To such mutual agreement, for the sake of expediting business, I am prepared now to commit this party.

(b) The legislation can be expedited by dealing in the house with only the main principles of measures introduced, and by referring to committees the consideration of the detail they contain.

(c) with respect to the budget and estimates, it is my view—

(1) That the estimates, as is now customary, should be tabled immediately after the speech from the throne is disposed of.

(2) That the budget should come down at the same time or closely following. This has not been the rule. What do we do now? We vote away millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, before we know how much we are going to get by way of revenue or what changes in taxation are proposed. Then, after having done that, the Minister of Finance comes here and says, "We have undertaken to spend so much; we will have to raise a revenue of this amount." I suggest that this is not business-like, and that members of the House of Commons ought to know what the provisions are for the raising of revenue at the time they are passing the expenditures.

(3) That motions to go into supply should be made at least once weekly, on a day when such motion is debatable, so that members of parliament may not be denied the right to discuss matters they may regard as of pressing public importance. In Great Britain, where they adjourn a little earlier than we do here, I understand the adjournment motion is debatable. My suggestion is made so that hon. members may not be denied under the rules the right to raise matters of major public importance at least once weekly.

(4) That much more time should be allowed for consideration of the estimates and that definite days from the beginning of the session should be set aside for this purpose.

I do not think we should be giving the major part of our time at the beginning of the session to the consideration of legislation with the temptation to do too much talking and then be crowded into pushing money appropriations through without due consideration. The unseemly and unbusinesslike rush in voting away the people's money at the end of each session is a procedure unworthy of a responsible parliament. It is in our hands, the hands of the members of the different parties in this house, to remedy this matter. I am prepared to sit in and help. I suggest that the way to proceed is to have, not a large committee with everybody having different ideas as to how to do it but a committee made up of a few people determined to modernize the rules and ready to go about doing it

(5) That the estimates of each department should be referred to a committee for the consideration of detail, the discussions in the house to be confined as far as possible to major items.

The government may not like some of these things, but the members of the House of Commons are entitled to know more of the details than they now get.

(6) It is my view that the whole committee structure of the house should be revamped, many of the present committees having no relationship to reality and some of them seldom functioning. There should be ten or more committees to cover the work of the different departments of the government. Each committee should have the power to review orders in council. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how many members of the House of Commons have read one-hundredth part of the orders in council that have been passed by this government? We just do not know what they contain. As I say, each committee should have the power to review orders in council affecting the work of the committee, to consider estimates, to ask questions relating to any departmental matter of public interest and to consult any or all officials. The members of the House of Commons are relatively ignorant of what is going on in these departments because we do not have access to the people who know the details. In the house there are 245 people who want to ask questions, but the great majority have no chance to ask them.

Each committee should have the power to consider the public accounts of the department concerned. Coming into this house from the outside, I thought one of the most serious criticisms was the failure of the house to use the public accounts committee. It is not for the sake of trying to prove that somebody is a rogue. I do not think anyone sitting over there is a rogue and I hope you will not force us to wait until we think you are rogues before you let us get into these departments and ask what is going on in order that we may know the people's business better. I think it would do the government itself a lot of good to find out the things that are there that need improvement and that the government itself would like to remedy.

These committees, if allowed to develop, could become a really effective aid to more businesslike and constructive parliamentary government. It is my opinion that if some procedure such as I have suggested were

adopted we could get through the work of the session in three-quarters of the time and do much better work.

I come now to a question which was not mentioned in the speech from the throne but which has been the subject of great public interest during the last month—espionage. The speech from the throne mentioned many things, most of which, as I have said, were mentioned when parliament met last year, but one thing it did not mention. It did not mention the one matter above all others that is occupying the attention of the Canadian people to-day. It did not mention the espionage proceedings that have been so much before the public.

On the day the government made its first announcement with respect to this matter I was given some intimation by the Prime Minister of the nature of the facts that had come to the attention of the government. On the same day, after the announcement had been made public, I issued a statement to the press that the government was to be commended for proceeding to take action on the basis of the facts in its possession. I have not since varied from the position that I took on that day.

When oaths are violated against the provisions of the Official Secrets Act, when information is improperly conveyed by civil servants in high ranking positions to the government of a foreign power, when these civil servants hold important positions as some did in this case in departments of government, such as the national research council, the office of the British high commissioner in Canada and one in a very confidential position in the office of the Prime Minister of Canada—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not in the Prime Minister's office, in the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. GRAYDON: A department the Prime Minister presides over.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not the Prime Minister's office.

Mr. GRAYDON: The Prime Minister presides over it.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am glad to be corrected by the Prime Minister. It is more correct to say that one of these persons was in a very confidential position in the office of a department over which the Prime Minister presides. When, as we were informed the latter part of last week, these things are being done in some instances because of a higher loyalty than that to Canada, then under such conditions it is high time that the facts of the matter should be speedily and thoroughly investigated and exposed and that those charged, if found guilty, should be brought to justice and that the public service of Canada be purged of all such influences of disloyalty and disaffection.

But there is a well recognized procedure that modern states follow in such instances, and that procedure guarantees certain rights to individuals who are charged with crimes against the state. In this case some sections of the public have become alarmed. It is charged that the government has resorted to star chamber methods and has denied to individuals certain rights guaranteed by law. We commend the government for searching out enemies of the state, particularly in the field of conspiring with representatives of governments of other powers, but the Canadian people in large numbers have become concerned lest in the carrying out of this duty the government is invading one of the inalienable rights that British justice has secured for individuals. It is feared by many that a dangerous precedent is being established.

In this respect, criticism of the government may well await the government's fuller explanation of its departure from ordinary procedure in such matters. But we will expect a clear and explicit statement from the government as to why, in its judgment, such extraordinary procedure was necessary. Until that statement is forthcoming the government cannot expect to be immune from doubt on the part of many who, while wishing to search out the guilty, will wish to preserve inviolate the rights of individuals that British justice has not denied for generations past. The Prime Minister last week, in reply to questions, promised to make a full statement on this matter in his speech to follow mine to-day. He answered it partly the other day. I wish now before he speaks to direct some questions to him, which I trust he will answer in the course of his address.

The order in council initiating the proceedings was dated October 6, 1945. One question I would ask is this: why was this matter held in suspense from that date until a few weeks ago? I am sure the Prime Minister will be answering that; probably he would have done so in any event, if I had not asked it.

Will the Prime Minister advise the house whether this matter was the subject of discussion with the governments of the United States and Great Britain?

Will the Prime Minister give us some indication as to how widely these subversive

activities have extended throughout Canada? It may be that he cannot answer that definitely.

In seeking information on this matter, I have no thought of embarrassing the government. This is a matter which may have very far-reaching consequences for all Canadians; and I believe that the ends of justice and the interests of Canada will be best served by the government taking the parliament and people of Canada into its confidence, and making the public fully aware of the extent and seriousness of the matters involved. We are anxious not only that the public service be purged of all such subversive influences, but also that we as members of parliament can assure those who sent us here that we are taking effective steps to ensure that there will be no recurrence of these activities in the future. I feel sure that these are matters with which the Prime Minister will deal to-night.

I come now to a matter which the government, in the speech from the throne, indicated was very important. Its words were:

> The future of our own and of every country depends upon success in the task of world reconstruction, and the establishment of an enduring peace.

That is a question not of our domestic affairs but of our international affairs. I want for the remainder of my remarks to deal with the question of foreign policy.

We are met here to-day at a critical time in the affairs of a troubled world. The nations are facing one of the great cross-roads of human history. They have no choice but to make solemn and far-reaching decisions. Upon those decisions—the wise charting of our future course—the destiny of mankind very largely depends. I agree with the government when it says that this is an important matter. The alternative paths become clearer day by day. They are clearer now than they have ever been before. We can have peace and progress or we can have anarchy and the reversion to worse conditions than the dark ages. The choice is in our hands to make.

In the first glow of victory of last May, and again in August, when the welcome news came that the war was over, the vision of permanent peace and progress appeared to be realized. Since then, slowly but inexorably, the fearsome knowledge has been borne in upon us that we still have another fight to win: this time a battle for peace, a battle that is quite as urgent, quite as difficult, and in some respects harder to fight than the battle for victory in war. The end of armed hostilities we now recognize as but the commencement of an even more stubborn and relentless battle for peace and progress among men.

I have used the phrase, "the battle for peace and progress." There is no better phrase for what lies ahead. It will be a battle, a great and unceasing struggle against all the forces that have been the cause of war and poverty and pestilence in the world. On the side of right will be ranged the intelligence and sanity bequeathed to us by the accumulated wisdom of generations of mankind, and against us will be ranged all the dark forces which have denied the peace and prosperity and well-being which is the gift of science to this generation if we have but the collective wit to use it.

In war we met German aggression by our own aggression, German destruction by our instruments of destruction. We must now by sanity disarm aggression, substitute production for destruction, and settle our international disputes, not by the blood of our sons but by the force of reason.

In recent months optimism has given place to pessimism. Recurring waves of hope, of cynicism and of fatalism have swept across the world. It has become fashionable to be critical of the united nations organization. It is easy for men of little faith to predict its failure. As for myself, I am not one of those. I believe that a good beginning has been made in the building of a new international order, one which eventually will be strongly based on moral precepts and the rule of law. This new order of diplomacy is suffering growing pains. Plain speaking has replaced drawing-room courtesy. The nations of the world have reached a point of crisis.

It is a time for steady hands, a time for restraint, a time for caution, a time for sanity in both our thinking and our speaking. In these days we must recognize that enduring peace can be founded only upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of all the nations of mankind. Peace based upon political and economic expedients will not survive. The defences of peace must be soundly laid on the basis of free exchange of knowledge and ideas and resources throughout the world and a recognition of the rights of all peoples to govern themselves without dictation from outside.

The united nations organization is the present hope of mankind for world peace. To that organization this parliament has already given its unanimous allegiance. That allegiance we shall never withdraw. The obligations assumed we shall carry out. There are some who fear that this organization may fail.

But it can succeed. It will succeed, if ordinary people the world over are helped to recognize that peace is the responsibility of all, not merely the responsibility of delegates of governments.

Where does Canada stand in this picture? What is our role to be? In this new world of science and modern transportation Canada has suddenly discovered herself to be the geographic and strategic centre of the continents. In the past we have thought ourselves protected by the oceans and isolated from the spheres of influence making for war. Bounded by three great oceans, we appeared to be a favoured and protected unit in a world that had not learned to live without war. If ever that were true it is certainly not true to-day. The three oceans no longer isolate or protect us. On the contrary they but provide an uninterrupted highway over which hostile agents of destruction can search us out between dawn and daylight from any angle of the compass. Any global map shows us where we are, in the centre of the great land masses of the globe, a possible modern Flanders in a world war.

Our geography has become at once our greatest danger and our greatest challenge. We have no choice now but to throw our weight positively in the direction of peace and order in the world. We are not mere spectators of the international scene. From this time on we are actors as well as spectators on the world stage. Those sacred acres of European and other soil "which are forever Canada" will not permit us again to shirk our responsibilities as a nation.

To make our full international contribution Canada must have a continuous and consistent foreign policy. Improvisation is not good enough to ensure continuity. To ensure the full assumption of our world responsibilities it is imperative among other things that a separate ministry of external affairs be created. Foreign policy is too vital to be left to the spare-time direction of a harassed Prime Minister. I was glad to hear the announcement this afternoon that the Prime Minister recognizes that he is already carrying too heavy a load, and that provision is being made so that sometime, I do not know how soon, that load may be shared by someone else.

Canada is now an international power. Her responsibilities in the cause of peace are potentially heavy. Her obligations are great.

Complacency in the past has been the scourge of our generation, and unpreparedness and appeasement the cause of war. All this complacency, unpreparedness and appeasement will have the same results in the future as in the past. Let them be cast off now and forever. Canada is now invested with the moral responsibility for sharing the price of world peace, and I venture the solemn prediction that unless we are true to the sacrifices of our sons we will be equally guilty with aggressors for any anarchy that may again confront us.

We have paid a terrible price for a war that could have been prevented. Our default was not wholly in lack of military preparation. It was also in a negative attitude of irresponsibility. Everyone preached about rights, but little was heard about responsibilities, and the dictators saw in this attitude a lack of unity of purpose and of faith. Furthermore, there were in our midst people who exalted novel and foreign types of government and at the same time condemned British institutions upon which our Canadian way of life was built.

Dictators preached that our democratic institutions were decadent. After world war 1 we placed all the emphasis on status, autonomy, political decentralization; meantime, the technological forces of the universe were driving nation states against their will toward world inter-dependence and forced cooperation.

I do not raise these matters for the purpose of recrimination, but I trust that from now on there will be less irresponsible talk on the part of public men in this country. Canadians will expect that public men will not again seek votes in certain parts of this country on the basis that they, if elected, will keep the country at peace and that their opponents, if elected, will drive the country into war.

The ultimate solution is of course a world government, but humanity will have a long and hard road to travel before that utopian objective is achieved. In the meantime, this parliament must decide what part Canada is to play in our journey along that road. What then is to be our policy? Where in fact do we stand? Let us be done with any doubts on that matter.

We see before us a world dividing into blocs and spheres of influence. It is recognized that there are now three great powers. Does anyone here wish to see these major spheres of influence reduced from three to two? What would the next step be? It would be a contest between two powers for world domination, and Canada would find itself in the front line of that contest.

Surely that is a prospect that none of us can contemplate with equanimity. I suggest therefore that the preservation and strengthening of the commonwealth of British nations is at this stage in our history the best hope of permanent peace in a world dominated by three spheres of influence. Within that family

of nations there is now no single dominating land power. Its organization by its very nature makes for peace and not for war. Positive knowledge by the world as well as by members of the commonwealth that Canada means to be a loyal partner in that family of nations will do more than anything else to give it the moral power and prestige now so essential to the cause of world peace.

If we now fail that great family of British nations and it should thus be made weaker at this critical time in the world's history, Canada will eventually find itself but a satellite of the United States of America, at first to become dominated by it economically, and later on to become absorbed politically into that great republic.

I am one who does not think that Canada can achieve her highest destiny by weakening the family of British nations only to become eventually a forty-ninth state in the American union. If any such world calamity as the break-up of the fraternity of British nations should occur, the North American continent would find itself eventually an island in a potentially unfriendly world, a consummation which I feel sure no friend of world peace can look forward to with an easy mind.

Looking at the geography and political structure of the world at the moment, I am of the firm belief that the British commonwealth and empire, with its ramifications in all corners of the world, constitutes the greatest cohesive element in that structure of world unity which is now for the first time taking a definite form in the minds of men. Let us then preserve the important balancing factor in the three spheres of influence that dominate it. Let us strengthen that community of nations called the British commonwealth. Let us be proud to acknowledge our faith in it and the part we are to play in it. Let us no longer be hesitant to say that we will do our part in preserving it. Let any nation that raises the ugly prospect of destroying peace in our time know that we in Canada are a firm and loyal partner, not alone within the family of British nations but in the larger family of the united nations as well, and that we are prepared to take our part and assume our obligations within both.

Mr. Speaker, in some of these remarks I have been critical of certain of the policies of the government and its administration of them. I wish now to move, seconded by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon):

That the following words be added to the said address:

"We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that Your Excellency's advisers have:

(1) Failed to meet the needs of veterans and workers by planning reconversion so as to avoid unemployment and dislocation;

(2) Failed to take adequate and timely action to ensure the provision of suitable housing for Canadians;

(3) Failed to adjust their agricultural production plans to meet the altered conditions of the world's demands;

(4) Failed to relieve the tax burden particularly on low income groups."

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) continued the debate following the mover and the seconder on Friday last, he very appropriately introduced his remarks by reference to the departure of the then Governor General and the arrival in the near future of the Governor General designate. I should like immediately to join with him in what he said with respect to both governors-general. We have parted with Lord Athlone and with Princess Alice, with the deepest regret. I believe that regret has been felt in all parts of Canada.

I am sure the house will be pleased to know that on Sunday I received a telegram from Lord Athlone from Washington expressing very warm appreciation of the manner in which the citizens of the capital had turned out to greet him and Princess Alice on their departure, and referring more particularly to the feelings which they will always cherish in regard to the years they spent in Canada. Lord Athlone used the expression that their association with the people of this dominion will be for each of them an imperishable memory.

As the house is aware His Majesty the King has designated Lord Alexander of Tunis to be the successor of the former Governor General. I think I am correct in saying that when Lord Alexander's appointment was announced there was not only approval but rejoicing in all parts of Canada that one who had played such a brilliant part in the great war, and who, as their Commander, had been so closely associated with Canadian troops in the battles in Sicily and in Italy, and in the victories there achieved, was to come to this country as the representative of the king. The approval given at that time, and the expressions of feeling, have deepened since the announcement was made. I need not say any more at the moment than that I am sure that when Lord Alexander arrives in Canada he will receive one of the warmest welcomes ever extended to any representative of the crown in this country.

My hon. friend also very kindly made reference to the speeches delivered by the mover and the seconder of the address, my friends and colleagues in my party, the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau) and the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Winters). I should like to join my congratulations very warmly to those of the leader of the opposition. The mover and the seconder with the accustomed modesty of young and new members credited their selection as being a compliment to their constituencies. I may say I think the constituencies may feel complimented by the manner in which they were represented in the speeches which were made by their representatives in this house. The hon. members come not only from two of the very important but two of the historic regions of Canada. At the moment, time does not permit me to speak of St. Boniface and its relation to the development of the Canadian west, or of Queens-Lunenburg and its association with the development of the maritimes, and the place which each of those constituencies holds to-day in the industrial and commercial life of our country. But I should like to say that there were other reasons as well which caused my colleagues and myself to feel that we would wish to have these two members, in particular, address the house at the beginning of this debate. They are among the younger men who came into parliament for the first time after the last elections. I should think that for that reason alone we as their colleagues in this house have reason to be proud of the addition which has been made to the debating strength of the house by their presence here. But they are also veterans of the great war. May I say that naturally the people of Canada would wish to have as those first to participate in a great debate, members of parliament who have taken their part in the service of their country as members of the armed forces.

In recent years both of the hon. members have also taken an active part in the public service of Canada. In different ways they have been public servants holding trusted positions, and have filled them in a manner that was most creditable to themselves. These are but some of the reasons which caused me to extend the invitation which I did. May I repeat how pleased all their colleagues were at the manner in which they addressed the house. I think I may associate members of all parties in the congratulations which I now extend to them.

There was just one thing, perhaps, that I found a little embarrassing in their remarks; it was the extremely generous way in which they referred to myself and my leadership of the party. I have no doubt that that will be offset before very long by something from the other side which may help to adjust the balance; but I should like to say that if I have been spared through many years to hold the position I have it is due above all else to those who I have had immediately around me as my colleagues in the cabinet and, other members in the House of Commons in the party to which I belong. In enunciating Liberal policies I have sought as best I could to give expression to what I believed to be the views of the Liberal party in Canada. Through the years that I have held my present position I have been extremely fortunate in having about me colleagues second to none any prime minister has ever had in his cabinet or as loyal followers in parliament.

I come now to my hon. friend's address of this afternoon. Here may I note at the outset what he has said, and rightly said, about what may be said in a debate on the speech from the throne. My hon. friend intimated that, after all, the debate on the speech from the throne is partly formal procedure for the purpose of opening parliament and therefore should be made brief in order that the house may get down to business—the business about which he said a good deal this afternoon—and not lose too much time. He did not set us the best example in the matter of shortening the debate. May I say that I am ready to join with him and the other leaders immediately in seeking to work out an agreement as to shortening the length of the present debate. I think it is desirable that the debate on the address should be brief; but may I point out that when it comes to making these arrangements it is not always as easy to bring about the result as it is to tell others what should be done. If there were only my hon. friend and myself, the two of us, or myself and any one of the other two leaders, we could I think come to an agreement; but where there are one, two or three leaders of the opposition, not to mention one or two others who feel they have a sort of right to lead as well, it is very difficult to get an agreement by which all parties will be bound. However, I do hope we may come to some agreement at once in regard to the length of this debate.

Then, with respect to the rules of the house, of which my hon. friend has spoken, may I say that the government intend to recommend the reappointment of the committee on the rules of the house. I hope and pray that the committee may get down to work immediately and that it may be able to present to parlia-

ment at an early date something in the way of a revision of the rules which will help to shorten the discussion. I am not going into the various points my hon. friend raised this afternoon. Many of them have been raised over and over again in this parliament for years by others who have had just as high motives as those of the leader of the opposition in the proposals they have made. But this House of Commons is a big institution; it is the master of its own house. It is not the government that is responsible for the rules and much of the procedure; it is the house as a whole.

In connection with proper procedure may I say to my hon. friend that I believe the one thing above all others which will help is that we recognize there is an appropriate time for everything. With all due respect may I say that to-day my hon. friend tried to cover nearly every subject that is likely to be discussed in the course of the present session. That is a pretty big order; it has taken a good deal of time. He has spoken on employment, on housing, on repatriation, on the loan to Britain, on credits; he has made a budget speech as well as a speech on the address. Not only that—he concluded with a lengthy speech on foreign policy. May I suggest that if he wants to improve the procedure of the house from now on he select one topic at a time, limit the number and not try to cover everything in the course of the debate on the address.

Mr. BRACKEN: Would you confine the leader of the opposition to one topic on the speech from the throne?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, by no means; as my hon. friend rightly said, the speech from the throne affords an opportunity to discuss anything. But I should have thought in the light of the amendment he has proposed what my hon. friend would have done would have been to make one general blast; that he would have come out and said in one short denunciation that everything the government had done was wrong, and that as a matter of fact they had failed to do anything. He could have greatly shortened his speech if he had just put it into those few words, but he lost the effect such a statement might have had by first of all running through a long list of topics and trying to exhaust all that he could say on every single one.

However, my hon. friend failed to point out to the house that while employment may not be all that we would wish it to be; while housing may not be all that we would wish it to be; while repatriation may not be all that we would wish it to be, and so on in regard to all these and the other subjects he has mentioned, nevertheless, Canada is to-day in a better position than any other country in the world. When one hears from all the countries that are really struggling with their problems to-day, whether it is the United States, whether it is the United Kingdom, whether it is Belgium or Holland or the other countries of Europe or other dominions that were involved in this great war—I am not referring to enemy countries because we know they are all destroyed—from every one of these countries comes word, "We wish we could be like Canada. We wish we were in the position Canada is in." No other country in the world stands as high in the eyes of the world as Canada stands to-day, and I think it an unfortunate thing that the one view to the contrary should be expressed in this House of Commons by one of our own Canadian citizens, the leader of one of our political parties. That is the corrective I want to make this afternoon to what my hon. friend has said. As far as employment is concerned there is not, in any other country in the world, as large a percentage of men employed as there is in Canada at this time; nor is there, may I point out, another country in which there has been as little in the way of industrial strife. That is a very important thing. It has not been a matter of chance. It has been a matter of the policies of this administration over many years and, may I say, it has been due in very special measure to the exceptional ability of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) of this government in adjusting labour relations. That is something to be proud of, something this country can, I will not say boast about, but at least feel a tremendous satisfaction in, namely that we have had such a record of comparative industrial peace since V-J day.

In regard to rehabilitation, my hon. friend knows that as far as the return of our forces from overseas is concerned we stand very much in the lead in the numbers that have been successfully repatriated. Certainly we have not been able to meet the situation in its entirety, but what country has, not only at this time but at any time? What is needed it seems to me is a proper sense of proportion in these matters. In regard to housing the speech from the throne mentions quite clearly that the demand is in excess of the supply; but here again I ask, in what other country, relatively speaking, is there a larger proportion of houses available than in this country?

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, go on.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I ask my hon. friends to mention any other country. Will they say that in Great Britain they are in a better position as far as housing is concerned? Will they say that in the United States they are in a better position? Will they say the position is better in Belgium or in Holland; in Australia or New Zealand, South Africa or anywhere else? As a matter of fact when one compares Canada with these other countries in the matter of housing we make a better showing, in relation to our numbers, than any other country at the present time.

Mr. MACDONNELL: Give us some figures to prove it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend's leader is the one who made his statement to begin with, and perhaps he will give us his figures.

Mr. MACDONNELL: Give us the figures.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will just bide his time he may get his chance for leadership, before his life is over.

The leader of the opposition next spoke about food production and agriculture in general. I would again ask him: Can any hon. member in the opposition point to any country in the world which has made a finer contribution in the last few years than has Canada, and which to-day is continuing to make a finer contribution in the export of food stuffs to help other countries?

Then my hon. friend found fault with controls. Again I wish that he might take a little more to heart what other countries are saying about Canada in this respect. I wonder what country would not give a great deal to be in our enviable position, because of our anti-inflation policy and the successful manner in which it has worked out? Will any hon. member mention any country which has dealt more successfully with that most difficult of all problems, namely, the combatting of inflation?

The truth is that my hon. friend has not stopped to ask himself where this country would have been but for the government's policies in all these matters. I ask the people of Canada to think deeply on that point when they are asked to express condemnation by those who are saying the government has failed in this, failed in that or the other thing.

All one has to do is to compare the relative costs of living in Canada with those in any other country of the world to realize that in Canada the government's policy has been a great help to the masses of the people, and has been more successful than similar activities have been in other countries. That is the kind of emphasis that is needed.

My hon. friend has said that we failed to do this and to do that. The truth of the matter is that my hon. friend has failed to grasp what our policies—framed not at the last moment, but years in advance—have meant to Canada, and what they mean to-day.

Had we not introduced and passed at a previous parliament legislation setting up the Department of Health and Welfare, with its administration of family allowances, and the Department of Veterans Affairs—again, administering, the best measures for veterans to be found anywhere in the world—my hon. friend would have found a situation very different indeed from the one to be found in Canada to-day.

Had we not provided in advance for the Department of Reconstruction, to replace the Department of Munitions and Supply, thereby making preparations in advance for the work to be carried on most effectively in the post-war period, I wonder where we would be to-day. And may I add this—and I do not think the fact will be disputed,—that the Liberal, Conservative and every other political party in this country is loud in its praise, and rightly so, of the magnificent work done by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe). In like manner the veterans of this country are loud in their praise of the magnificent work done on their behalf by the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie). War veterans to-day have in Canada a charter all but completed, in which is to be found legislation related to the many sides of their work and of their lives. Again I say the like of this is not to be found in any other country.

My hon. friend did say he approved of the loan to the United Kingdom, and I was pleased to hear him say that. I believe he appreciates, as do all thoughtful persons who have given study to the condition of the world to-day, the sacrifices made by Great Britain during the war, and the position in which she finds herself to-day in seeking to meet her obligations. I believe it is realized that if Great Britain is to be maintained in a position where she can play a helpful role among the nations, then she must be re-established in a way which will help toward that end.

My hon. friend spoke of a gift. This is not a gift; it is a loan. True, it is being made for a long period of time; and I have no doubt in the world that as my hon. friend has said if the loan were not made this country

as well as the United Kingdom would find itself in a very difficult position within a short time.

Mr. BRACKEN: Did the Prime Minister understand me to say it was a gift? I did not mean to say that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I believe the hon. member did say that, because I made a note of it at the time. It may have been a slip on his part, and I am quite prepared to accept his word. It is wise, however, to make it clear that we are making a loan. However this is one of the matters which will be discussed at considerable length, later in the session, and I feel I need not take too much time in discussing any aspect of the measure at this time. I expect the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) will introduce the necessary legislation, and at such time will speak at some length upon it.

My hon. friend touched briefly upon financial and trade matters which, as I have already said, are directly related to the budget. I believe we might well defer consideration of these matters until we are discussing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I might take considerable time in reviewing other matters discussed by my hon. friend; but, as he has said,—and I believe I have his words before me—the matter which above all others occupies the attention of the people to-day is the deplorable question of espionage and disclosure of secret information to a foreign power which so unfortunately has come to the fore.

Having in mind what my hon. friend has said, namely that this disclosure of secret information to a foreign power is attracting keen attention throughout the country, I felt I should take it up at the earliest opportunity. With that in mind I announced a day or two ago that I intended to deal with this matter when speaking to the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

As I am about to deal with this new subject, Mr. Speaker, it would I think, meet with the convenience of all hon. members if you would call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, on Friday afternoon last I expressed the hope that hon. members of this house would read with care the interim reports which had been presented by the two justices of the Supreme Court of Canada who are acting as commissioners to conduct an investigation into the disclosure of secret information to unauthorized persons for communication to a foreign power. This afternoon my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, asked me to take the house and the country into my confidence with reference to matters pertaining to this investigation. May I say at the outset that in this I am necessarily confronted with one serious handicap, one to which I have referred in a statement which I have given to the public, namely, that the whole matter is one which is *sub judice* at the present time. For that reason there is very much that I should like to impart to the house and to the country which unfortunately I will not be able to impart and which cannot be given to the house or the country until those who have been or may be committed for trial have had their trial and evidence has been taken in public upon which verdicts will be based.

I have been asking myself at what point one would necessarily have to draw the line with respect to what is not permissible because of matters being *sub judice* and, up to what point matters might be discussed quite frankly. I am right I believe in assuming that anything that took place of which I had knowledge up to the time of the appointment of the commission and which influenced the government in its action with respect to the course it took in appointing the commission and in acting on the advice of the commission in certain particulars would be a matter that I should be quite free to discuss openly, being careful all the time not to say anything, if that is possible, that would in any way prejudice the trials that may take place.

I do not think I can do better in speaking to the question itself and giving to the house at once some idea of its vast significance and importance than to quote from the first interim report of the royal commission. I am not disclosing anything that should not be disclosed because of *sub judice* reasons if I quote from a published report which is in the hands of all hon. members of parliament. Therefore I would bring immediately to the attention of the house the gravity of this question and its far-reaching significance and importance by reading what the commissioners have said with respect to the inquiry they are holding, what they have found thus far, and what they have felt should be given as soon as possible to the public. On page 11 in the document which was tabled on Friday last relating to the proceedings of the royal commission will be found the following paragraph:

> The evidence establishes that a network of under-cover agents has been organized and developed for the purpose of obtaining secret and confidential information particularly from

employees of departments and agencies of the dominion government and from an employee of the office of the high commissioner for the United Kingdom in Canada. The evidence reveals that these operations were carried on by certain members of the staff of the Soviet embassy at Ottawa under direct instructions from Moscow. The person directly in charge of these operations was Colonel Zabotin, military attache of the embassy, who had as his active assistants in this work Lieutenant-Colonel Motinov, chief assistant military attache, Lieutenant-Colonel Rogov, assistant military attache air, Major Sokolov, of the staff of the commercial counsellor of the embassy, Lieutenant Angelov, one of the secretaries of the military attache as well as other members of the staff of the military attache, all of whom, as well as the agents whom they employed in the pursuance of their activities, were, in the interests of secrecy, known by under-cover names.

In the next paragraph will be found the following:

We have had before us a former employee of the Russian embassy at Ottawa, Igor Gouzenko, the cipher clerk of the military attache, who has described this organization and its functioning, and who has produced original documents, the authenticity of which we accept.

I need scarcely say that these paragraphs describe as serious a situation as has existed in Canada at any time. If the house has had to wait some little time for the information which I intend to give it this evening, it is because the government have been only too conscious of how serious this situation is and how far-reaching its repercussions may be.

Perhaps I cannot better take the house into my confidence than to begin with an account of how I personally became informed of this situation and how the government became aware of it. Hon. members perhaps recall that when the first session of this house opened on the 6th of September last we met in the morning to choose a Speaker and the proceedings were to begin at eleven o'clock. Hon. members may have noticed that at that time the house was kept waiting, for a few minutes at least, before I found it possible to come in. What had happened was this—I was informed that morning by the under-secretary of state for external affairs that a young man from the Russian embassy had been to the office of the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) asking to see the Minister of Justice. He said that he had most important information to impart to the government, that it disclosed a situation which threatened very seriously conditions in Canada, that it was an extremely serious situation and that he wished to warn the Canadian people with respect to it. He said that he had in his possession documents which would make wholly clear what he was saying and he wished these documents to be in the possession of the government. He said that he had taken these documents from the vaults of the Russian embassy and also from among papers which he had collected over a short time with a view of making the disclosure which he now wanted to make.

I was asked what should be done in these circumstances I replied that I thought this was a case where we could not be too careful or too cautious; that this man represented that he had come from the Russian embassy; that we could not say whether the documents he had in his possession were fabrications or not; that we did not know what his own state of mind might be, or how responsible he was; that we knew nothing of the circumstances which had caused him to leave the embassy and come to the government and that I thought he should be told to go back to the embassy with the papers he had in his possession.

He had been anxious to see the Minister of Justice. He had not seen the Minister of Justice. He told his story to the secretary of the Minister of Justice, who gave a full account to the under-secretary of state for external affairs, and he gave me the particulars which I have just mentioned.

What I felt most important was to see that nothing should be done which would cause the Russian embassy to believe that Canada had the least suspicion of anything which was taking place there, or which could be regarded by them as unexpected in the circumstances.

This advice was given to the man who came, whose name has been given in the commission report—Igor Gouzenko. He was a cipher clerk in the Russian embassy. He had been in the embassy in Ottawa here for some two years, associated with the military attache. Prior to those two years he had been for a couple of years in the secret service in the U.S.S.R. He had been trained particularly in ciphering and deciphering messages. That, he claimed, was how he had got possession of the documents to which I have referred.

Perhaps at this point I should indicate what I subsequently learned about Gouzenko's movements. Apparently he left the embassy around six-thirty in the evening of the day prior to the one at which he went to call at the office of the Minister of Justice. He left with the papers in his possession and went from the embassy to one of the newspaper offices in this city. It was to the *Journal* that he went and told his story to one of the persons whom he found in the office. He wanted to see the editor. The editor was not present; but, I am told, he gave a fairly full account of what he believed the people of Canada should know, what he wished to

impart, and seemed very anxious that full publicity should be given to the statement which he was making. He claimed that his purpose was to let the Canadian people know of a situation about which he felt they should know. I understand that though his story seemed fantastic he was told—as he had documents with him—that he should go and see the mounted police, that if he had information of this kind they were the persons he should see.

He went back to his house that night. Next morning he came to the office of the Minister of Justice. Not seeing the Minister of Justice he then left for other parts. He had his wife and little child with him. During the course of the day—I need not relate all his movements—he visited the office of the crown prosecutor in the city and spoke there about his situation, again wishing to give publicity to the information that he had. During the afternoon he left his little child with a neighbour to be cared for, while he and his wife sought to meet others and discuss the situation with them. Then, at night, he went to his home, and when he was there he asked immediate neighbours, a gentleman and his wife, if they would be kind enough to look after his little child; that he was very fearful that something might happen to him that night, that he felt that by this time it would have been discovered that he had left the embassy and had taken with him certain papers which were of significance, and that he might expect to be killed in the course of the evening unless he got protection. The persons in whom he confided his situation took him into their apartment along with the little child and had them all stay in one of the rooms. Meantime the gentleman whose apartment it was, seeing the fear and the dread which he had, went to the city police and told them of the situation and asked that protection should be given to him. Arrangements were made with the police to be in the near vicinity lest there should be any incidents.

About midnight there was an incident. His apartment was entered by four persons—I believe he maintains that it was broken into. At any rate, the four persons who entered the apartment were from the Russian embassy or connected with it. The city police wanted to know from them just why they were there. They claimed immunity, being members of the embassy. No arrests were made. They were allowed to return to the embassy. In the meantime, Gouzenko had been safe, secreted as he was in the other apartment. Later in the evening another visit was made to his apartment, but nothing came of it and Gouzenko asked the city police if they could put him in contact with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. He said that he had information which he thought was of importance to Canada and, indeed, to his own country if it could be disclosed, and that he would like to give this information to the government through the police.

He was promised that he would be taken to the mounted police where he could tell his story. Later in the morning he was taken to the mounted police, and he gave a full statement, producing the documents that he had in his possession, and asked for protection for his life and the lives of his wife and little child. They were given protection by the police.

The documents were then very carefully studied together with other information he gave.

Let me repeat, from the outset I felt that the situation with which we were confronted was one that could not be viewed too circumspectly. I felt we must make sure what type of person Gouzenko was, and what the motive was that prompted his action. I have come to the conclusion, from the statement which he gave to the police, that his motives were just as he himself described them, a desire to expose a condition which he thought was intolerable and which was likely to work injury to our country and to his own country as well. To the police he made a very careful statement in which he said that he had been in Canada for a couple of years, had been immensely surprised when he came here to see the freedom of the people, the way in which democratic institutions worked in this country. He said that he had been very greatly impressed with the way in which general elections were conducted, the different political parties speaking freely in the open, having candidates who opposed one another and the like. It impressed him deeply in contrast with what he had seen in his own country. He said he felt that, having witnessed for two years what this country was doing to assist its ally with munitions, money and food, and in every other way, and at the same time affording to himself and to others every facility that could be extended in the way of freedom, he could not stand it very much longer, and he had made up his mind that, regardless of what the consequences might be, even if it were life itself, he owed it to the people of this country and to his own people to reveal the condition of affairs as he had come to know it at first hand. And having made up his mind in this way, he then began to gather some of the documents which he felt would be absolutely convincing in themselves if made public.

I wish the house to note that his actions corresponded with that profession. He did not come to the government in the first instance. He went to a newspaper office, and he paid a second visit to a newspaper office with a view to having the documents published and having his story made public. He later came to the police to give them the full story, and the documents which were in his possession.

One may take what view one wishes of Gouzenko. I have stated my impressions as gathered from what evidence has come before me. But what I attach importance to in speaking to the house to-night is not the individual and what he said but the documents which were produced. Some of these documents are in the handwriting of some of the persons who have been examined by the commission, while some are in the nature of transcriptions; many of them are cipher messages that have been sent back and forth; some are messages that have come from Britain to Canada and passed on from Canada to the U.S.S.R., and there is much that relates to plans and records that have to do with the manufacture of munitions, explosives and the like.

It is upon the documents which are in possession of the government now, and which will be made public as the trials proceed, that such subsequent action as was taken by myself and my colleagues was based. We have not acted upon hearsay. We have taken the reports which have been made to us by the police, and which are verified and authenticated by the documents themselves.

These documents disclose among other things that Canada was being made a base to secure information on matters of very great and grave concern to the United States and also to Great Britain; that information was being sought through agents here with respect to many matters that were of the utmost concern to Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom.

I speak of myself personally because I must take the main responsibility. In fact, I am prepared to take the whole responsibility if necessary for the steps that have been taken, though the Minister of Justice and myself were together in considering and dealing with the questions that had to be considered. There come times, however, in a government when, sooner or later, the decision as to what course is to be taken has to be made by the head of the administration.

I realized at the outset that this was no small matter, not a domestic matter only, by any means. We could not ignore the evidence that there were in our public service a number of trusted employees who were giving information to agents of a foreign power to be of assistance to the foreign power and that it was clearly necessary that there should be an investigation. It was inevitable that an investigation would have repercussions, having regard to what might be revealed, in many parts of the world, and for that reason one had to consider other nations as well as one's own before taking a step that might come to be considered premature.

I should perhaps have mentioned this as a central feature of the Gouzenko statement. He claimed that what was being created in Canada was a fifth column; that it was being created through Russian agents in contact with the members of the public service and others in this country and that it had extended very far; that the infiltration of this effort had gone in very wide directions and for that reason there was the necessity for the completest investigation. I felt it was my duty, regardless of what might come, immediately to inform both the United States and the United Kingdom of what had been disclosed here and to let those two countries know of the government's intention to have the matter investigated.

My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, asked me to inform the house to-night whether, when I visited the United States and the United Kingdom, I informed the authorities there of what I have told the house this evening. I did. I felt my first duty was to visit our immediate neighbour the United States, to see the President and let him know that there were certain matters being revealed to us here which caused me to feel that Canada might be being used as a base for the discovery and the imparting of information that was of concern to the United States, and I was most anxious to have the President know that we intended to have the whole matter fully investigated.

Before I say anything further I think I ought to let the house know what was the kind of information that was in my possession at the time that I decided to visit the United States and Great Britain, and here again, so that I shall not be imparting any information that might bear on what is *sub judice,* I shall, I think, be safe if I take the statement which appears in the first interim report of the royal commission and quote what is set forth there. I should like to make it clear that it was during pretty much all of the month of September that the investigation was being made by the police. I was being informed of what was being brought to light, and pretty much the whole case as it has since been developed

had at that time been worked out at least in outline by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The matters of which I had knowledge in this indirect way are pretty much the same as are set forth by the commission from the documents before them. I quote from the first interim report of the royal commission:

As shown by these documents, the specified tasks committed to Colonel Zabotin were the following:

(1) As described in telegrams from "The Director" at Moscow addressed to Colonel Zabotin under his cover name of "Grant," in August, 1945.

(a) The technological processes and methods employed by Canadians and the English for the production of explosives and chemical materials.

(b) Instructions as to which of the members of the staff of the military attache should contact particular Canadian agents and the suggestion of names of persons in the Department of National Defence for Naval Affairs who might act as agents.

(c) Information as to the transfer of the American troops from Europe to the United States and the Pacific also the army headquarters of the 9th army, the 3rd, 5th, 7th, 13th army corps, the 18th armoured division, the 2nd, 4th, 8th, 28th, 30th, 44th, 45th, 104th infantry divisions and the 13th tank division, together with the dates of their moves, the location of the army headquarters of the 8th and 16th armoured corps, the 29th and 89th infantry divisions, the 10th tank division and the location of the Brazilian infantry division. Whether or not there had been organized a staff for the American troops in Germany and, if so, its location and the name of the officer-in-command.

The location of the 1st parachute troops and the plans for their future use.

(d) Instructions to take measures to obtain particulars as to the materials of which the atomic bomb is composed, its technological process and drawings.

(2) As described in writings under the hands of Zabotin, Motinov and Rogov, during the period March to August, 1945.

(a) To obtain from the national research council models of developed radar sets, photographs, technical data, periodic reports, characterizing the radar work carried on by the council and future developments planned by the council.

(b) Particulars of the explosives establishment at Valcartier and its work, including the obtaining of formulas of explosives and samples.

(c) A full report on the organization and personnel of the national research council "Give more details of organization of research council. Manipulate so as to get to their leaders and find out what they do."

(d) Particular work of specified employees of the research council.

(e) The obtaining of documents from the library of the national research council so that they might be photographed, with the expressed intention of ultimately obtaining the whole of the library of the national research council.

(f) Particulars as to the plant at Chalk river, Ontario, and the processing of uranium.

(g) The obtaining of a sample of uranium 235, with details as to the plant where it is produced.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

(h) Specifications of the electro-projector of the "V" bomb.

(i) Research work being carried on with relation to explosive materials and artillery.

(j) The obtaining of material on the American aeroplane radar locator type, navigation periscope.

(k) A list of the army divisions of the Canadian army which have returned from overseas and the names, or numbers, of the divisions which have been divided, or re-shaped, or undergoing re-shaping.

(l) The number of troops in the Canadian army in the post-war period, together with the system of its organization.

(m) Information from the Department of Munitions and Supply of various kinds relating to guns, shells, small arms, ammunition for small arms, arsenals, optical and radio appliances, automobiles and tanks, apparatus for chemical warfare and particulars of plants producing same.

(n) Information as to electronic shells used by the American navy.

(o) To endeavour to keep agents in government departments threatened with discharge as a result of shrinkage in size of the departments, in order to maintain their usefulness for the future.

(p) Information with regard to depth bombs and double charge shells for cannon.

(q) Information as to telegrams passing into and out of the Department of External Affairs and the office of the high commissioner for the United Kingdom.

It must not be assumed that the above list is exhaustive, but it illustrates the nature of the objectives of these operations.

The commissioners then make the following statement:

It has been stated to us by commission counsel that the method of presentation of the evidence before us is with the object of ultimately establishing the identity of the greatest number of those persons who have acted as agents, but the question of the relative importance of the above subject matters has not been dealt with to an extent where we are yet able to pronounce upon it. To proceed in any other manner might have been prejudicial to the ultimate attainment of the purposes of the investigation.

I read that now because of another question which the leader of the opposition asked me this afternoon to answer, namely, how far this espionage system extended.

I should like my hon. friend to notice that commission counsel have attached particular importance to ultimately establishing the identity of the greatest number of those persons who have acted as agents. I shall return to that a little later, as one of the reasons why the commission have thought it desirable that certain persons should be kept incommunicado pending their interrogation and the taking of their evidence. It has been with a view to finding out in the most effective manner possible how far-reaching this particular infiltration has been.

I could not very well leave Canada until the end of the debate on the address. It was the first session of the new parliament; there had been no division; I had to make perfectly sure that the government was going to remain in office, so that I felt it advisable to wait until after the first division. However, before leaving I did call into my office the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), the leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell) and the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Low) and told them individually one of the reasons why I was leaving at that time. The house will remember that Mr. Attlee had communicated with me somewhat earlier, asking me to come over for purposes of consultation. I had been obliged to reply that I could not leave at least until the session was under way; but this matter coming up in the first month of the session made it important that I should not delay my departure longer.

There was one other reason why I went at that particular time. Part of the information secured by the police was to the effect that a scientist who was quite high in his profession and very much trusted by the British government; who was a citizen of Britain but was engaged in research work in Canada; who had perhaps as much knowledge as anyone of matters pertaining to the release of atomic energy and researches in that connection, was about to leave Canada; that he had taken passage on a plane and would be arriving at a certain time in London, where he would make contact with the agent of a foreign power. Information of this kind cannot be easily trusted to telegraphic communication. I thought I should give to the British government as full information as I could with regard to what we had ascertained.

I left for Washington about the end of September. I called upon the President at the White House and had a short talk with him before leaving for New York to catch the ship on which I was crossing to Britain. I arrived in London on a Sunday evening and immediately, on Mr. Attlee's invitation, spent the evening with him at Chequers, where I told him of what had been discovered here. Later I had talks with Mr. Bevin, the foreign secretary, to whom I gave such information as I thought the British government might wish to have. As hon. members know, I returned later to Washington, in company with Mr. Attlee, where a conference took place with the President in respect of atomic energy, in connection with which a report has already been made. I then came back to Ottawa accompanied by Mr. Attlee and, after Mr. Attlee returned to England, took up anew the question into which I had been looking so anxiously before I went away.

One question that undoubtedly presents itself to the minds of hon. members is why there should have been such a long delay in disclosing this condition of affairs. Why was the commission not appointed at an earlier date? Well, I think I have indicated enough to show that it would have been a very great and grave mistake to have taken any premature step in regard to the time at which the investigation should take place. The last thing this country would have wished to be responsible for was that in any way it had affected the relations between any of the united nations in a way that might prove prejudicial to all. Hon. members will recall that there was a meeting in London of the council of foreign ministers at which the British, American and U.S.S.R. foreign ministers were present. That particular meeting did not get very far. After it was over, there were recriminations of one kind and another. I think it would have been most unfortunate had these disclosures taken place while that meeting was being held. There were other meetings which would be held in the near future to consider. It was a question not only of what was the wisest step to take, but also of the best time at which to take it.

In order to be perfectly sure of an objective view being taken of the whole situation, the government decided to secure special counsel and have him go over with the police the whole record they had, and the documents which were in their possession, and advise the government as to the course which in his opinion it would be best to follow. The first question was what counsel to select. Hon. members are now aware that the government chose Mr. E. K. Williams of Winnipeg to be counsel to advise the government in this matter. Mr. Williams was made the choice of the government because of his eminent reputation in his profession and because at the time he was president of the Canadian Bar Association. We were anxious that whoever was chosen to advise the government and later on, as it proved, the commission, would be one in whom members of the legal profession and the country would have every confidence. We felt that Mr. Williams, being president of the Canadian Bar Association, and occupying such a prominent position in the legal profession, would be the best person upon whom to call.

A report was made by Mr. Williams, which I hope some time later may be given to the public. It cannot be given now because it

contains information that would have a bearing on some of the trials about to take place. In that report Mr. Williams recommended that the best course to pursue would be to appoint a royal commission and to obtain as commissioners the best persons it would be possible to secure. It was on that advice that the government came to request the services of Mr. Justice Taschereau and Mr. Justice Kellock, two members of the Supreme Court of Canada. Here, again the government realized that questions as to the liberty of the subject and of individual freedom were certain to arise in the exploration of the extent and development of this system of espionage, and that it would therefore be most desirable and indeed, absolutely necessary to have as commissioners persons who, above all, would be most anxious to protect the liberty of the subject, and to see that justice was done—and justice only.

I have heard hon. members opposite speak about the importance of upholding justice, and of having justice followed in every step in this matter. That is why, to the exclusion of all others, two justices of the Supreme Court of Canada were selected. The government did not know where in Canada it could find two persons who would be more certain to uphold justice in every particular, or who would be more zealous in protecting the freedom and liberty of the subject than would two justices of the Supreme Court of Canada. I hope this will be kept in mind by hon. members if at any stage they are inclined to criticize some of the methods which necessarily have been adopted to fulfil the purpose of the inquiry.

I said a moment ago that there had been other conferences. Hon. members will recall that in December there was a meeting in Moscow at which the Secretary of State for the United States, and Mr. Bevin, the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom, met with Mr. Molotov in Moscow to discuss matters of mutual interest and concern. That would not have been an appropriate moment at which to have gone into this matter. Had an investigation been started at that time in Canada, it might conceivably have been said, or it might have been thought that it had been planned with a view to making difficulties in connection with that particular meeting.

Then there came the united nations meeting in London, the preparatory commission of the united nations organization, the meeting of the assembly and of the security council. It was most important that these bodies should be organized with as little as possible in the way of mistrust, suspicion or recrimination. Here, again, was another factor which entered into the judgment of my colleague, the Minister of Justice and myself as to the time at which it would be most appropriate to begin proceedings.

And here may I make a statement which I think it is important to make. My hope had been that it might be possible to have an inquiry which would attract very little in the way of public attention, at least until matters were in such shape that only those against whom evidence seemed to be conclusive would be apprehended and committed for trial. I thought that possibly we might have members of the public service whose names unfortunately have been brought into this situation examined by deputies and ministers of the departments, in the presence of the Minister of Justice, and that the matter might be dealt with in that way. That illustrates only one of several ways in which we hoped the matter could have been dealt with so as to have as little effect as possible on international relations.

A moment's consideration, however, made it clear that anything of that nature was wholly impossible. In the first place it would not have been possible to have made more than a very limited inquiry. And in this situation, because of its vast proportions, it was all important that if there was anything to it at all we should go into it thoroughly and see that nothing was left undone which could possibly be done to clean up a situation of the kind.

I now come to the question of the apprehension of the persons who have been detained. This afternoon my hon. friend asked me to explain when speaking this evening why the order in council passed on October 6, giving authority to the minister to have individuals apprehended and detained, was not made known to the House of Commons at the time the Emergency Powers Transition Act was passed and a question was asked as to whether there still remained any secret orders in council under the War Measures Act.

The explanation, in a word, is this: I have spoken about a very trusted official who had left Canada to go to England, who was to make contact there with certain persons, who had, as we have reason to believe, very important information in his possession, and who was in a position to give perhaps as much in the way of information as almost any other with regard to certain aspects of research on atomic energy, and matters pertaining thereto.

Contact was to be made in London on October 7. It was understood that if this person should make contact and thereupon be apprehended and brought before the police for

examination, a similar step would have to be taken here with respect to the others in Canada who were believed to be in a similar position. October 7 being the date upon which this man was to be apprehended in London, if caught in the act of making the contact it was thought he might make, it was understood that on the same date we should make similar arrests here.

The War Measures Act was then in force, and the order in council was passed in my absence on the recommendation of the Acting Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice. I would have done exactly the same, had I been here, so as to give authority for the apprehension of persons here the moment it was thought desirable that such steps should be taken.

However, the contact in London did not materialize. One of the reasons it may not have was that it had been known in certain quarters for a couple of weeks at that time that a good deal of information was in the hands of the government here, but it was still thought probable that the expected contact might be made. However, as it did not come at that time, the matter here was also held in abeyance. No steps were taken at all under the order until the time came when in was thought necessary and advisable to take the course recommended by counsel and approved by the commission.

Up to that time use had not been made of the order; it simply lay in abeyance until the beginning of the time at which the commission asked that certain individuals should be apprehended and brought before them for interrogation and to give evidence. I doubt very much—the Minister of Justice will speak for himself—whether the matter was in the mind of the minister as to that particular order still being on the list when he was asked in the house whether there were any other orders. I confess that I never thought of it. I was here, I think, when some one asked if there were any other orders. The order had lain dormant; it had not been used at that time. I imagine that that would be the reason why the minister made no mention of it. Even were we to assume that he had knowledge of it, I think it would have been most unwise for the minister to have disclosed to parliament and to the country at that time that there was such an order, and that under it persons could be apprehended for the purpose of the inquiry that has since taken place. What I would have done and what I think the minister would have done if it had entered into his mind would have been to have told my hon. friend and the leaders of the other parties in confidence that the order was there and that it was being kept intact in case use might have to be made of it a little later on. That is the position as I see it.

Let me emphasize this fact. Before any persons were apprehended at all, the commission had examined carefully the man Gouzenko to whom I have referred and all the documents that had been presented to the police. The commission met in camera for a week before any one was apprehended. The two justices of the Supreme Court of Canada were satisfied in their own minds beyond any doubt that the documents that were before them were authentic, and it was the documentary evidence they had that caused them, when the commission counsel expressed the view that certain persons ought to be apprehended and detained until they gave their evidence, to recommend to the minister that he issue the orders for apprehension.

May I ask hon. members this question? All that I have described thus far and much more was known to the minister and myself at the time the commission was appointed. While the commission sat we were further informed of what the commission themselves had found with reference to the documents and to the situation generally throughout the country. If, knowing all that, the Minister of Justice, when the commission recommended that in order to get to the bottom of this thing it was necessary to apprehend the different persons whom they named, had refused to accept that recommendation, had refused to act and had said, "Well, we will have a political question; the question of the freedom of the subject and the like will come up and for political reasons we had better not take any steps," I ask, what would have been the responsibility the minister would have had upon his head to-day before this house?

It is an easy thing to criticize others for taking particular steps before all the facts are known. I believe that already many criticisms have been made which would not have been made if the facts had been fully known or even partly known as I have explained them to-night.

At the time the commission asked that certain individuals should be apprehended, I gave out to the public a statement which I think I ought to read at this moment because it helps to make clear the caution with which the government was proceeding from beginning to close. This was issued by myself on February 15:

> Information of undoubted authenticity has reached the Canadian government which establishes that there have been disclosures of secret and confidential information to unauthorized

persons, including some members of the staff of a foreign mission in Ottawa. In order to make possible the full investigation which the seriousness of this information demands, the government has appointed Mr. Justice Taschereau and Mr. Justice Kellock of the Supreme Court of Canada to act as royal commissioners to hear evidence and to present a report which will be made public. The commissioners have appointed as their counsel Mr. E. K. Williams, K.C., of Winnipeg, Mr. Gerald Fauteux, K.C., of Montreal, and Mr. D. W. Mundell of the Department of Justice; the commission has already commenced its investigation, which is proceeding in camera.

Let me emphasize that the commission had been sitting a week at that time or longer. They had made perfectly certain that the persons whom they were asking should be apprehended were persons whom, upon the evidence before them, they felt justified in asking to have detained. My statement continued:

Upon the application of counsel, and having regard to the serious nature of the evidence already adduced before the commission, the commissioners recommended counsel to apply to the Minister of Justice for orders for the interrogation and detention for that purpose of a number of persons known or suspected to be implicated. This action has been taken to-day. The persons involved include some now employed or who have been employed in a number of departments and agencies of the government.

It is the intention of the government that, after the report of the royal commissioners has been received, prosecution will be instituted in cases in which the evidence warrants it. It would not be proper at this stage to make a more complete statement or, in particular, to make public the names of those concerned. Some of them appear to have been far more deeply and consciously involved than others. Some will probably be found to be more or less innocent instruments in furthering activities much more serious than they may have imagined. Obviously, the whole matter should be treated with caution and reserve, pending the time when it will be possible to issue a fuller statement. Until the investigation by the royal commissioners has been completed the case remains sub judice.

In other words, there again the government, on the one hand, was taking every step possible to make the fullest possible investigation and, on the other hand, to protect persons or the liberty of persons, to protect the names of persons until the very last moment at which some disclosure would have to be made with regard to what had been done in violation of the Official Secrets Act. This step was in part to protect these persons themselves, some of whom to-day are on trial. Until the last moment everything was done to keep their names out of the press.

The authority granted to the commission was to investigate persons who were or had been in the public service, and that is as far as the commission has been investigating. I must confess that I regret, as every member of the house regrets, very deeply that the work of the commission has taken as long as it has. When the commission was appointed we hoped it might be a matter of only a few days that any of the persons would have to be detained, but perhaps I have told the house enough for hon. members to realize how extensive this inquiry necessarily is. In order that the inquiry may be as thorough as possible the commissioners have gone about the taking of evidence in a way that will leave no stone unturned to establish the facts. We have indeed reason to be grateful to the commissioners for the manner in which they have given unremittingly of their time and thought to their exacting duties. Particularly are we indebted to them for the manner in which they have sought to guard against publicity being given to the names or actions of any persons until this became wholly imperative.

Perhaps I should deal for a moment, before concluding, with some of the international aspects of this matter. The house will have noticed, as the public have, that in the statement I gave out I made no mention of any country by name. But before giving out this statement I did ask the charge d'affaires of the Russian embassy to come to my office: I read to him the statement, and I told him that the country to which reference was made was the U.S.S.R. Hon. members will have noticed that it was the Soviet government itself which was the first to state that Russia was the country that was referred to in that statement. There has been no communication from the government of the U.S.S.R. to our government other than a statement which was handed to our representative to the U.S.S.R. at Moscow and to which much publicity was given in the Russian press. That was the statement which made light of many aspects of the statement I had given out, but which did have this significant paragraph in it, that the Russian government admitted that the military attache had taken a course of action here which was, I think the term used was, "inadmissible", and that he had been recalled. May I say that in the course of this inquiry three or four other persons have since returned to Russia from the Russian embassy; this at the instance of the Russian government itself.

This brings up, of course, a very large question, that of the relations between Russia and Canada. Some persons may feel that we ought to sever relations, as they would say, by having the Russian embassy withdraw from Canada. I hope that no view of that kind will be expressed by anyone in a

responsible position. We in Canada want only the best of relations with the U.S.S.R., as we do with every other country, and we must not be too ready to judge until we know all the circumstances connected with the particular situation. I believe it is true that there are agencies working, may I put it, at the side of the Russian embassy which are doing things that possibly are unknown to the ambassador himself and members of his immediate staff. That may be so and it may not be so. At any rate I am not going to be the one to judge as to who has knowledge of this and who has knowledge of that. The time will come when all this can be worked out and, I hope and pray, will be worked out in a manner which will let us get rid of whatever there may be of wrong and evil in the whole business and establish the friendliest of relations on a true and sound basis, one which will be above suspicion in every way.

It has I think been said that I should perhaps have smothered up this business altogether, that it was bound to have serious implications and that it might have very serious consequences. May I say, Mr. Speaker, I have done what I thought was right, and I have yet to find that taking the course which is right is doing other than following the course which will prove the best in the end. I cannot imagine anyone in a responsible position wishing to smother up a condition of this kind. That would only help to spread the evil through the country, and extend it through time, until, perhaps, consequences very serious indeed would arise. The best way in which most social ills can be cured is not by penalty but by publicity. The light of day will cure much in the way of evil that nothing else is able to cure. That is a belief which I have held all my life in regard to all questions that have to do with social evils of different kinds. I am sure that as a result of the present inquiry once the whole situation has been cleared up, we shall all be able to breathe more freely, with greater confidence in each other, and in other countries.

I think in the statement issued by the Russian government it was said that I ought first to have let their government know about these facts. Well, I did think at one time of going to Russia myself and of speaking with Generalissimo Stalin in reference to it. What I know, or have learned of Mr. Stalin from those who have been closely associated with him in the war, causes me to believe that he would not countenance action of this kind on the part of officials of his country. I believe that when these facts are known to him and to others in positions of full responsibility, we shall find that a change will come that will make a vast difference indeed.

However, I did ask myself the question, were I to attempt to convey to the Russian government what I knew, without documents, which I could myself explain and prove, might I not be met with the statement that, after all, as it was Canadian government officials who were concerned, we had better clean our own house first? If the time should come when it would be of any service in helping to meet this situation, I am prepared to take any step at all that may be deemed advisable with a view to having it cleared up in a manner which will not only maintain but strengthen friendly relations with that great power.

May I add this word. The Russian statement mentions that Canada's action had been taken because of some feeling that Mr. Bevin, the British foreign minister, had as a consequence of discussions which took place at the security council. Let me answer that by drawing the attention of hon. members to the fact that the security council met months after the time at which this information came into the possession of the government. The security council meetings were something apart altogether. Our action here had no possible connection with events in the security council.

One other thing which is being said is that the alleged actions of the persons being detained were due to the secrecy with respect to the atomic bomb. I had a letter only yesterday from the secretary of one of the councils of Soviet-Canadian friendship, stating that all this had grown out of the fact that Russia was being denied information which the United States, Britain and Canada had with respect to the atomic bomb. May I impress upon the house this fact,—the disclosures of which I have been speaking to-night go back to 1943 and 1944. The organization for the purpose of espionage of which I have been speaking has been in existence for three or four years in this country, and the greater part of the information which it obtained or sought to obtain was secured before anyone knew anything about the atomic bomb outside of those in the immediate know. The attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were, if I recollect aright, on the 6th of August and at a later date in that month, the 9th of August, I think. Documents in the possession of the government are in large part prior to that time altogether. This espionage business has not arisen out of the atomic bomb in any way or any secrecy in connection with it. Now that the atomic bomb is a known factor, un-

doubtedly information is being sought in that connection, but the espionage net which has been referred to to-night has been in existence for a much longer time that the past seven months. It was the 8th of September when the documents came into the possession of the government.

I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything about the statements which have been made in reference to myself as being anti-labour and anti-Soviet. My feeling towards the great mass of the people in this and other lands and what should be done to improve their position is well known in this country. In regard to Soviet friendship I recall that a year or two after first coming into office twenty-five years or so ago the government of which I was then the head was the one which promoted an "Aid for Russia" fund, to help the starving children of that country. I did what I could to help further that great movement at that time. I have done what I could to further the Soviet-Canadian friendship movement. I have spoken on the platform in Toronto in support of it and on the platform in Montreal in support of it. The government of which I am a member has given aid to Russia in munitions and in food and assistance in other ways. It is the same government that invited the Russians to come and open a legation here, the same government that has sent an ambassador to Russia. All through, from the beginning to this hour, my attitude and the attitude of those who sit around me and with me on this side has been one of furthering to the utmost the friendliest and best of relations with all countries. And may I say that none of us will ever forget the heroism of the Russian people. None of us will ever forget their sacrifices and what we all owe to them, along with those of other countries in saving the freedom of the world. We are not going to let these years of sacrifices and the sacrifice of millions of lives go by in order that allied nations may become separated rather than drawn together into one great family.

I wish to conclude by saying that I hope that members in the course of the further discussion of this question will be very careful not to attempt to judge any country or any individual until we know all the facts as fully as we can possibly know them.

As far as the Russian people are concerned I am as sure as I am of anything that the Russian people are just as anxious for friendly relations with Canada and with peoples in other parts of the world as our own people are. But in this country, as in some others, there are persons who for their own selfish ends will do many things that would not be countenanced by the great majority. We have seen how a few men may get power into their own hands, and how, power once secured, they will do with it for selfish and ambitious ends many things that are not approved by their fellowmen. What has happened in this instance may have been the action of a few men which I am certain would not be countenanced and will not be condoned by the Russian people. So far as this matter is concerned, I intend, with whatever little power I have, to unearth whatever may be wrong, and for the remainder of my life to devote my time to trying in every way possible to see that the greatest amount of friendship and harmony and good will is promoted between all peoples, and between the Russian people and the people of Canada in particular.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, to-night I find myself in a somewhat difficult position. We have heard a story which I think has impressed itself upon the house and will undoubtedly impress itself further, and it is very difficult now to enter into a discussion of the speech from the throne or even of the remarks of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I realize, however, that we are late in meeting this session, and that there is a desire on the part of the house to proceed with its business. Therefore I shall refrain from doing what I might otherwise have done, ask the house to allow me to call it eleven o'clock, and proceed to say what I have to say to-night.

First I should like to make some comments on the speech which has just been made by the Prime Minister. I think that in view of the very uneasy international situation we should follow his advice and be careful in the phraseology we use in discussing what has been placed before us to-night. If I may say so, the first thing I would remark is that in reality we are discussing events which have led up to charges against Canadians and British nationals in this country in peace time. Espionage is the word that is used in this connection, and I think wrongly used, because espionage can, in my opinion, properly and best be defined as the sending of persons into an enemy's country in order to watch what the enemy is doing. But here we are dealing with persons of our own nationality who, it is alleged, have violated their trust, and who, if found guilty, will invite punishment under our Official Secrets Act. I think this should be kept in mind in discussing this matter, and that is why I try to make that point quite clear.

I say, too, that if the accused are found guilty after a fair and proper trial, they must be dealt with according to the law as laid down by this parliament. It is no excuse, as some cynics in this country are suggesting, to say that all nations employ foreign agents. We are not trying a foreign power; we are charging our own nationals with an offence against their fellow citizens which, if proven, no right-thinking person can possibly condone. That I think should be made abundantly clear, because some sections of the press in our country and in the United States have publicized this matter in a way which I believe has tended to complicate a very difficult international situation.

The Prime Minister's statement of February 15, which he read to the house to-night, was couched in careful and I think unprovocative language, and I regret that some sections of the press did not exhibit that sense of responsibility in discussing the matter which characterized our Canadian newspapers during the war. Such newspapers may have overlooked the fact that a violent press campaign directed against Russia would be regarded in a country where there is no free press, as the official attitude of this country. Considerable mischief has arisen because of that. It has lent colour, too, to the charge in the communist Labour Progressive papers in this country, widely quoted in the Soviet union, that Canada and its government are engaged in a plot against what they are pleased to call the left wing of the labour movement or in an anti-Soviet campaign, when I am confident that nothing is farther from the truth. Actually the fact is that everyone with any sense of responsibility realizes that the peace and welfare of the whole world depend upon what? Upon the establishment of friendly relations and confidence among all nations, and particularly between Russia and the English-speaking world. Failing to achieve this, lacking this hope, the united nations organization will be shattered. Upon our understandings and good relations the future of mankind depends.

In this atomic age the united nations organization must be made to work so that we may proceed to the establishment of government at the international level. I believe there is no other way of preventing a terrible catastrophe, a third world war, in which, with the new weapons and scientific knowledge we now possess, millions of people may be wiped out in a single night. And when I make that statement I do not make it as my own. Had I been present in December when the matter of the atomic bomb was discussed—unfortunately I was ill—I would have told the house that early in December I heard some of the leading scientists who were responsible for the discovery of atomic energy and the making of the atomic bomb make that very statement; that with the knowledge they now possess it is possible in a country like the United States, by planting atomic bombs in the industrial centres, to destroy as many as forty million souls in a single night.

Now I want to say something about the method pursued by the government in the handling of this situation. I appreciate the difficulties; I appreciate the defence of the government's procedure which the Prime Minister has offered this evening, but I believe there has been too much secrecy, too much mystery in the government's handling of the matter for the public good. The air has been full of rumours, some wild but many which subsequently proved well founded. This has been bad and, may I say to the government, indicates serious leaks from persons who might be expected to show a greater sense of responsibility. A case in point is that of the arrest of the representative of a constituency in this house. A week before the action was taken a dispatch to a London newspaper quoted in a Montreal newspaper, I believe the Montreal *Herald*, said that such action was about to be taken, that the Prime Minister would denounce a member of parliament in the house when we met. Well, the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) was arrested the day we met, and the next day the Prime Minister informed the house that the unknown agent who had received information from an accused for the benefit of Russia was believed to be the representative in parliament of the constituency of Cartier, Montreal. There have been other similar news items.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that I saw the item to which he refers, and if my recollection is aright it stated that I was going to complain about something having been revealed in regard to some secret session of parliament. Nothing of the kind that I know of has entered into the present situation. More than that may I say that I had no knowledge that the report which was received from the commissioners on Thursday would be made at the time it was. It was that report which necessitated the arrest of the hon. member. There have been leaks, I admit, but that was not one of them.

Mr. COLDWELL: Well, I am very glad to get the Prime Minister's assurance; but he states there have been leaks, and indeed it was at least quite a coincidence that a

week before the action took place a dispatch containing such a story should go from Ottawa to the London *Daily Mirror*, I think it was.

In view of what the Prime Minister said this evening I wish to say that through the ages our forefathers have fought vigorously to prevent secret trials and actions affecting the liberty of the subject without fair and proper trial. During the war hon. members who were here will recollect there was considerable debate in this house. The defence of Canada regulations were modified, but many hon. members were disturbed by the manner in which those regulations and the War Measures Act were used not only against those who endeavoured to assist the enemy but against members of religious sects and, indeed, Canadians of Japanese origin. Quislings and traitors must be punished, but we dare not allow any government to act except in accordance with the established principles of justice.

The persons now held are believed to have violated the Official Secrets Act and betrayed their trust. I repeat that if they are guilty, they must be punished. But I have carefully read the reports that were tabled in this house by the Prime Minister last Friday, and I confess that I still have grave doubts concerning the procedure followed in some of these cases. Indeed, I do not believe the Prime Minister is aware of all that has gone on. I almost hesitate to say this because when I heard it first it seemed to me unbelieveable. But I was informed by a minister of the gospel last week that he saw a person who had been held at Rockcliffe for some time, and that for six days and nights that person was in a room which was brilliantly lighted, and the lights were never out. I wanted to check that statement, and I telephoned the counsel of another of the accused, asking if such a thing could have occurred. I was told by that counsel that his client, a different person, had told him precisely the same story. It may be said, of course, that this was done in order to prevent the possibility of suicide, but again I asked questions and was informed that neither of these persons was ever left alone.

I would ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) to look into this. If that is so it savours of the totalitarian system, and it must be neither permitted nor condoned in this country. I said I could scarcely credit the story, and indeed that is so. No one can have sympathy for those who betray the interests of their own people. For our nationals, who accept the rights of our citizenship but give their first allegiance to any foreign power, and thus gear their political and secret activities to its external policies, I have nothing but the utmost contempt. These are the quislings who, if their guilt is properly established, must be dealt with according to the law; but it must be in accordance with the law.

Let me sum up my feelings in this way. In spite of all that has been said to-night and last week the fact remains that men and women have been summarily arrested. As a letter I received from one of them states, they have been held for weeks without charge, without access to their friends and without counsel. From the documents tabled here I have gathered that this procedure had been followed not on the initiative of the government but upon the advice of the justices of the Supreme Court of Canada who are the commissioners under order in council P.C. 411. For my part I shall await with a good deal of interest some further statement from the Minister of Justice at the proper time. In the meantime I should like to recommend something for his consideration. I have in my hand a copy of "The Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier" by Doctor Skelton. In the press and in a letter which came to me I saw a reference from this book. I looked it up and should like to put it on the record, and I commend it both to the minister and the government. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was speaking on the case of Louis Riel in this house in 1874. It was his maiden speech; he entered into an argument and then said this:

> It will be argued, perhaps, that the reasons which I advance are purely legal subtleties. Name them as you please, technical expressions, these legal subtleties, it matters little; for my part, I say that these technical reasons, these legal subtleties are the guarantees of British liberty. Thanks to these technical expressions, these legal subtleties, no person on British soil can be arbitrarily deprived of what belongs to him. There was a time when the procedure was much simpler than it is to-day, when the will alone of one man was sufficient to deprive another of his liberty, his property, his honour and all that makes life dear. But since the days of the Great Charter, never has it been possible on British soil to rob a man of his liberty, his property or his honour, except under the safeguard of what has been termed in this debate technical expressions and legal subtleties.

That is something we might recommend to the government for its perusal and for its consideration.

I want now to deal with some of the other pressing problems before the country. I think I have said all I wish to say to-night in connection with matters which have arisen under the Official Secrets Act.

We are to-day in one of the great periods of human history. Revolutionary changes are in the making throughout the world. In America we have been spared the suffering and pain so widespread in Europe and in Asia. I am glad to voice approval of those references in the speech from the throne which foreshadow increased economic aid to suffering peoples by Canada. Indeed, these are the only constructive proposals in a speech so barren and unrealistic in other particulars.

I would add, too, that the appeal made by the Prime Minister last evening for Canadians to restrict their own consumption of foodstuffs needed by starving peoples, meets with our wholehearted support. I wish he could have gone further, and prohibited the wasteful use of cereals in non-essential luxuries, such as in the manufacture of liquor. I can assure him that, in my opinion, if food for starving peoples involves further rationing in Canada, the people of Canada will support any intelligent and necessary move in that direction.

We can remember, in the words of Geoffrey Francis Fisher, Archbishop of Canterbury, that "There is one task ready to the hands of the united nations in which we can all unite and which divides none—the task of common humanity, which makes the world one. That is to relieve as fast as possible the famine and starvation that is bringing many millions in many nations to misery and death."

The house will, I am certain, give its approval to the proposed loan of $1,250 million to the United Kingdom. The agreement is a recognition not only of the suffering of the British people but, in part—and I should like to emphasize the words "in part"—that our future prosperity depends upon the future ability of our best customer to trade with us.

Again, I want to use the word "trade" advisedly for, while the United Kingdom cannot export commodities in exchange for our goods just now, she can do so in the future. I believe that she will, if our own domestic tariff policies make it possible for us to receive those goods. If we receive those goods, they will make a contribution to our own standards of living in Canada. I am glad to know that there is in prospect a conference at which the opening up of channels of trade and the wiping out of these unnecessary barriers will be discussed by some of the great nations.

But let us bear in mind that the proceeds of that loan spent in Canada will provide only partial and temporary relief to our unemployment and farm problems. Other more comprehensive domestic policies must be promoted.

I am glad to note, then, that the government intends to encourage the highest possible production this year. I had been disturbed by reports of speeches by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) in western Canada urging what seemed to me, and I think also to the people of western Canada, a somewhat different policy.

Certainly advice to prairie farmers to increase cereal production invites some risk—and I admit this readily—of a reduction in otherwise necessary summerfallow, which may lead to the depletion of moisture in 1947. But 1946 is the crucial year, and we must take some risks in order to assist in sustaining human life in many countries.

I think there is little likelihood of our accumulating any surpluses; but if there were, this country, profiting surely from past experiences, should establish intelligent policies under which surpluses of grain would become national reserves against future shortages.

The lack of intelligent policies accounts for the fluctuation in the production of agricultural commodities. Uncertainty with regard to prices of farm products is already causing a serious decline in some products. Agriculture needs the assurance of floor prices which will be reviewed from time to time and be set in relation to the cost of production and the sacrifices farmers made or are making to the maintenance of price ceilings. I wish to say at once that we cannot subscribe to the grain exchange propaganda that farm prices should be allowed to find their own levels by open market trading. True, levels of some farm products, notably wheat, would reach a high level now; but inevitably the day would come when they would become equally low. Consequently we believe the farmer desires, not high prices at one period and low prices at another, but some stability in price levels.

The farmer, like the industrial worker, wants fair, stabilized returns so that he may maintain a decent standard of living every day of every year. Such a plan can be achieved for agriculture through the encouragement of the cooperative movement and through public organizations under producer-consumer control having authority to regulate the assembly, storage, transportation and grading of grain, live stock, fruit, dairy and other farm products. This is not an easy task I readily admit; but I believe it is an essential task. And I hasten to say I also believe that it can and ultimately will be done.

A guaranteed farm income, however, requires, too, a comprehensive crop insurance plan. That is true not only in the prairie provinces

but also in other parts of Canada. If this is to be successful we must survey the soil, utilize the water of some of our rivers for irrigation, and drain marshlands and swamps in some other parts of Canada. This will mean, too, at a time when we may need it very badly, productive work for thousands.

There is already a great deal of unemployment. It is useless to say that conditions here are better than they are in some other countries. I do not know that that statement is true, nor would I accept it until I have figures which will prove that statement. But even if it were true, the fact is that we have to-day considerable unemployment. Figures from the Department of Labour tell us that employment increased by 170,000 between July, 1945, and January 24, 1946. It is estimated that nearly a quarter of a million are without employment now.

Let us not be complacent about this. The governor of the Bank of Canada warns in his last report to the Minister of Finance, dated February 8, that:

> Looking to the future there is no reason for complacency. Most of our real problems of post-war adjustment are still ahead. The backlog of demand will not be large in relation to productive capacity when industry has been fully reconverted and inventories built up to normal levels. The prevailing optimism on the North American continent is dangerous if it diverts attention from the conditions which have to be faced.

There is too much, I think, of a prevailing optimism on the other side of the house. So far, in spite of what the mover and the seconder of the address in reply said in this regard—and may I take this opportunity of doing what I should have done earlier on behalf of my party, namely of congratulating them upon the able manner in which they moved and seconded the address in reply—so far, in spite of what they said, we believe the present administration has failed to plan adequately the reconversion from war-time to peace-time needs. Without a full employment plan, satisfactory national wage and farm policies, standards of living will be forced down and all will suffer.

Inextricably linked with reconversion and the maintenance of employment at the highest possible level are the problems of housing and of settlement of returning veterans in satisfactory civilian employment. Even veterans who wish to enter into farming operations are met with endless delays in obtaining decisions regarding the suitability of the land and sometimes, I may say, the suitability of their wives to go with them on the land. I have no doubt that most hon. members have had many cases of exasperating delays and investigations brought to their attention during the recess. There is a dangerous sense of disappointment and frustration abroad in this country. The red tape in the Department of Veterans Affairs and many other departments also must be cut, and cut quickly. We in the C.C.F. believe that there can be no true democracy without economic democracy; that there can be no true freedom without economic freedom. The time has passed when liberty often meant merely the liberty to starve and be homeless. We believe, further, that only social ownership of the principal means of production and distribution will permit economic security and political stability. I know the government believe otherwise. Very well, but it is up to the government to make their system work and as yet it is not fulfilling the promise made last June of jobs for all.

Closely allied with this condition is the problem of housing. Housing conditions in Canada are deplorable. They are a disgrace to a country possessing our wealth and resources. For years before the war private enterprise failed to provide adequate housing; yet the government has entrusted practically all our needs to private firms again. There is not a single city or nation that I know of which has solved its housing needs through private enterprise. Any successful programme has invariably been accomplished through a properly planned public housing system.

The government, through its Curtis report, admits that 700,000 houses are required in the country, and this is only half the number required to house the nation in reasonable health and comfort. One needs only to look north from this building to see the truth of that statement. The provisions of the National Housing Act make it impossible for the average citizen to build with any assurance that he can complete the payments on a home. No provision whatever has been made for adequate low rental houses within the reach of the low wage group.

We are told that 50,000 houses will be built this year, but there is little evidence that even this inadequate objective will be reached. Canada is faced with more than a grave problem in this respect. It is indeed a national emergency and should be treated as such. I believe the proper planning of the use of material and labour could provide this year 100,000 new houses. This would give employment, so it is estimated by those who know how to make such estimates, to more than a quarter of a million Canadian workers in all branches of the building and allied trades.

The unnecessary export of needed building materials should be halted There is no need

for Canada to provide the United States with materials for luxury building when people are homeless. I have been told by people who have visited the Pacific coast, San Francisco, Los Angeles and so on, during the winter that they have seen magnificent homes being built in those states of No. 1 Canadian lumber. These are mansions that are costing many thousands of dollars, and I say that we have no right to export lumber for luxury homes when we need homes for our people so badly. Non-essential and deferable building in Canada should be prohibited and supplies rationed so that top priority may be given to housing which costs under $5,000 per unit.

In conjunction with such a policy crown companies should be set up to break the bottle-necks created by monopoly industry, and workers should be trained in the needed building skills just as they were trained for war-time industry. A long-term housing plan should be introduced immediately which would co-ordinate the resources of the federal, provincial and regional authorities to ensure that sufficient houses are constructed.

Linked, as I have already said, with the housing and unemployment difficulties facing the country is the problem of the returned veteran. Thousands of young men who have served our country so well in war have found neither jobs nor homes upon their return to Canada. Many are living only on their army savings and gratuities. Many are forced to take inadequate jobs because they cannot find work which offers either promise of security or anything else. Thousands have been forced to discontinue needed schooling because of lack of living quarters and high rentals, which make their allowances inadequate to meet their needs.

This afternoon the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) referred to the survey of the Montreal area which was recently published by the rehabilitation information committee. Many other hon. members may have seen this survey, so that I am not going into that, although I had intended to do so. Referring to married veterans the report stated:

> Most of the personal difficulties arose less from psychological than material obstacles, such as housing need and inadequate income, against which veterans and their wives were struggling calmly and courageously.

I regret to say that I have run across some cases, particularly of brides who have recently come to this country and who have had to find temporary accommodation with their husband's relatives who were strangers to them. In many cases this has had a disastrous effect upon these young couples who have come, on the one side, as newcomers to a land which is strange to them. This condition of affairs is an indictment of the lack of policy in this regard on the part of the government and it also endorses the warning the governor of the Bank of Canada gave.

There is much more that I could say if time permitted, but I see I have just three minutes left. I should like to say something about the dominion-provincial conference and the possible agreements, agreements which have been delayed too long. I should like to say something about a national health programme, old age pensions at a lower age with increased amounts without a means test, federal grants for education and the needed comprehensive programme for the building up of a Canada in which our people may find not only the means of life but the amenities of life as well. To sum up, I wish to move an amendment to the amendment that was moved this afternoon by the leader of the opposition in order that we may place our position clearly before the house. This is seconded by the hon member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) and reads:

> That all the words of the amendment after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:
>
> "We respectfully submit, however, that in the opinion of this house, Your Excellency's advisers in their reliance on private enterprise have failed to propose the comprehensive national planning which the present emergency demands;
>
> We submit further that such planning is essential in order to achieve full employment, provide for the adequate rehabilitation of war veterans, assure the maintenance of stable and adequate farm income, build urgently needed homes for the Canadian people, and attain the high volume of both agricultural and industrial production which alone will enable Canada to provide a rising standard of living for our own people and contribute to the pressing needs of war-ravaged countries in such a manner as to help lay the basis for a lasting peace."

Mr. SOLON LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, this has been a very heavy day; and, since the hour is late, I am sure hon. members would welcome an adjournment. I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think we should go ahead. I felt the same way, but I went ahead, and I think the business of the house demands that we should proceed. I am objecting to adjournment now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand that some arrangement has been made by the whips that my hon. friend would have the right to adjourn the debate. I was informed of that just a little while ago. If that is the case, I do not think we should go on.

Mr. COLDWELL: Our whip knows nothing about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not know anything about it.

Mr. COLDWELL: This was done last year, you know, at the same time.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Tuesday, March 19, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

FOOD

AGREEMENTS WITH THE UNITED KINGDOM—SUBSIDIES ON FARM PRODUCTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture, and possibly also of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. According to newspaper reports these two gentlemen visited Great Britain a short time ago for the purpose of making contracts and perhaps agreements for Canadian food products. Will they, at as early a date as possible, acquaint the house with any contracts or agreements that have been entered into, as well as the terms of those agreements and the prices to be obtained for the products?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The agreements that were under discussion while we were overseas are still being discussed by the British government and this government. We have an understanding with the British government that no announcement shall be made here until forty-eight hours after the agreement is finally signed, the object being that they may have an opportunity of making an announcement to their house at the same time as it is made here. The exact date of the announcement will have to be left, therefore, until such time as the decision is finally made.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Will hon. gentlemen please speak louder? We cannot hear them at all.

Mr. SENN: May I point out to the minister that seeding operations will soon begin and that this is really the breeding season for live stock. I suggest that the announcement should be made at as early a date as possible.

Mr. GARDINER: I expect it will be made before the end of the week, but I do not want to be too definite about that.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

[*Later:*]

Mr. GARDINER: I think I should supplement the answer I gave a moment ago to the hon. member for Haldimand. The suggestion was made that before seeding takes place, farmers should know what the prices are to be for this season's production. I may say that an announcement was made a year ago last fall and it has a bearing on some of the discussions that have been taking place in the house. The contracts which covered this year's food products were on a two-year basis and were made in the fall and winter preceding last winter. There is no intention on the part of the government to have these lowered this year. The price for delivered bacon was established down to December 31, 1946, and on cheese and milk down to the spring of 1947. Those prices are still before the farmers, and they have some knowledge of what their floor returns at least will be. When I speak of "floor returns" I include both subsidies as well as prices.

Mr. SENN: May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that a large proportion of the grain produced this year will not be marketed for another year, and therefore a new contract will be needed.

Mr. WRIGHT: I should like to ask a supplementary question based on the minister's last statement. Does that mean no further farm subsidies will be taken off farm products during the coming year?

Mr. GARDINER: There may be an adjustment of the returns that have been given to farmers, but that will be announced in due course. What I am saying is that the farmer was given assurance a year ago last fall that he would have a certain return for the year 1946, and I do not think anyone has in contemplation a downward revision of those returns. What I wanted to make definitely understood was that the farmer can, as he has been able to do ever since the war started, anticipate what his returns are going to be for the year that he is seeding the crop.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): May I be permitted to ask an additional question in regard to barley and the policy of the government in regard thereto? In the west we find that there is a definite move to cut down barley production. Will the minister make a statement as to the barley policy for this year?

Mr. GARDINER: I have made so many statements on that point that I do not suppose it will do any harm to make another one. I have consistently and persistently stated that

barley acreage should be kept up. That is one of the reasons I have been suggesting that wheat acreage should not be increased. I am sure that if all hon. members who represent constituencies in that part of Canada will take the same attitude there will not be any danger of barley acreage being decreased this year.

VETERANS LAND ACT

PRIORITIES AND DISCOUNTS FOR FARM MACHINERY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. G. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): I wish to ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) a question, notice of which I have already sent him. In view of the urgency of increasing agricultural production and the necessity of the early and satisfactory reestablishment of veterans on farms, would the minister give immediate consideration to allowing veterans not coming under the Veterans Land Act, but who wish to become bona fide farmers, the same priorities and discounts for farm machinery as those who now come under the Veterans Land Act?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. member that the rule forbids the making of any statement. His question should be brief and to the point.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): It is of urgent importance.

ALASKA HIGHWAY

QUESTION AS TO OPENING FOR PUBLIC USE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): On Friday I asked the Minister of National Defence a question; I wonder if he can answer it today.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): I have just forgotten what the question was; I was not in my seat at the time.

Mr. IRVINE: It was whether the Alaska highway would be opened in the near future to public use.

Mr. ABBOTT: There is no probability that the Alaska highway will be open to the general public in the near future. As my hon. friend knows, it is to be taken over from the United States army by the Canadian army on or about April 1. There are no facilities for servicing civilian motor cars and supplying them with gasoline, and so on; consequently it will not be possible for the Canadian army to undertake the responsibility of permitting ordinary civilian travel on the road in the immediate future. We shall have to look into it further after we have taken it over.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask a supplementary question? Is there to be any official ceremony when the highway is taken over on April 1?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, there will be an appropriate ceremony. The date is not yet fixed, but it will be some time early in April. I am now discussing the matter with the chairman of the permanent joint defence board. Of necessity the ceremony will have to be on a modest scale because of the lack of suitable accommodation for civilians in the area.

MAPLE PRODUCTS

RATIONING AND PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance a question. Is there any chance of the government easing the rationing of maple syrup and maple products in order that production may be increased?

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I shall have to take the question as a notice. No notice of it was given and therefore I am unable to answer it now.

SUGAR

ALLOWANCE TO BEE-KEEPERS FOR HONEY PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. MAYHEW (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance): On Friday last the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) asked whether the Minister of Finance would not consider advising the sugar administrator to increase immediately the allowance of sugar to Canadian bee-keepers sufficiently to stimulate honey production in 1946.

The answer is: The wartime prices and trade board is fully aware of the necessity of encouraging the production of honey in 1946. The following instructions have been issued by the sugar administrator:

For feeding in the winter of 1945-46 a maximum allowance of fifteen pounds per colony was permitted. For spring feeding an allowance of five pounds per package may be granted where necessary, but only to the extent of packages imported to replace colonies destroyed. In the case of veterans wishing to import packages to reestablish a comparable apiary given up on enlistment, sufficient sugar may be granted to carry bees

through to the honey flow. Ex-servicemen studying bee husbandry in vocational training classes may be permitted a maximum of twenty pounds of sugar should they desire to gain some practical experience through the operation of one or two hives. In addition, provincial apiarists have been authorized, when in their opinion the circumstances might warrant, to grant sufficient sugar to prevent starvation of colonies. Applications for sugar in such cases should be made to the provincial apiarist of the province in which the bee-keeper resides.

POSTAL SERVICE

RATES ON FOOD PARCELS OVERSEAS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General with regard to the food shortage in the United Kingdom. Will the Postmaster General facilitate and encourage the sending of parcels by Canadians to friends and relatives there by (a) reducing the postage to the same rate as was charged for parcels to members of the armed forces during the war; (b) speeding up the time taken in transit at the present time? Will he take the necessary steps to shorten the time for air mail letters to the United Kingdom? These letters frequently take from one to two weeks.

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Postmaster General): I suggest that this question be placed on the order paper. I shall have to give it some consideration before I can answer it.

FISHERIES

INVESTIGATION OF JAPANESE FISHERIES AND FISH CANNING PLANTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Will the minister take some action toward having appointed as soon as possible suitable and competent Canadians to join with the officials sent by the United States and now in Japan to investigate on behalf of Canada Japanese fisheries and fish canning plants?

Hon. H. F. G. BRIDGES (Minister of Fisheries): I thank the hon member for giving me notice of this question. I am pleased to inform him that steps have already been taken by the department, in consultation with the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Reconstruction, under which it is hoped that Canadians competent to observe and examine the Japanese fisheries will join United States delegates for the fulfilment of this purpose. While arrangements have not yet been fully completed, it is hoped that they will be shortly.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

The house resumed from Monday, March 18, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fernand Viau for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): First I should like sincerely to join with the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Bracken), the leader of the government (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) in expressing regret at the departure from Canada of the Earl of Athlone and Her Royal Highness the Princess Alice. I join with them also in congratulating the two right hon. gentlemen who so recently have been honoured in their appointment to the imperial privy council. I should like also to congratulate the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau), the mover, and the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Winters), the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, on their very fine efforts. Considering what they had to go on by way of material, Mr. Speaker, I should say both hon. members did an excellent job. The Liberal party is indeed fortunate to have the support of young men of their high qualities.

The speech from the throne seemed to reflect something of the gloom that must be in the minds of the leaders of the government. It certainly could not be called an optimistic document in any respect. In two or three passages the government made an obvious effort to congratulate itself by resorting to comparisons which, to say the least, were convulsive attempts at unfounded optimism; but I found little in the whole speech to indicate that in reality the government is aware of what things are absolutely essential if Canada is to break the bloody cycle of unemployment, want and war, and to make this country strong in peace. It takes more than pretty statements in a speech to set things right. The best evidence of honest meaning will not be found in the theories of their writers or in the speeches of their speakers, but rather in the practices of the government itself. For that reason the true test of effective government is to take a good straight look at the state of the realm, and that I propose to do for a very few minutes.

It is now more than six months since the war ended. The speech from the throne points out the conditions of hunger, privation and suffering for millions which are following in the wake of those six tragic years of human experience. All our hearts, I am sure, bleed for the sufferers in the various countries throughout the world. The most pressing world need to-day seems to be for food for the people who face serious shortages or who indeed face conditions of actual famine. If the need is to be met; if human suffering is to be cut to a minimum, then Canada's duty seems quite clear. My group will join in any effort to see that the suffering is cut to the absolute minimum. The flood-gates of production must be opened wide. They should have been opened wide months ago. Now our reserves of foodstuffs are gone. Any one with any gumption at all could see the danger inherent in restricting production, as we did in connection with wheat some time ago simply because our existing storage facilities were taxed to the limit and were not sufficient to take care of more wheat. At that time a few of us said that in view of the potential world tragedy it would be a criminal act against humanity to curtail wheat production, as was being advocated. We suggested the construction of adequate storage facilities to handle all the wheat the Canadian farmers wanted to produce at that time. Needless to say we were looked upon as blithering idiots, and wheat production was restricted. Then the world surplus vanished overnight, and now men, women and children must die of hunger. I say the Liberal government must take its share of responsiblity for this tragic condition in the world.

I have been surprised that though each week the shortage of necessary commodities has been growing more acute, little has been done by the government, at least in the way of national organization to stop, the decline and increase the flow of wanted goods and services from the farm, the sea, the mine and factory to meet the tremendous demand that has developed both in Canada and in foreign markets. It is true that the other day the Prime Minister announced his nine-point programme for increasing production in order to meet the shortage of supplies; but in recent months I have noticed that luxury goods have been far easier to obtain than the plain, ordinary necessities of life. What does this indicate, Mr. Speaker, if not a woeful lack of experience and practical knowledge on the part of the legion of controllers and bureaucrats who have become the most serious handicap to productive industry in our country? What Canadians want, in common with the other peoples of the world, are the plain, ordinary necessities of life, not the luxuries; and it seems to me every thinking man can see that the situation is so serious that nothing but an all-out effort to increase the production of foodstuffs and ordinary civilian goods like rubber footwear, socks, shirts, nylons, underwear, bath tubs, houses, washing machines, automobiles and radios will even begin to prevent tragic results.

The whole Canadian scene continues to be overshadowed by the spectre of inflation. Abundant production and the successful distribution of ordinary consumer goods is the only defence against inflation; yet the government persists in a policy of drifting along, afraid to take bold and effective action to remove the bottlenecks and the discouragements that have dulled incentive and checked productive capacity from one end of this country to the other. For instance, what has the government done about taxation? The system of punitive expropriation followed by this government has contributed more than anything else to the discouragement of productive enterprise. Endless and overlapping regulations, rulings and decisions continue to confuse and exasperate the people, and little is being done by the managers of our financial affairs in this country to remedy the situation and free Canadian enterprise from this millstone which hangs about its neck.

Social Crediters everywhere, in common with all progressive and sound thinkers, urge the government to begin an immediate and progressive downward revision of taxation. Those taxes that bedevil and restrict production should be revised at once in order to provide incentive to industry to step up its output and restore confidence once more. And coincidentally with the increase in production of consumer goods the personal income tax schedules must be revamped to exempt from taxation the incomes of all Canadians up to $2,000 per year. We are prepared, Mr. Speaker, to organize a fight to see that this is done at the earliest possible moment, and we are simply serving notice of that fight. Nothing would do more to rejuvenate the workers and farmers of Canada and to induce an all-out productive effort than the lightening of the taxation burden upon them, especially the burden of income tax. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the appointment of a tax commission to investigate, simplify and revise our whole system of taxation is long overdue. The people of Canada should unite in demanding these things. They can and must be done.

Another old man of the sea which has been dragging down industry and slowing our reconversion is the government's price policy. I

supported price fixing for the duration of the war. I supported the continuation of price control until the flow of consumer goods to the Canadian market should remove the danger of inflation. But when I gave this support I war fully aware of the necessity for some revisions in certain lines as we got along into the post-war period. It should have been perfectly obvious to the government that even before the war, producers of staples and ordinary commercial goods operated on a very narrow margin of profit. Further they should know that in the last two years production costs have gone up materially. With a much narrowed margin of profit, increased costs and restricted volume, producers certainly have been in a squeeze. Where was the incentive, therefore, to increase production to meet the demands of this time? It has been a heart-breaking business for producers to get long overdue revisions of an obsolete price control structure. If our country is to meet the desperate needs of this most critical time, the government will have to revise quickly and sensibly its price policy. And, what is just as important, it seems to me that the hordes of officials, large and small, will have to be paired down to a minimum; for today it is almost impossible to get quick action because of the many strata of bureaucrats through whose hands things have to go for final decision.

I do not advocate by any means even now the complete removal or abolition of the price controls, but I do say that in many cases there must be a fair revision of ceiling prices if we are to release the flood of ordinary commodities that the world needs in such a desperate hurry. We are not so concerned about the luxury goods, on which there has always been a very large margin of profit, but we are concerned about ordinary consumer goods.

The government, it seems to me, must wake up and do something about this very important matter—and do it soon. If agriculture is successfully to respond to the call for increased food volume, then the farmers of Canada, and in particular of western Canada, will have to be assured of a much better supply of labour than they can see available at the present time.

What is the government doing about it? Is there coordinated effort among the departments of Labour, Agriculture and National Defence to speed up demobilization and rehabilitation of the men in the services, and to make many of them available for the work of food production? I have noted that our cities recently have become full of idle people, thousands of them drawing unemployment insurance.

[Mr. Low.]

His Excellency's speech mentioned the recently concluded agreement for a loan to Great Britain of $1,250 million. I personally was glad to see that this credit had been made available to Great Britain. As a matter of fact a similar credit should have been arranged for Great Britain last fall. I am satisfied that if the various parts of the commonwealth had risen to the occasion last autumn, they collectively could have prevented the United States from bludgeoning Great Britain into submission to the nefarious Bretton Woods agreement.

But while I am pleased to see a huge new credit advanced, which will I feel stimulate trade between our two countries and materially contribute to employment in Canada, yet I think the loan should have been made to Great Britain interest free. Two per cent on the yearly balance outstanding will, in time, be found to clutter up and finally to make impossible the balancing of payments between Great Britain and Canada, especially if we persist in maintaining our senseless system of financing foreign trade.

While I am speaking about trade, may I offer one word of comment on that part of the speech from the throne which reads:

> Employment and income alike are bound up with the restoration and expansion of world trade. To the productive employment of vast numbers of Canadians, export markets are essential.
>
> The government has steadily pursued its efforts to restore former markets, to secure new markets, and generally to expand peace-time markets. In pursuit of this policy, export credits for which additional provision was made at the last session, have been extended to several of our wartime allies.

This, Mr. Speaker, seems to indicate no new approach whatever to the government's plan of foreign trade. It is essentially the same old approach. I see nothing in the speech from the throne of His Excellency, nor yet in what the government is doing, to assure me that they are determined to look after the home market—the very best market we have.

If foreign trade continues to be the main objective of the country's productive effort, then we are going to see the same old races for markets, the same old idea of favourable trade balances, followed by economic and military war. But if the emphasis is changed so that consumption, first at home and then abroad, becomes the objective of our production effort, then foreign trade in normal times will be concerned only with our real surpluses—that is, those over and above what the people of Canada want and can use.

When those surpluses are trade into other countries, Canada must be prepared to receive goods and services in payment for them. And

if she is so prepared, then we must set about finding a way equitably to distribute those imports among all the people. Foreign trade must be a two-way street, if we are to have in future a warless world of free men. I should like to hear from some government speaker during this debate who will tell us what the government is doing about that.

Now, while it is on my mind let me suggest to the government that it bring forward its legislative programme for this session at the earliest possible day. This group is prepared to facilitate the business of the house, just as much as any party or any group in it. We will shorten debates; we will do everything we can to help out. But we do plead with the government to bring forward at the earliest possible moment its legislative programme, so that we may see what it is. There is absolutely no sense or reason in holding back important measures until the dying days of the session.

I do not want to see a repetition of the Bretton Woods fiasco of last December. If anything of the kind should occur, I will not give any understanding or undertaking that my twelve valiants, who have so well demonstrated what thorough study and unity can do, will not keep the house sitting all summer and fall, and all winter if necessary, to get right to the bottom of whatever schemes may be hatched up to take us off our guard.

I think, too, that the government must recognize that the all-too-frequent practice of talking out private members' resolutions is the negation of the true democratic principle. Democracy needs to be revitalized and strengthened in this country, rather than to be weakened and rendered anaemic by such practices as that of "talking out" in this assembly. Private members' days should mean something. They should be valuable to the country. If some resolution is brought forward and catches the support of a majority of hon. members, then the government ought to have the courage to allow it to come to a vote. By their example in doing so they would encourage true democratic practices throughout the whole country.

For a moment or two I should like to refer to the question which is currently uppermost in the minds of all our people—this whole business of espionage. I wish first to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) upon his determination to bring this whole sordid matter of espionage into the full light of day. Had he not done so, I believe he might have been branded as the arch criminal of this age. I want to congratulate him upon the way he handled the situation from beginning to end. I have no criticism whatsoever of his action in that regard. I must say however that I was not at all surprised when the story broke some weeks ago. I have known something of communist activity in this coutnry; and the Social Credit organization—and I along with it—has repeatedly warned the people about what was going on. As a result of this warning we have been called red-baiters, nazis and fascists by those who would seek to hide their own guilt by trying to smear the other fellow.

I join with the Prime Minister in expressing the fervent wish that Canada may be able to live at peace with all nations. There is nothing we want more than peaceful relations with all countries—and I am not picking out any particular one; I refer to them all. But I believe that good straight talk is sometimes necessary to clear the air. If I do a little straight talking this afternoon it is for the purpose of trying to clear the air, and to put our finger upon some of the difficulties.

I think enough has already been said about holding suspects in the case incommunicado. Serious as that is, especially from the point of view of personal freedom and human rights, there are other aspects of the case which now require most earnest consideration and with which no one yet has dealt. I should like to know how these men and women who are charged before the courts in this country got into their important positions. I should like to know too who appointed them. I should like to know who recommended them, which is a very important thing. I should like to know too if there was any investigation of their background and their past before they were given such key responsibilities as they seem to have been given. Some person or persons in the government service must be responsible for putting these people where they were and, furthermore, for retaining them there as long as they were retained. In this connection I should like to quote from a report furnished me by a former intelligence officer in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—and I say "former." It reads:

> Prior to the first conference of the united nations at San Francisco last year, Ottawa authorities were furnished with information indicating that the communist party power would be further expanded as a result of such conference. Also that after the next federal election (which has since taken place) the communists would have more strength in the Canadian government than ever before, as it was known that they were running under various colours other than their own. However, such information was obviously not acted upon, and I would say that the public is now quite capable of judging whether communist party power has increased.

Surely it is quite obvious that the government service, if not its ranks, has been shot through and through with communist sympathizers and actual members of the communist party. The Liberal government stands charged to-day with gross negligence as a result of which vast spy rings appear to have grown up within our country.

Perhaps some member of the government will furnish the house with the reason why Ralph Wesley Clearwater, formerly a detective corporal in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, was removed in May, 1945, from the position he held as non-commissioned officer in charge of the intelligence section of the R.C.M.P. for the province of Saskatchewan. This officer furnished many reports to his superior officers in the force concerning the growth of communist and nazi espionage in Canada over the past several years. These reports were repeatedly ignored. This man was shifted from the intelligence section of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to another branch, and in frustration he did resign from his position.

Why was not a most careful inquiry conducted to determine the loyalties of these suspects who are now before the courts, and many others not yet suspected? At least one of those at present scheduled for trial was repeatedly discharged from Research Enterprises Limited for unseemly conduct. Why was he immediately given a commission and a position of high trust in the navy? There seems to have been little difficulty for communists and others of very doubtful loyalties to secure highly important and key positions in the government services. Perhaps if we could find out how, we might also find out how so many of their ilk have secured key positions on university staffs throughout Canada where they find opportunity to undermine the faith of our young people in Canada in true democracy and in Christianity. It must have struck thousands of Canadian readers as peculiar that so many of the suspects already charged with serious offences were either on the staff of or were graduates of McGill university. That is not surprising to me when I think of some of the heads of that university, and of the fact that for some years back there has been definite information that the institution is a "red" hotbed.

In the second interim report of the royal commission of inquiry is an arresting statement, namely:

> . . . some witnesses holding strategic positions have made the significant statement under oath that they had a loyalty which took priority over the loyalty owed by them to their own country, and for that reason they acted as they did.

[Mr. Low.]

This is getting to be an attitude widespread over Canada and is not by any means confined to the unfortunates who now find themselves in the toils of the law, or, I might say, even to government employees. You find them in all ranks across this country. There must be a reason for the attitude, and the safety of our beloved country impels us to seek that cause. We must find it, and we must correct it mighty soon if we are to have a warless world of free men in future years.

I am convinced that we will find the cause largely in the flood of propaganda which was loosed shortly before the outbreak of the war and which was designed to shake Canadians loose from their attachment to the crown, from their loyalty to Canada and from their will to remain as a part of the British commonwealth. It also was aimed at preparing Canadians to surrender their sovereignty to some kind of supranational government later to be set up. That propaganda has continued through the years since, with increasing volume and intensity. It has gone on over the radio, in the press, at public forums and through the distribution of thousands of tons of printed matter. It has done its work mighty well in some of our institutions of higher learning.

Some of the propaganda looked harmless, but its subtle effect was deadly. For example, in March, 1943, one B. K. Sandwell spoke to the Ottawa branch of the league of nations society. The Ottawa *Citizen* of April 1 of that year reported Mr. Sandwell as saying:

> A supranational authority with power to settle questions of immigration, natural resources, treatment of minorities, repudiation of debts, finance, and other questions was predicted by B. K. Sandwell of Toronto.

The report continues:

> To bring about Canada's acceptance of the new "authority," however, Mr. Sandwell said it would be necessary to bring all the people to a diminution of their loyalty to the crown by substituting a new loyalty to an "authority" wider than Canada, than the British commonwealth of nations, and the United States or all the democracies together—

And again:

> It is up to such organizations as the league to endeavour to develop among Canadians the will to sacrifice a substantial part of their national rights for this new "authority."

Mr. BLACKMORE: Government at the international level.

Mr. LOW: I might point out that Mr. Sandwell, as a reward for all he has done in that respect, is today one of the governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and still travels about Canada spreading supranational hysteria. Mr. Sandwell may have been sincere and honest in his aims, and the members of

the league of nations society may really have believed that what he said was right and sound, but it is my conviction that the endeavours of such men and organizations over the years since, influenced as they undoubtedly were by the flood of propaganda which all but swept away faith and reason, have been mainly responsible for the condition because of which people find within themselves a loyalty which takes priority over their loyalty to their own country.

The wind has been sown and now we are about to reap the whirlwind. Man cannot serve two masters. Either his loyalty will be to Canada or it must be to some other country. What has the government across this floor done to counteract the ill effects of this terrible and subtle education of our people into becoming subjects of an ethereal supranational or international thing that no ordinary man can understand, leaving them easy marks for communist persuasion? What indeed? While they are examining unfortunate Fred Rose and the others, let them take a look through the other end of the telescope. All the while that this supranational propaganda has been influencing large numbers of Canadian people as well as some members of the government, Russia has been very busy developing communism and making it bring alleged benefits to the Russian people. Those benefits have also been widely heralded to a fear-burdened Canadian citizenry labouring under a crippled and shackled capitalist system, but few if any of the disadvantages and heavy disabilities of communism have been publicized.

Let me say right here that I admire the Russian people for their great bravery. I admire them for their devotion to their "ism". They have not been victims of this supranational propaganda, and that is significant. But one thing is beginning to stand out very plainly. From now on capitalism and free enterprise, in fact, Christian democracy, must compete with communism on the basis of performance—not talk. Capitalism and free enterprise—that is, Christian democracy—must provide jobs and spread abundance to the limits of the people's ability to produce and their desire to consume; otherwise in due time it will be succeeded by communism. Ignorance, apathy, and ridicule can afford us no protection. The only certain bulwark for Canada is a superior economic and political life, if we are to preserve the freedom and security of the Canadian people.

Any system which exacts the price of unemployment, depressions, and wars is nothing to cheer about. But I for one am not prepared to swap our system of Christian democracy, so-called free enterprise, for communism, because I believe that with the proper adjustments and the proper opportunity our system can work best for the Canadian people. Our big problem is to make those adjustments so that every Canadian can be assured of complete economic security with full personal freedom. I say to you, sir, that the application of the Social Credit principles to the system of capitalistic free enterprise will make that system yield so much greater results than communism can ever yield that I would have no fear at all about who would win the race with communism—none at all. That is why I am glad that Russia is trying out a new economic system, within its own borders. I hope they will keep it within their own country until they have proved it. It can save us in Canada the pain of pioneering a new idea that would prove to be inferior to our own. But this government must wake up, get the kinks out of our system, and make it yield us the benefits we want; otherwise a dissatisfied, disgruntled, propaganda-victimized people with loyalties weaned away from their country will kick the system overboard and adopt communism. There is no alternative for the future. It is Social Credit or communism —Christian democracy or slavery.

The government of Canada has a tremendous responsibility in these trying times. Whether our country becomes a strong, united land of abundance depends to a very large extent upon the quality of government leadership. Canada can be the greatest country in the world. But if she is to become the greatest country in the world the government must immediately undertake the reeducation of many thousands of people to a fervent loyalty to Canada; to a faith in their great land, a dynamic faith that will impel them to work as hard for Canada as Russians do for Russia. This can be accomplished only by getting the whole truth to the people, by making our system yield for all Canadians superior results, by strengthening the sinews of democracy and by revitalizing it, and by lending Canada's full cooperation as a completely sovereign state with other nations in a real effort to bring about a warless world of free men. God grant that we may meet the necessities of this grave time!

Mr. LEON JOSEPH RAYMOND (Wright) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, while I am quite late in doing it, allow me, on this first opportunity that I have to address this house, to tender you my congratulations for the dignity and impartiality with which you are discharging your high functions.

I also wish to join those who have preceded me in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

In that speech His Excellency the Governor General takes his leave from us and we are deeply moved in reading the following words:

> Princess Alice and I will ever recall that in these momentous years it has been our proud privilege to share in your anxieties and rejoicings. Throughout our lives we shall cherish an abiding affection for Canada and her people.

Such words attest the noble character of those who have just left us, and I wish to tell them that the Canadian people will, in turn, hold an undying affection for them.

No one who reads the speech from the throne can fail to notice the emphasis that is put on our international relations and on their effect upon our domestic policies.

In the second paragraph it is stated:

> It is only in the light of the world situation that all our problems can be seen in true perspective. The future of our own and of every country depends upon success in the task of world reconstruction, and the establishment of an enduring peace. Many of the measures you will be called upon to consider at the present session will be concerned with this wider aspect of human affairs.

A little further on, we find the following statement:

> It is the policy of my ministers to see that the utmost support is given by Canada to the united nations organization.

While many other paragraphs of the speech from the throne refer to world problems, I do not deem it necessary to make further quotations from it in order to assert that primary importance is given to our international relations, and let me add, rightly so.

Without claiming in the least that I am an expert in such matters, but merely because I wish to bring my contribution to the common work, I desire, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks on our international relations and at the same time to add a few words about relations as they are today within this country.

Whatever may be thought about the last war, all Canadian citizens must admit that our country has emerged from the conflict with a greater stature. Canada has achieved a tremendous effort in the industrial, military, economic and financial fields. Thousands of her soldiers, sailors and airmen have fought on all theatres of war; the products of her factories as well as those of her farms and forests have spread her name to the farthest corners of the world; the savings of her people have buttressed the allies in the darkest hours of the war, and later hastened the common victory.

Before 1939, Canada was already recognized as a world power, but the last war has much more clearly brought home to other nations that status of our country. Those nations which, until then had the least knowledge about Canada or underestimated her economic, military and political importance, have taken cognizance of her. Since that time, they understand better and better the potentialities of our young country, which is endowed with an abundance of partly developed natural resources, enjoys modern economy and occupies a strategic position of primary importance.

We have much evidence of that growing recognition of the importance of Canada in the international sphere. At the beginning of the war, four countries only, except the members of the British commonwealth, had diplomatic representation in the capital. Those nations were the United States, France, Belgium and Japan. Since that time, about 18 other countries have deemed it proper to open legations in Ottawa.

In addition, the Vatican, the highest moral authority in the world and the best friend of true democracy, has just given to Canada a testimonial which puts her among the greatest countries of the world by appointing to the Sacred College a second cardinal in the person of His Eminence the archbishop of Toronto. Although some countries whose population is greater than ours have but one cardinal, Canada now has the same number as Poland, Brazil and Argentina. That is undoubtedly a recognition of the spiritual value of Canada among the nations.

Finally, our country participates in the great international conferences, and despite her youth, she commands the attention of older nations through her well-balanced thought and her matured judgment.

Some may be prone to exaggerate with too great complacency the part played by our country in international affairs, while others are given to minimizing its importance. These two extremes should be avoided.

Canada has much to learn in the field of international affairs, but there is a reality that should be squarely faced; it is that our country ranks among the greatest in the world through her economic, if not her political, power. While remembering the fact that she is an American country and is a member of the British commonwealth, she must have a foreign policy of her own, a policy consonant with her legitimate national interests as well as with the interests of the great family of nations.

Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy should not be a source of serious dissension among us,

but rather one of union. It is surely human to disagree as to what are the best procedures to follow, but, as far as the fundamental principles of our foreign policy are concerned, the great majority of our people should be able to come to an agreement, if they wish to do so. There are certain fundamental principles on which all Canadians, without distinction of racial origin, should be able to come to an easy understanding, provided there is goodwill.

The first is international cooperation. This may seem like a set phrase, but although many people talk about international cooperation, very few put it in practice and it is not sufficient to talk about it. Every Canadian should have a firm belief in international cooperation and when I speak of international cooperation, I do not mean unilateral cooperation, but cooperation based on reciprocity, law, justice and charity.

It is only logical that this cooperation should begin with our neighbours. Geography is one of the natural factors which influence the foreign policy of a nation. What is Canada geographically speaking? Our country is part of the American continent. Whether we like this fact or not, we are not free to change it.

International cooperation is essential, among American nations, first and foremost with the United States. From the economic and military standpoint, Canada is linked to the North American order. Our economy and that of the United States are closely knit together. On the other hand, Washington cannot see Canada attacked without feeling itself threatened, just as Canada could not look on indifferently should some powerful nation attack the United States. There exists, in fact, a Canadian-American military alliance. That is the logical outcome of the geographical position and common interests of two neighbouring nations, and it is necessary to accept all that is implied by this responsibility.

Canada and the United States alone, however, do not spread over the two American continents. South of the United States lie several republics holding many things in common with us as American nations. Canada cannot ignore them. As a matter of fact, we have taken an interest in them, but I feel that we should develop our commercial and cultural relations with them to a far greater extent than we have done in the past. South America offers an extensive market for Canadian products. It is up to us to make the best of it.

If Canada is geographically part of the American continent, it is also a member nation of the British commonwealth and this, whether we like it or not, is also a fact.

So long as Canada remains associated with this group of nations, it must take this partnership into account when framing its foreign policy, and even if it were not bound to the British commonwealth, it should nevertheless base its foreign policy on the interests which it has in common with Great Britain. This cooperation is essential, however, between Canada and the other members of the British commonwealth acting in the capacity of sovereign nations. It must rest on complete reciprocity and be governed by their respective legitimate interests.

This cooperation, however, should allow Canada complete command of its own foreign policy which ought to be framed first of all according to the common welfare of its people.

In other words, our cooperation with the nations of the commonwealth should be conceived not on the colonial but on the Canadian level. Canada, moreover, is a member of the universal comity of nations. This is the third fact which must define the fundamental principles of our external policy.

The interdependence of nations has always existed, but it has been brought out much more forcefully by the last war and it is still obvious now that the war has ended. The nations of the world depend upon one another for their prosperity and their security.

The economic set-up of nations is so much interrelated to-day that prosperity has become as it were indivisible. It appears that no part of the globe may prosper if another section of the world is in the throes of economic depression. The economic upheaval which now hinders the economic recovery of the world, exemplifies this truth.

Likewise peace is just as indivisible. Such progress has been made in the manufacture of armaments in the atomic age which now dawns that the next war, if ever there is one, will be a war between continents. Bombs may be launched from one continent to another, and within a few hours waves of planes may spread death and destruction amongst the enemy. In such a conflict, as a result of the economic interdependence of nations, all would be inevitably involved. Our prosperity, based mainly upon foreign markets, and our security make it imperative for us to seek international cooperation.

It is within the United Nations Organization that we must strive to uphold the prin-

ciples of justice which will bring back in the world normal trade relations, and will ensure world-wide security.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations Organization is not perfect. But, notwithstanding its lack of perfection, it is a step and an important one in the right direction; and Canada must do her utmost to ensure its success and to perfect it.

Obviously, we must assume a fair and just share in the policing of the world under the direction of the new League of Nations. But it is worthwhile to pay it this insurance premium against war, against a war that everyone is agreed would send the world to its doom if it should break out some day.

Finally, Canada must be in a position to ensure her own security against any potential enemy. Of course, we do not want war. But the last conflict was for us a painful experience. What is now taking place in the world reminds us that we must be prepared to protect efficiently our borders against any aggressor.

According to scientists, such progress has been achieved in the manufacture of armaments that, should another war break out, the most powerfully armed nation will have the advantage. The countries which will not be ready to defend their borders will not have time to prepare their defences as during the last war.

So long as the new League of Nations has not taken the necessary steps to establish the peace of the world upon solid foundations and to effect worldwide disarmament, we must be prepared for any eventuality.

I do not advocate specific measures. It is believed that the voluntary system is sufficient to furnish all the men needed by this country for the efficient defence of her borders, but I say that so long as the United Nations Organization is not sufficiently strong to silence agressor nations, Canada must stand prepared. This is not a matter to be discussed from the standpoint of party politics, but it is the protection of our country and of our loved ones which is involved.

However, Mr. Speaker, our relations with the rest of the world must not overshadow our national problem.

I do not delude myself with words, and when I look at the situation in our country, I am struck by the same mistrust which seems to exist between nations.

I find such mistrust between the two main racial groups in our country, notwithstanding the smiles that are sometimes so readily exchanged.

[Mr. L. J. Raymond.]

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf) (Translation): That is perfectly true.

Mr. RAYMOND (Wright) (Translation): To my mind, a state can never be powerful as long as mistrust of this nature exists. I also detect this suspicion between the various provinces. Last August, the federal government called a conference in Ottawa for the purpose of submitting to the provinces a new scheme for the distribution of financial responsibilities. So far, an understanding has not yet been worked out. I know full well that such an important task cannot be completed in a few months. The conference met again in November of last year, and again in January. New sittings will take place next April. What is most apparent in some of the participants, is the sentiment of mistrust, fear and doubt.

The same spirit seems to prevail in the economic field. Suspicion pervades the ranks of employers and workers and I do not think it could be said that the two groups trust each other. The same applies to the relations of the rich and the poor. The individual who has money or properties distrusts the masses. He fears their demands. On the other hand, the public holds the owner of worldly goods as a suspect.

The following statement may appear rather childish, Mr. Speaker, but I am convinced that all our problems can be solved provided we base their consideration on a spirit of mutual trust. However, this sentiment can only be awakened, nurtured and matured provided justice and charity govern the consideration of all these problems.

On the national level, what is wanted above all else, as common sense tells us, is that every one be both sentimentally and legally loyal to one country only: Canada.

Besides, our country is a federation organized by two groups of different ethnical origins: the Anglo-Canadians and the French-Canadians. The principle behind this charter is the equality of treatment of the two racial groups which officially make up the nation and the respect of the peculiarities of each race in their loyalty to the same country, Canada. Two races, two cultures, two civilizations, living in harmony and progressing in peace and mutual confidence: such is, in my estimation, the dream of the fathers of the Canadian confederation; such is the object which we must be willing to bring about and to enhance if national cooperation between two official racial groups is to be established on a solid foundation.

Once this sentiment is prevalent, it will become increasingly easier to establish good relations between the federal and provincial

authorities. I do not intend, now, to review the scheme submitted to the provinces, last August, by the central government. However, I may be allowed to state that, provided all the members of this conference are sincerely willing to safeguard the principles of the Canadian confederation, it should be relatively easy to arrive at an understanding on the revision of federal and provincial financial prerogatives without interfering with provincial autonomy and without preventing Canada from attaining the rank of a powerful nation. Where sincerity and fairness exist, mistrust is readily replaced by mutual confidence, without which it is well nigh impossible to attain a satisfactory understanding.

Mr. Speaker, we should always carefully avoid representing the federal government and the provinces as antagonists. This is a false conception of the functioning of confederation as intended by its authors.

Sovereign in their various fields, the federal administration and the provinces are intended to cooperate in the respect of the legitimate traditions of each of the two official national groups and in the social and financial interests of the various provinces for the greater good of the whole country. It is in such a spirit that federal-provincial relations must be inaugurated.

In the economic field, it is by a similar policy that rivalries between capital and labour will be surmounted. Capital and labour are interested partners in the success of a large common undertaking and I do not believe there is any more room for strikes in our economy, than there is for war in the world.

May I sum up my idea, Mr. Speaker, by saying that since Canada has become an important international power she should assume her full share in international affairs in order to bring to the world the greatest of all temporal assets: peace.

Peaceful relations between nations, between employer and employee, between capital and labour, peace that will bring back normal business conditions and ensure collective security.

In order to achieve that aim, international realations must be based on mutual confidence and cooperation animated and strengthened by reciprocity, law, justice and charity.

In relations between ourselves, such cooperation must also exist because our country will not prosper in mistrust, division and lack of loyalty or in unification, but in understanding, tolerance, unity and loyalty.

Mr. Speaker, before resuming my seat, I wish to recall what Sir Wilfrid Laurier said at London, in November 1918, while addressing a meeting of young Ontario Liberals. These words have been quoted over and over again, but they are of lasting interest and they may be applied not only to Liberals but to every Canadian, whatever may be his racial origin, his party or religion, and they may even apply to the whole world.

(Text):

As for you who stand on the threshold of life, with a long horizon open before you for a career of usefulness to your native land, if you will permit me, after a long life, I shall remind you that already many problems rise before you; problems of race division, problems of creed differences, problems of economic conflict, problems of national duty and national aspiration. Let me tell you that for the solution of these problems you have a safe guide, an unfailing light, if you remember that faith is better than doubt and love better than hate.

Banish doubt and hate from your life. Let your souls be ever open to the promptings of faith and the gentle influence of brotherly love. Be adamant against the haughty, be gentle and kind to the weak. Let your aim and purpose, in good report or ill, in victory and defeat, be so to live, so to strive, so to serve as to do your part to raise ever higher the standard of life and of living.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): As indicated by the leader of this group, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), when he spoke last evening, we of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation are deeply concerned about conditions within Canada, particularly housing and unemployment. But as one who has just returned from several months overseas, during which time it was my privilege to be one of Canada's representatives at the meetings of the united nations organization held in London, I feel that my remarks in this debate should be in the nature of a report of my experiences. Indeed international affairs are of such importance that it is my desire to devote my entire time this afternoon to this subject.

It seems to me the time has come when, in the words of Prime Minister Attlee, Canada should very definitely make UNO the overriding factor in this country's foreign policy. This concept to me has certain definite meanings. First of all I suggest that we should realize clearly the true nature of the united nations organization. I have in mind what I regard as an inadequate if not false impression of UNO that has been gained because of the extensive publicity given to the conflicts which took place in London, particularly at the security council table. It is true that one of the principal organs of the united nations organization is the security council, and that one of the principal functions of this new

world organization is to prevent the outbreak of war through the work of that council. Accordingly its work is of great importance, and the security council deserves full publicity when it is in session. The point I should like to make, however, is that the work of the security council during the period we were in London really occupied only a minor portion of the total time we were there. Including the preparatory commission as well as the meeting of the general assembly, we were in session in London for a total of almost eleven weeks. The amount of time consumed by the security council was a relatively small portion of that total period. In other words, the greater part of our time over there was spent in dealing with matters other than the immediate question of peace and security. Those other matters were principally at the social and economic level.

It would take far more time than is at my disposal today—but I am hoping that other members of the delegation may add to what I have to say on this point—to discuss even briefly all the subjects that were dealt with. For example, we spent considerable time on the food problem that faces the world today, and on the problems of agricultural production related thereto. We dealt with problems of labour and the relationship between the new world organization and organized labour. We dealt with relationships between UNO and the specialized agencies that have been in existence or have come into being in recent months: the food and agricultural organization; UNRRA; UNESCO; the ILO; PICAO, and other organizations of this nature. The purpose of all these discussions was self-evident; namely, that it was the desire of those who attended the UNO meetings in London to establish a basis for government at the international level. When I use that phrase I am conscious, as one who was there, of the fact that we have not as yet achieved world government. As another speaker in this debate has already suggested, that ideal may still be a considerable distance away. But what impressed me was the number of responsible leaders of governments from all parts of the world who made clear their realization that we had to move to an era of world government in which the nations of the world would not meet just in a sort of continuing peace conference, still jealously guarding their individual sovereignty, but would meet rather to plan the basic social and economic life of our world so as to build up conditions that would not only make war unnecessary but achieve a higher standard of living for the peoples of the world all over the globe. As a matter of fact, the thing that thrilled me most in my experiences at London was the extent to which that concept was present and was expressed. In public addresses I have referred to it as a groping toward the concept of world government, and in my view Canada, as a nation that ought to make UNO the overriding factor in its foreign policy, should be concerned about making the greatest possible contribution toward the creation of conditions which will make world government possible.

I emphasize that, Mr. Speaker. It is not enough just to seek the passing of a resolution to bring world government into being. It will not come in that way. We are going to get it only if we create conditions which will make it possible. There are various conditions which are necessary. I mention first of all the need for the removal of suspicion and fear among nations, and the replacing of that suspicion and fear with trust, good will and positive friendliness. Then I mention the achievement of economic policies within a country such as ours, and, indeed, within all countries, which find their expression and their fruition in cooperation among the nations rather than in competition with each other. Toward that end I see the various things that I feel we should be attacking in this country, our social and economic problems, not just as something we should deal with for our own good here in Canada but as the basis for our giving a stronger lead toward the creation of conditions that will make possible government at the international level for the good of all mankind.

It has been said that this is a difficult ideal to achieve and that we will have a hard time getting there, but I suggest that a much harder time is ahead for mankind if we do not achieve it. It has been my experience to see something of the destruction that occurred during the recent war, before the atomic age; and I am sure that others who have seen what I have seen, especially those who were there when the destruction took place, and anyone who uses his imagination at all, will agree that we simply have to make it an overriding concern that we achieve world conditions that will prevent the outbreak of another war, for another war there must not be.

I have said already that our first aim in strengthening UNO should be to realize its true nature, namely that it is the basis for world government and that what the nations of the world are aiming at is the possibility of planning together our whole social and economic life so that we may achieve a higher standard of living and thus not only prevent

war but win positive human accord. In the second place, I would urge that Canada give the fullest possible support to the united nations, by positive and active participation in all the organs and specialized agencies of which we are a member. I cannot emphasize too strongly the significance of the social and economic factors in the new world we are trying to build. I have already mentioned a number of the specialized agencies. As a Canadian I am proud of the fact that we have been elected to the economic and social council. One cannot say too much about the importance and significance of our being on that council. I call upon Canada to give a strong lead in the economic and social council, and in the deliberations of the general assembly and its various committees of which, as time goes on, we shall be members.

This may involve increasing the size of the Department of External Affairs, so that more work can be done in this field, and so that the strongest advice and support can be given to our delegations at the many meetings that must be held year in and year out. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that here is one place where, surely, no member of parliament would object to an expenditure of money.

A few minutes ago I was trying to do a bit of rapid calculation to find out what it cost us last year to maintain what then remained of the league of nations. The figure I was able to get was about $300,000. To any one of us that amount of money might seem large, but in terms of what it cost Canada to finance the war I would point out that it is less than the cost of Canada's part in the last war for the duration of only one hour per year. That is all it cost us last year to maintain the league of nations. I suggest we can easily increase that amount of money, and find whatever amount is required to build up our staff so as to be able to give the best possible lead in our power within the united nations, and for the support of all its organs.

I urge not only that we press our support for UNO, by what we do at the meetings of the assembly and of the various organs, but that we realize that as a member of UNO we have made certain commitments. When one uses the word "commitments" in connection with UNO the first thought which comes to many minds is of our commitment to the security council in terms of military force, in the event of it becoming necessary to put down aggression. That is one of our commitments, but I urge hon. members to realize that it is only one of them, and that more significant are the commitments we have made by becoming members of an international organization, the aim of which is to improve the social and economic life of the people of the entire world. And having made that commitment—a moral one, if you wish to call it that, and that makes it all the stronger—we have an obligation to the world to do all we can within our own country to improve conditions of life here, and to achieve the highest possible standards—standards judged not by boastful comparisons with those of other countries, but by comparison with our own capacity.

Much has been said about the way other countries look to Canada. That is true. I was amazed at it. But it seems to me that we should respond to those eyes that are looking to us by giving the strongest possible lead in terms of an economy and social order that will provide the very best of living standards for the human beings within our borders.

There is one further thought I should like to express in connection with UNO—and here I address myself not only to the government, but to all members of parliament as individuals. I am sure all the delegates who were in London will support me when I say that in the last analysis the strength of UNO lies in the support given to it by the people of the member countries. The opening words of the charter are indeed significant: "We, the peoples of the united nations," are determined to do certain things. It is not an organization of governments; it is an organization of the peoples of the world.

So I speak to individual members of parliament rather than to the government when I say that one of our jobs as public representatives is to do all we can to enlist interest in and support of the united nations organization from the people of this dominion. In this connection I should like to refer to the work of the United Nations Society in Canada, an organization which is seeking to do this sort of thing. I believe two or three dozen members of the house are members of that society, but I feel that all ought to be. All hon. members should be giving it all the help they can in its effort to enlist the support and the interest of the people of Canada in UNO.

I note from the estimates of last year that we made a contribution of $3,000 to the work of the League of Nations Society in Canada. Certainly that is a small amount, considering the importance of its work. However, I know the United Nations Society, as it is now called, would prefer to carry on independently, so that it may be perfectly free to express any views it may wish to at any time. But because of the difficulties of getting started

in this new era I should hope that if the United Nations Society were to ask the government for a contribution—even a fairly good-sized one—to get started in its work, the request would receive sympathetic consideration. Surely an expenditure of this kind is as nothing when compared with what we have spent on the war. Surely its purpose is one which commends itself to all of us.

I turn now to another thought which impressed itself upon me most forcibly while I was in the United Kingdom. As hon. members know, it was my privilege to be there for more than three months. During that time I had an opportunity not only to learn something about the work of UNO, but also to make extensive contacts with members of parliament and of the government of that country. I had, too, an opportunity to rub shoulders with the English people themselves, and for a few delightful days with the people of Scotland.

May I say as forcibly as I can that although I feel keenly about Canadian citizenship and although I am one who insists that Canada's position within the British commonwealth should be one of clear independence, nevertheless I insist that as Canadians we should recognize the significant place in this era of human history now being filled by the British people and their government. A good deal has already been said in the debate, and I imagine more will be said, about the present conflict in the world among various ideologies. Sometimes it is assumed that the choice ahead is one between the ideology represented by the Soviet Union and that represented by the United States of America. But that is not the complete picture. Despite the political differences hon. members may have with me and members of my group, I appeal to them to realize that the success of those things all of us hold most dear in our democratic way—and I mean by that an adherence to the principles of democracy and freedom, together with a determined effort to improve the lot of the common people—depends very largely upon the success of the experiment upon which the British people have embarked under the leadership of the government they have recently chosen. Having said this, it seems almost unnecessary for me to suggest that I will give wholehearted support to the loan to Great Britain. But I point out that we must go farther than that—and here again I address myself not only to the government but to hon. members generally. We can do a good deal in the way of moulding public opinion and public attitudes throughout Canada. I urge the strongest possible support for what the British people are doing in this reconstruction period. They are putting into their post-war task the same vigour and determination they displayed during the period of the war, and they deserve all the support and good will we can give them. Indeed, they are once again fighting our battle.

I was impressed by the calibre of the men who are in the government over there and by the calibre of the members of parliament. I was impressed, too, by the attitude of the British people. Life is grim in the United Kingdom, as others can bear witness to; yet the way in which the people are taking the continued austerity with which they are faced, and their determination to pull through to the achievement of a new Britain, convince those of us who have been there that Britain will yet give a real lead to the world in terms of a new era. I call for all-out support on the part of the Canadian people for what the British people are doing under the leadership of their new government. Our connection with them is one of which we can be very proud, and I believe that will be even more true in the years that lie ahead.

I should like to turn to another subject which I feel is important in terms of Canadian foreign policy. I urge that Canada should take definite steps—before I am through I shall suggest some of the steps that I have in mind—looking toward the achievement of positive and friendly relations with the Soviet Union. I am fully conscious of the atmosphere in which one must make such a proposal at the present time; yet all I am doing is going on from where the Prime Minister left off last night. The house will recall that at the end of his speech not only did he deplore any suggestion as to the severing of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union; he said that he himself was prepared and anxious to do everything he could to establish and maintain the friendliest possible relations with all peoples, and then he added, in particular with the peoples of the Soviet Union. I only wish the last part of the Prime Minister's speech could be publicized in the U.S.S.R.

As the house knows, it was my privilege a few short weeks ago to make a brief visit to Moscow. I went, of course, entirely on my own. I went because my experiences in London from the time the preparatory commission first convened in November strengthened my realization that understanding between the Soviet Union and the western world is one of the things most fundamentally needed in our era if we are to achieve peace and if we are to build the united nations into the effective instrument we want it to be. So I

welcomed the opportunity that was mine to go to Moscow at the end of the meeting of the general assembly and I had a very interesting time.

I could make my appeal for understanding between the west and the Soviet Union on the basis of a human interest story about my own experiences in Moscow. If there were time to tell such a story, which there is not, I could indicate something of the experiences I had and something of the vigour of life I found there. If I had time to describe conditions as I saw them I would point out that it is a different world and that we cannot make comparisons between conditions there and conditions here, but that having in mind their past of only thirty years ago the fact is that they have made tremendous progress. I found what one would expect to find in any country, that is, things that were surprisingly good and some things that were disappointing. But the general picture as I have tried to give it, when speaking elsewhere with more time at my disposal, is that of a great group of human beings who have chosen a way different from ours, but a way to which they are thoroughly devoted, and on the basis of which they are going ahead. They are a group of people who have unlimited faith in their destiny and certainly a solidarity that cannot be questioned.

It is true that there are some things about the system in the Soviet Union, and they have some ways of doing things, that do not satisfy me. May I say very clearly that in our western world, in our democratic tradition, we have something that is priceless, something that we must guard with everything that we have. But the way to guard it is not to sing songs about it or wave flags or make speeches denouncing other ways; the way to guard it is to see to it that our democracy achieves in terms of social and economic conditions something that is better than other people are trying to achieve in their way. That is what counts, and will count as time goes on. I urge upon everyone the importance of realizing the significance and force of that concept.

I started out to say that I felt I could make an appeal for understanding of the Soviet Union and her people, and the building of a bridge between them and us, on the basis of a human interest story, but I prefer to do it on the basis of political and international realism I confess that the world seems a lot smaller to me now than it did a few months ago, having found it possible to get half way round it in a pretty short time. One realizes, perhaps more clearly than before, that the neighbour to the north of us is just about as close as is the neighbour to the south. We never even discuss whether we should be on friendly terms and have friendly relations with the United States of America; we take that for granted. It seems strange that we should have to discuss and advocate friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

I suggest that in a world which has become as small as ours—in a world where surely it is a basic consideration that war is unthinkable—we must find ways and means of living together on this planet whether or not we like the systems that other people may have chosen. Accordingly, so far as relations between the west and the Soviet Union are concerned there are three possibilities. One could take the position, if he were completely lacking in grey matter, that we cannot get along, and that sooner or later one must get rid of the other. Surely that position, at least in the atomic age, is unthinkable. The second position one might take would be to agree to get along together but to maintain a sort of armed camp relationship, tolerating each other but not really establishing a friendship. That might survive for a time, but I have no faith in that kind of relationship having any chance of lasting in our present-day world. We do not talk of our relations with the United States on that basis. We take it as a matter of course that between the United States and Canada there must be positive friendship, and we do not even marvel at the fact that we have three or four thousand miles of frontier without a fortification. That situation is dictated by the proximity of the two countries, and I suggest that the proximity of Canada and the Soviet Union also dictates that an armed camp relationship is not good enough. We must go on and achieve positive, friendly relations if we are to build anything that is permanent and lasting.

I am trying to be realistic about this; therefore I should face up to the main argument that is sometimes posed seriously against the position I am taking. That main argument is that we may have been fooled by what has been taking place; that perhaps the Soviet Union is bent upon a policy of expansion step by step which in due course will gobble up the whole world, and the sooner we wake up to that fact the better. This is an argument I have heard expounded in this country, but I deplore it, not only because to me it is warmongering but because I think it ignores a basic economic fact. To put it in the simplest way I can, the basic fact is that whatever else we may think about the Soviet system, there is all the difference in the world between the economy of the Soviet Union and the economy that did exist in nazi Germany under Hitler. There is not the slightest ques-

tion about that, and I do not like making the comparison even for the purpose of refuting it, but I mention it because this is argument that we sometimes hear. The economy of the nazis was one which required expansion, and in due course there was no alternative but for the world to be thrown into the catastrophe we have just come through. The Soviet Union is based on a totally different kind of economy, which does not require expansion, which in terms of the ideology to which the Soviet people adhere, eschews war. I am convinced that they are neither bent on war nor will they be driven to it. The fact is that by the very economics of the situation they are a force for peace, if we can only realize it and only connect with that element of the situation.

One asks what is going on at the present time in areas immediately surrounding the Soviet Union. Surely one can understand their position, even if he deplores the conditions that have prompted some of the steps that have been taken. What you have there is an attempt to secure the frontiers of the Soviet Union, growing out of her fear of the western world. People here say that we are afraid of Russia. The opposite is equally true; they are genuinely afraid of us, and our task is somehow to cut across that vicious circle and get moving in the direction of friendship and understanding rather than to heighten these fears. To this purpose we must bend a supreme effort.

Last night the Prime Minister said he was convinced that the Russian people as a whole desired peace and friendly relation with Canada and all other countries. I want to underline that statement. I was in the Soviet Union at a time when it was tested. By a strange coincidence I was in Moscow when the Prime Minister issued his statement on February 15 concerning the violation of the Official Secrets Act by certain Canadians. I was still there when the Prime Minister's statement was published a few days later, in the Russian newspapers, and I was still there, a few days later still, when just at the end of my visit *Pravda* made its attack on the Prime Minister, and particularly on the press of this country, for its bitter anti-Soviet attack. Yet right in the midst of that I had the experience of talking with people whom I did not know, in the subway system and on the streets, and also the opportunity of talking with semi-official people at a reception held at the Canadian embassy the night before I left, and they raised the question now before this country. But the question they raised was not the so-called spy incident itself but

[Mr. Knowles.]

Soviet-Canadian relations in which they were deeply concerned, as I was too. When I tried to explain that on my return to Canada, some of the press who interviewed me found it difficult to understand that position. They thought that not only were the Russians evading the basic question, but that I, too, was evading it. But the same charge can now be laid against the Prime Minister, because last night in the latter part of his speech he was taking exactly the same position. He too declared his primary interest in friendly relations between our two countries. Yes, the so-called spy matter is one that must be brought to light and cleaned up; but when that is done, in fact even now while the process is going on, it seems to me that we must put—the government, and all of us—just as much energy and planning into the effort to reestablish friendly relations with Russia as are being put into the unearthing and cleaning up of the situation now before us, and toward that end I wish to make a few suggestions. I make them not as all the suggestions that might be made, but to get across the idea of doing something definite, for that is what we now have to do. This thing has happened. I am not condoning any of the wrongs that may have been committed. Canadians I feel are unhappy about the state of Canadian-Soviet relations as a result of all that has happened, and they want something done about it. There are, indeed, some things that can be done to improve those relations, and I hope my suggestions will be given serious consideration.

The Prime Minister said last night that he had considered going to Moscow. I urge him to go. He may by chance be going over to Europe this summer for the peace conference, and Moscow is only a few hours by air from Paris. The Canadian embassy will be glad to arrange for his coming, and I know from experience that they will see to it that he has an interesting time in Russia. I am sure that it is the kind of gesture that will help to reestablish friendly relations between the two countries. I urge him to be sure to go.

I suggest, too, that despite the difficulty there is in getting into the Soviet Union, we should consider sending missions there for the purpose of promoting good understanding. We could send a few members of parliament, together with trade unionists, farmers, and students—and a few business men, if you want to add them to the delegation. In return, we should invite the Russians to send similar missions here. We might perhaps have an exchange of students, writers, scientists, artists. The point is that relations between the two countries being what they are, it is up to us to make some special effort to improve them.

The road will be difficult. We may be rebuffed, just as Mr. Bevin was rebuffed by Stalin, who said he saw no difference between Bevin and Churchill after the effort that Mr. Bevin has made to establish friendship between Great Britain and the Soviet Union. No one would call Mr. Bevin an appeaser. That same Mr. Bevin knows how serious the situation is and yet having received a slap on one cheek he comes right back and repeats his offer of a fifty-year pact with the Soviet Union. Bevin knows better than I do the differences that have arisen between democratic socialism and soviet-communism. I take my stand with Mr. Bevin for democratic socialism. But I realize how important it is that all nations in UNO be in the organization on a friendly basis, with complete confidence and trust in each other, and we have a particular responsibility to do what we can to establish relations between us and Russia looking toward bringing them wholeheartedly into the family of nations that UNO must be.

There are other suggestions that might be made. One occurs to me now. I hold in my hand a copy of a paper. I shall not attempt to read it. It is in the Russian language. Its name is *Britanski Soyuznik,* which translated into English, means *British Ally.* It is a paper published in Moscow by the British to help the Russians understand Britain and the British ways of living by interpreting them to the Soviet people. The last day I was in London I heard this paper discussed in the House of Commons, and one suggestion made there was that a tremendous increase in the circulation of this paper should be made in the Soviet Union. It so happens that on the back page of this issue there is a story about the Canadian frigate *Swansea.* My suggestion is that under the auspices of the Canadian information service we should establish a similar paper for circulation in Russia which might be called *Kanadski Soyuznik,* or in English, *Canadian Ally.* Better still, I would like to suggest *Kanadski Droog,* or *Canadian Friend.* Such a paper might well be started in Moscow. It would cost a little bit of money, but it would be only peanuts compared with the value of cementing friendship between the two countries. I urge this concentration on Soviet friendship, not because the Soviet Union is the only country in the world. No. I agree with all those who have said today, and at other times as well, that what we want is not just bilateral friendship but friendship among all the nations. Being a realist, however, I suggest that if the united nations organization is to succeed, world relations being what they are, the key to that success is Soviet-western understanding. But the underlying purpose must be the strengthening of UNO. We must make it the kind of organization to which all nations and all peoples can give their loyalty, so that we can make it what we want it to be—an effective instrument for the achievement of peace, happiness and human accord.

Mr. A. P. COTE (Matapedia-Matane): In taking the floor with all the reluctance of a new member in this house, may I be permitted to make mine the words of a man I know quite well and whom I admire the more for it, Senator Claude Pepper of the United States Congress:

> Although I have reached only the age of 42, which may be young or old, as one looks at it, I have begun to derive considerable consolation and satisfaction from the sense of perspective.

And I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot easily adapt myself to the gay-nineties —or, shall I say—the decadent Victorian age of *modus vivendi* yet prevailing on certain spots of parliament hill.

Yes. Although I had previously heard, from a distance not too far, that there existed in this house an atmosphere of dust-powdered, heavy-curtained and blackened windows, a stuffy-aired and inconceivably poorly acoustic'd chamber of deliberations, unbearable working quarters in which the lawmakers of the land have been, up to now, accustomed to strive with or to mind not at all, for being self-conscious of Bernard Shaw's notion that "members of parliament should not make laws but should criticize them", I never anticipated, when I ran for parliament, that my services to my country would be limited merely to attending the session, once a year, as a shareholder in a large trust corporation does, for rubber-stamping the decisions initiated by Tory brain-trusters for a Liberal government. But one has to remember, of course, that this government now derives its authority, at least as we were told during the last session, not from the people, as we used to think since the days of the grandfather of our grand Prime Minister, but from the crown. True enough, though, that we were also told, in the same breath, that it was irrelevant to claim in 1945 that Queen Victoria was no longer alive.

And, sir, although I was quite aware of the anchluss of the protectors of the trusts, of the sovereign state profiteers, of the high pressure propagandists and lobbyists, and of the indoctrinators of the plague of "back to peacetime normalcy" policy, I could not but believe that the atrocious war, out of which we are just emerging, must have taught all kinds of peoples that the world had surely come to the cross-roads of its destiny, that it is, "Whither humanity—a paradise in this world or anni-

hilation?" A life paradise, if the gap from science to politics and economics is being filled; annihilation, if not.

As it is impossible and not even advisable, if it were possible, to stop the scientists' progress, and since the scientists are so far ahead of the politicians and the economists, it surely is not too early to ask the latter groups to push forward, and all the nations of the world to force upon their sovereign-state authorities a dose of wisdom and dynamism strong enough to make them reach for and join effectively the scientists of all lands with their discoveries, so as to make sure that those discoveries will serve peace rather than war—discoveries that I shall not try to define or even to understand, being least of all a scientist, but that I take for granted like the people of London, Berlin and Hiroshima; discoveries that the world scientific dares challenge the world politic and economic to hide, conceal, bury or what have you—meaning a negative approach; discoveries that can be classified by a layman as the atomic power and the jet propulsion. In other words, inconceivable speed joined to incredible power.

And may I simply quote here the Swedish Sven Lindequist, who was the first in 1924 to predict high-altitude aviation engines and sub-stratosphere bombing, so as to give at least a small idea of what those discoveries are and, by inference, what can be expected from that as a force of destruction. I quote:

> Jet-propelled monsters guided by radio at speed from 200 to 2,000 miles per hour . . . landing within a few hundred yards of selected targets on the other side of an ocean . . . will obliterate cities . . . The sneak attack of an atomic bomb falling like a giant meteor from the stratosphere will inflict annihilation.

And he adds:

> Civilization cannot survive a third world war.

Do you think, sir, that with such implements of warfare it is possible to witness a war which will not be a world war, more so if one considers that the world has shrunk to-day to smaller frontiers than continents or even countries of two decades ago? It was, I think, Anthony Eden who said at San Francisco that the world is today one large city and the countries its several parishes. And he added, "therefore we have become citizens of the world."

(Translation):

In the international sphere, it is surely time to get rid of the old man and all these idiosyncrasies and to look at the world from an objective point of view rather than an egocentric and narrow-minded one. In doing so, politics could well profit by a theory which has not yet erred, but on the contrary is proving its continued truthfulness, and I mean the universality of the Catholic church, from which it will also learn peaceful means—in honour since the crusades—of looking at the world in its true perspective.

(Text):

Anyway, if there ever was a time in the history of mankind which called for reorientation in politics and economics, it surely is ours, because, may I venture to say, that in the realm of international relations the famous "what we have we hold" or the concept of imperialism is no longer an up-to-date enunciation of realities; no more than the obsolete policy of balance of power or sphere of influence.

Furthermore, if there is no doubt that an atomic and a rocket era has been given to mankind by the scientists, what then will the politicians (or let us call them the statesmen, for it may give them a jet propulsion in the right direction) and the economists alike do about it? Will these forces be considered only in relation to war, either as offensive or as defensive weapons, or on the contrary why not use them as God's gifts to mankind so as to present the world with a victory but this time a true victory over disease, poverty and famine, because with the "know-how" the politicians and economists can certainly use those discoveries for peace and this time a peace which must mean for mankind abundance of shelter, clothing and food.

Here again, I have not the pretension of being able to establish under what conditions these results can be brought about, but please let me assume the possibilities that the scientists are already forecasting, for they have at least come to quite definite anticipations.

And irrespective of the fact that I may scandalize the old beards, conformists, who live only in the past and are unable to visualize the future with its "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin" written on the walls, but who dare call themselves realists and smile at so called idealists who are at least able of rational thinking, I say, "Laugh, laugh, political hermits, but begone with your fetishes; they are being destroyed as surely today as the atom is now being split."

What are Canada's responsibilities in this year of grace, in this new era, Canada which is one of the two spots of the world known up to date as producers of uranium—a fundamental element for splitting the atom—and one of the three to "know-how"? Surely it is to contribute to make this atomic age the best epoch known as yet.

Thus, by what ways and means such a big order can be delivered, you will ask me. Well, surely not on the international front, through

the old, bankrupt and passed-out method of diplomacy and policy. Then, what about trying law and order in the international sphere or, let us say, rather, the universal sphere, as law and order have been known to us in the national sphere.

Without going into a demonstration with regard to this aspect of world order, may I venture to say that if law is the only foundation upon which social life in modern society can exist because we cannot trust men's promises not to kill, that law is also the sole prospect upon which peace in this new era can last, because treaties and diplomatic relations cannot in the light of past or recent experiences line up people like little good sheep, irrespective of the shepherd and the pastures.

I do not want to convey, nevertheless, the impression that I am opposed to seeing Canada participating with other nations in diplomatic discussions of policy and treaties. On the contrary, but as long as Canada, in such meetings, does not merely carry the satchel for any larger power. I, for one, fully realize the difficulties with which the Canadian delegation met at the London meeting and which resulted in having Canada sidetracked from the security council of UNO.

Without the support of the United States it surely was an impossibility. I am afraid that Americans still believe that we are, as ever, the summer-kitchen of Great Britain and therefore we are not with regard to the Munroe doctrine an independent state of this hemisphere. That is why, I fear, the Americans supported Mexico rather than Canada.

Yet it has to be borne in mind that we are sandwiched between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., which, for all practical purposes, should give us at least an animal instinct of preservation.

Also, "Lest We Forget", even if our stupid inferiority complex as an adult nation seems to belittle all our international endeavours that, thanks to our great leader the Prime Minister, and his government, we have emerged from the war anything but a puppet in the hands of the "master traders" of the world.

Not only is Canada one of the few solvent nations of the world to-day, thanks to our Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley)—who strikes me as being more at home with bills than the bill of rights—but she has become a creditor instead of a debtor vis-a-vis Great Britain, which should be sufficient to allow us, now, to do away with the British preferences on behalf of an open door tariff policy vis-a-vis U.S.A., and the world at large; for it is surely not too early for us Canadians to pay the same prices for our automobiles, washing machines, electrical appliances and farm implements as the Americans do.

Besides, we can now welcome this kind of free trade because Canada now is the first power of the world in the production of nickel, newsprint, asbestos, platinum, uranium, radium; the second in gold; the third in aluminium, copper, zinc and silver. Canada was the fourth allied nation in the production of armaments; why should she not be of peacetime commodities? In one word, Canada is to-day the third nation as far as universal trade goes.

Thus there is only one consolation that remains for us Canadians, all proud of our country, namely to hope that this first setback in international recognition of our status and destiny—and here I think the leader of our delegation at London, the right hon. Minister of Justice, Mr. St. Laurent, should be congratulated upon his tactful smoothness and French gallantry under unbearable circumstances—may be conducive to a grand price of a greater pride, that is to see the dean of the statesmen of the world—what am I saying?—the greatest statesman of the world to-day, our beloved leader, the Prime Minister, become the recognized angel of peace, to which peace he has devoted every minute of his political career, in being elected chairman of the coming peace conference.

Then the nations, aware of the fact that the inescapable realities of our time make it imperative for them all to reorient their thinking with regard to their respective sovereign state authority in relation to world wide sovereignty, will, I hope, establish a universal government under the guidance of our Prime Minister.

As far as Canada is concerned I am sure there will be no difficulty toward such a realization, for fortunately for our time we have here in Canada statesmen in the government who are not afraid to tackle new responsibilities in correlation with rights based on functional contributions.

Such a universal government would provide social as well as national security. It would accelerate free trade and reassure full employment. Full employment would surely bring about better education, better medical care, better housing and more food. With social security at home no people can feel nationally insecure if similar conditions prevail all over, more particularly so in the neighbouring countries. And to reassure a better distribution of wealth which is, of course, the best safeguard against aggression, it would implement inter-

national monetary agreements, stabilization funds, international banks or at least clearing houses.

But on top of it all I firmly believe that the most important factor to coordinate and consolidate all the elements conducive to peace is a world wide unity of purpose. Such a unity can be reached only if all the peoples regard the world in its true perspective and from the same angle, and such an achievement can be reached only through public enlightenment. Before loving his neighbour as himself one has at least to know him. Thus people have to be made to know one another, respect one another's property, understand one another's way of living and in return expect to be known better, understood better, liked better, through a professional job of international communications incorporating all kinds of vehicles of information.

Now let us see what should be the responsibilities of Canada in this new era on the national front and what can be expected for the betterment of the situation for Canadians. Canada's first responsibility in this new era is surely not to adhere to that plague policy of going back to peace-time normalcy, as advocated by reactionary bigwigs, but rather to make Laurier's prediction *un fait accompli* —"le 20ême siècle sera celui du Canada." We have nearly reached the half-way mark, yet there is so much to be done. There should be no more laissez-faire, because opportunities, as stressed by a great American newspaper man, are now ours:

> When the fume of combat will have ceased, Canada will emerge a great nation of the world. And after peace, Canada should know an era of expansion similar to that of the U.S.A. after 1900.

By the way, who is the ordinary *compos mentis* citizen and more particularly the returned man who would wish to condemn the government's efforts to preserve life in peace time after having spent so much money to destroy life in war time? Who is the normal human being, even with a "tid-bits" memory, who would like in 1946 another 1,517,531 Canadians on relief as was the case in 1933? Who will not rather fight to his utmost to keep employment at the 1943 figure? Who is the ordinary layman who would think it rational to use wheat again as fuel? Who is the politician who can squarely state in this house that Canada's best insurance policy against depression is to reduce the burdens of the moguls of finance by reducing public services and social security? No sir, what Canada needs more than ever is social legislation and reconstruction coupled with peace-time financial reorientation. Let us give chips away, we who have chips, to people who have none if we want to start another game of poker; otherwise we shall have to play solitaire. But—and there is a but—let us have nothing of the sort with a marked pack of cards, or with players who stack the cards.

Who is the decent easterner who could agree that fifty-one per cent of the total population of a western province should receive the dole? I, for one, still remember too vividly the heart-breaking appeal of a great Liberal in this house, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) at the Reform Club in Montreal, in the depression years, to send apples to people who, in his province, had not eaten one in four years, to consent to any kind of put-over policy that would be conducive to such a state of affairs in a country of plenty.

Who does not remember newspaper clippings of the thirties showing unfortunates sleeping on doorsteps of public buildings? Yet early 1946 already sees the returned men's invasion of semi-public buildings. I do surely prefer a "soak-the-rich" promoter—on behalf of the masses—to the humbug advocate of the "tie-your-belt for the benefit of the greedy" going to the Bahamas to conceal his rapine. Let us realize once and for all that the pre-war old days and old ways are gone, let us hope forever. Let us consider service rather than profit; let us praise society's wealth rather than So-and-so's gold. Let us keep in peace time the same public purpose we had in war time.

And may I quote my good friend Mr. L. W. Brockington who in turn was quoting D'Arcy McGee:

> All we have to do is, each for himself, to keep down dissensions which can only weaken, impoverish and keep back the country; each for himself—to welcome every talent, to hail every invention, to cherish every gem of art, to foster every gleam of authorship, to honour every acquirement and every natural gift, to lift ourselves to the level of our destinies, to rise above all limitations and narrow circumscriptions, to cultivate that true catholicity of spirit which embraces all creeds, all classes and all races . . .

Yes, let us keep down dissensions; the war must have taught us the stupidity of the ideological myth of a superior race. Let us rather have union in diversity. Yes, let us in the American way boast of one's talent instead of cooling it off in the Canadian way. Yes, let us hail every invention for the purpose of giving the masses a higher standard of living, rather than giving the cartels a greater control over lives. Yes, let us cherish every gem of art in promoting its significance through multitudinous museums and art galleries; it may thus at least help artists to

remain in Canada, if statesmen have not enough culture to subsidize, to commission and to secure them. Yes, let us also not forget the writers of all calibres and denominations, by securing them also against abuse, so as at least to assure freedom of expressions in this country. Yes, let us lift ourselves, irrespective of creeds, classes and races, to make this Canada of ours the greatest country of this new era.

True enough it is that our system of social security has already put Canada on its way toward a great destiny. Our social legislation is the most advanced in the world today, due to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) who has almost accomplished miracles in the short time he has directed this most needed service.

But what about our reconstruction programme? I do not see why the so able minister who presides over the ministry and who accomplished such a tremendous job at the Department of Munitions and Supply, that even the gossipers claim he should be the more honourable for it, cannot get the ball rolling quickly in peace time. I am sure he can and he will. But we are all most anxious for the starting gong. We have so much to do yet. Have we not to rebuild our railroad systems—at least their rolling stock? Have we not enough pride to finish the Trans-Canada highway, without borrowing passage from the United States? And we surely must have as much ambition to pay for it as we had to pay for the Alaska highway.

We are surely not to let go by the unique opportunities that our great systems of air communications offer us, by placing us at the "Times Square" of the skies.

Are we not badly in need of public works throughout Canada? And here I wish to point out that if in se it may be a good idea to do away with the slums in the capital area, outside Ottawa it is also Canada and elsewhere there are slums to be cleared, parks to be created, health and cultural centres to be organized.

Must I remind you, sir, that there are still electrical powers to be intensified and reforestation to be encouraged. Decentralization of industries has become a matter of vital necessity in Canada. Reorientation in agriculture is urgent. Development of the mines and of all the rich resources of our immense northern country and of the Gaspe peninsula await reconstruction activities. Oh yes, you are going to hear more about the Gaspe peninsula.

Oil has to be welled; coal has to be shafted and mined, and fishing has to be expanded. And it is no longer up-to-date political wisdom I am sure to leave entirely to private or so-called responsible enterprise, if you like, those extensive developments.

Therefore what must be done? If I may venture to express myself in this regard, I would say, sir, that I have no hesitation in endorsing the Liberal way; mixing government interference and private enterprise collaboration in directing economy.

(Translation):

However, be it on account of the beggars on horseback or the czars masquerading as civil servants who are still in charge of controls or restrictions, or on account of the inconceivable and so unfortunate inertia of government control over financial institutions which have already been given the responsibility of setting private ventures in motion, there are all too many concerns that hesitate and finally refrain from contributing to that development.

That is why the assistance acts introduced by the Minister of Finance are without any effect in so many places where their application is demanded; they will have either to be rescinded or to be made fairly applicable in the case of all taxpayers.

(Text):

In conclusion, may I be permitted to quote Eric Baldwin's poem, written in the thirties at the Montreal Press club—on one of those pleasant evenings—and entitled "The Road to Eldorado". This has nothing whatsoever to do with the mine of the same name:

> Dig out the silver of your soil
> The gold that's in your ground,
> Convey the copper from your mines
> And Canada is found.
> But quit your dolmens and your dole
> Your sons will pioneer
> But bury sects and party strife
> That makes all humans fear.

Mr. A. L. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make what I hope will be some contribution to this debate, I begin by paying my respects to the mover and the seconder of the address. I do that for two reasons: First, tradition says we must and, second, my kindly feeling toward them and my admiration for them prompt me to pay my respects and to offer my compliments.

I came down on the train with the mover and his charming wife. He was then working on his speech. Of course I am not suggesting that I collaborated with him in what he said. I noticed he followed tradition to some extent. I was pleased to note the way he complimented his leader, and I was sure he was conscious of the fact that other people who had adopted that policy are now living in some comfort in what we call another place. It seems to me, however, he may be a little

late because, if rumour and certain statements we have read are accurate, he has not acted soon enough.

Turning to the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Winters), I find that he did not make that mistake. It was clear that he complimented everyone he thought might ever wear a red carnation. No, he left out no one, at all. However, I pay him a special compliment and it is this: I realize that in the House of Commons there are some great linguists, some dialectical giants; but his French was the only French I have understood since I came here.

But I am not going to stop there in my felicitations, because I noted that when, following the speech of my leader, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) addressed the house, he complimented two of our number who richly deserve the very fine distinction which has been granted them.

I say nothing about the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) for two reasons: First, he is in my profession, and second, he might catch me out. But I am going to say something about the right hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) of which, I am quite sure, none of you Eastern people are aware. This might constitute an additional reason why His Majesty saw fit so to honour him. Out in Western Canada the minister is known as a second Michael Angelo, the greatest painter of his time. By that I mean simply this, that one needs only to drive through Alberta these days in order to see that every farm building is beautifully painted with money the farmers took away from the Minister of Finance because they could charge it up against their tax. So that at least by volume, in any event, he is the greatest modern painter.

Then the Prime Minister, perhaps thinking that some other member of his flock had been slightly overlooked, took care to compliment the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe), and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). And in the blushing contest which followed the thing I observed most closely was that the Minister of Labour won, in a walk. There can be no doubt about it.

Speaking seriously for myself—and I believe I might speak in this respect for all new members in the house—I wish to compliment and thank all the senior members in all parties for the great kindnesses they have shown and the help they have given to those of us who for the first time came here last September.

I intend to mention only one feature of the speech from the throne, that having to do with veterans' housing. I hope to be helpful,

and I am quite sure this may mean something to those in authority. We have been told all over Canada that we cannot get housing for veterans. There is in my home city of Calgary a radio station called CFAC which has a good idea. Those of us who come from there or who live near there know it is impossible to get accommodation, but this station has devoted fifteen minutes of its time during afternoons to interviewing veterans and their wives and families, if there are families, who are seeking accommodation. The offer made by the station was enthusiastically accepted by Mr. White, secretary of the rehabilitation council there. The result was that when the first programme period was completed the telephone started ringing and six offers of accommodation came in. That particular couple were placed as well as two other families. This continued from January 14 until February 15, during which time twenty-five veterans were interviewed, 101 replies were were received and ninety homeless veterans with their families were placed.

I think that record speaks for itself. It takes care of one of our major difficulties in finding housing accommodation for these people. Many people would be glad to open their homes or rent flats now available in their homes if they were sure of the type of people who would occupy them. I know ninety-nine per cent of our veterans are splendid people, but there is the odd bad apple in every barrel, particularly in Ontario apples, although this does not happen in British Columbia. The simple fact is that that excellent response was obtained in thirty days. Why? Because the people who had accommodation listened to the personal interviews that were carried on by the radio man named Jack Stewart, and they were able to get some idea of the type of people who were seeking accommodation. I am just giving that to the proper minister because it seems to me that if that practice were followed, especially in our larger cities, it might take care of a great deal of our veteran housing problem.

I turn now to a subject on which I intend to speak, not at length but only for a few minutes. I am referring to this espionage matter. I begin by giving you, sir, and the house my undertaking that my language will be temperate. I do not intend to accuse anyone of a violation of good faith or anything of that sort, nor will I say anything which might be interpreted, when coming from a humble private member, as having anything to do with international relations. But I do intend to criticize the course which has been adopted, and I trust that it will be

based on at least some reason. The farthest that I intend to go is to say that I think a serious mistake may have been made.

Having said that, I wish to dispose at once of the criticism which may be made because I criticize the government's action. I say at once that I have no sympathy with people who break the Official Secrets Act. One small change in the circumstances and they would be traitors, they would be guilty of treason and liable to be hanged. If that circumstance were changed, in other words if this were an enemy country, they would richly deserve that most severe punishment of our law. With that I leave it.

But I do mention this: When I read this first in the paper and as I listened last evening to the explanation of the right hon. Prime Minister, I took a look at a book which I had read years ago. This was a book published in 1935,—written by Sinclair Lewis and called "It Can't Happen Here." You cannot get it because I have the library copy at the moment, but I recommend that book to hon. members as preferred reading because it illustrates how a subversive movement requires much less than a majority occasionally to operate a country.

What has happened? In this Dominion of Canada we have watched our nation grow. I do not think there are any here who remember when we were a colony, nor do I think there are any who remember when we became a dominion. My mathematics are not very good, but it seems to me that 1867 is quite a considerable time ago. Then we came along to the Statute of Westminster which, after all, did nothing more than declare an existing state of affairs. In other words, our growth has been healthy; it has been constitutional. Any change in status or growth in status at all times has been in conformity with the British way and with the unanimous consent of the British government, of the British House of Commons and the House of Lords.

We find ourselves grown up, and to prove that we are really out of our swaddling clothes and short pants, that we are now mature as a nation, we have this spy scare. We used to read about this sort of thing in books that I remember that had to do with the mythical kingdom of Graustark. I can remember that those books were beautifully illustrated. There was always a princess who was going to be abused, but the right man came along at the right time and the kingdom of Graustark still went merrily on. It is too bad that one cannot deal with the matter which now confronts us with a light touch but, as the Prime Minister so well said last evening, that is something which just cannot be done.

What has happened historically is this. On September 5 last, or early in September some time, the Prime Minister became apprised of some information in the hands of a man who was an employee of some sort in the Russian embassy here. The only point I make about that is this: That information has been in the hands of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for a period of over five months. Lest anyone think I have any doubts to the contrary, it was in the hands of one of the ablest police organizations that this world, let alone this country, has ever known. They are an organization with plenty of money and plenty of brains. I have seen their laboratory in Regina and I know they have the finest instruments than one can imagine. I ran squarely up against it not long ago when a man made some photographs of paint that had come from here and there and elsewhere which startled me, and I thought I knew something about criminal investigation. I mention that in passing merely to show that this matter was in splendid hands, in able hands, in the hands of people who times without number had coped with serious crime in this country.

The first document which I mention is the first order in council which was issued I think early in October. The reason I mention that now, and I am going to come back to it, is that by that order in council government policy was set. Nothing that happened after altered the position which was then taken.

I now leave a direct discussion of what took place on this occasion and turn to a bit of history which I think all of us may very well remember. That has been the development in British countries of the position of an accused person before the law. Under magna charta it was provided that a man should have a fair trial and a speedy trial, and in all the developments in our law from that day to this the trend has been in the direction of throwing safeguards around accused persons whose liberty might be at stake. I know it is very easy to snipe at lawyers and say that we are archaic and bound by this and that and never learn anything new, but the common law has been and is constantly growing and has fairly well kept pace with new developments in this or in any other country. I refer to this one fact. Up to within the last eighteen months in any event we always said that if an accused person's statement were to be used against him—a statement made to a person in authority as a police officer—the onus was on

the crown to show that that statement was voluntary, and among other considerations by the court in coming to that conclusion was whether or not warning had been given to the accused as to what his position was. In short, he was told that he was not obliged to say anything. He had nothing to hope in the way of favour and nothing to fear, and what he said might be used against him. That is as close to the short warning used by the mounted police as I can remember. But in the case of Rex v. Gach the Supreme Court of Canada in a judgment written by or concurred in by Mr. Justice Taschereau, now sitting on this commission, the court held that it was a rule of law—not just one of the things to be considered but a rule of law—that no statement made by an accused person to a person in authority could be used against him without that warning having been given.

I mention that to show the trend there has been in our administration. I think Canada is the only country that has gone thus far in looking after the constitutional right and the interest of the person who is accused of a crime.

I now go a step farther and say this. Everything we have by way of administration is based on the innocence of the individual until the crown proves him guilty. That has been the corner-stone of everything we have done. You may have a little different superstructure here or a little change there, but that basic fact has never changed from the time we administered criminal law in any British country since magna charta.

Let us compare that with what obtains in some other countries. I do not make this comparison in a disparaging way or to be critical of other countries, because other countries certainly have the full right of setting up their own method of handling the administration of criminal justice. Let us go to France and see what happens. We will say that a person is suspected, an information is laid, and he is arrested. The first thing that happens to him there is that he is taken before what is known as an examining magistrate, and that examination is in camera, and it is indeed a real examination. We saw repercussions of it in the recent trial of Mr. Laval, and I am quite sure that it was not edifying to those of us who are accustomed to our own system.

Go to the United States of America. Today in many states of that union there is not even a preliminary hearing. In fact, in famous cases reported in their press I have seen it said that the crown had a star secret witness up its sleeve, and so on.

[Mr. A. L. Smith.]

Our position has been so different. Here a man is entitled to a preliminary hearing. He is entitled without cost in all the provinces of Canada, if he has no money, to get a copy of everything that was said. In the event that the crown discovers witnesses between the preliminary hearing and the trial the accused is entitled to a full statement from the crown counsel of everything he may say. That has been the British way of proceeding, and with what result? If we take the number of persons charged with crime in this country or in Great Britain and compare it with the numbers in the other countries I have mentioned, and take the number of convictions under our generous treatment here—you may not logically justify some of it, I know—our convictions compare five to one as against those of one other country I have mentioned and twenty to one as against those of one great state in that union. I suggest that that must give us an idea of just how fine this method is which we have had in administering our criminal law.

Now I intend to discuss what took place in this case, and with respect, Mr. Speaker, may I ask you now to declare it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock, or at a time when, according to one of our rules, we are permitted to "call it six o'clock", I advised you that I intended to deal chronologically, and fairly I hope, with the incidents in connection with this particular case. But before doing so, I intended to read two paragraphs from the first order in council, which I did not have before me at the time. What I wish to read is contained in the white paper, "Documents relating to the proceedings of the Royal Commission", at page 9. The first paragraph reads:

> Whereas it has been ascertained that agents of a foreign power have been engaged in a concerted effort to obtain from public officials and other persons in positions of trust secret and confidential information the disclosure of which might be inimical to the safety and interests of Canada and friendly powers and that secret and confidential information has been communicated, directly or indirectly, by certain persons to the agents of the aforesaid foreign power to the prejudice of the public safety or interests of Canada and of friendly powers.

That is the beginning. One might be constrained to wonder just what the distinction in that paragraph is between foreign powers

and friendly powers. It seems to be just a little jumbled. Then at the bottom of the page there appears the following:

1. The Acting Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice, if satisfied that with a view to preventing any particular person from communicating secret and confidential information to an agent of a foreign power or otherwise acting in any manner prejudicial to the public safety or the safety of the state it is necessary so to do, may make an order that any such person be interrogated and/or detained in such place and under such conditions as he may from time to time determine.

These last words are of course the important part, and I merely read these two paragraphs now because, when the house rose, through my own fault I did not have them in front of me.

What has taken place? The first thing that we knew was the statement of the Prime Minister with respect to this matter. May I in my humble way quite deferentially say that I think the Prime Minister adopted a very wise course in the first statement which he made. I do not believe that, having regard to his statement of last evening, his hopes that this might not create much public interest could be justified. At least it was a hope which he was quite entitled to entertain, and I am sure that many of us would share that hope with him. Remember, I mention this date in early September when this information came into the hands of the Minister of Justice.

Prior to February 15 certain people were detained. In short, they were arrested. They were arrested without warrant, and they were arrested not because, as in a case under the criminal code, as the Postmaster General (Mr. Bertrand) well knows, they were actively caught committing a crime. They were arrested under the special provisions, if I may say so, contained in the order in council which I have just read.

The fact that people are arrested does not normally mean very much. People are arrested every day. I have been arrested myself. As a matter of fact, it was not a very serious charge and I got out of it without any difficulty. But I really know what the thing means. When you are arrested you cannot do what you want to do. You do what the policeman tells you, or else. That is the position of a man when he is arrested. But here is where we really start to differ with the normal procedure. These people were held incommunicado. What does this mean? We all know it means that they were not allowed to communicate with anyone, and I am quite sure their movements, their letter writing and all that sort of thing, would receive excellent supervision, not to use a stronger word.

If the information given by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) last evening is correct, this thing cannot end here. Surely it can never be said again in the Dominion of Canada that people were held for six days with glaring lights upon them. That has never belonged to the administration of justice in this country. It smacks of that which we have read about elsewhere.

The next thing which we have not been told about is whether or not these persons before this commission, under the Inquiries Act, had the benefit of what we know as section 5 of the Canada Evidence Act. In other words, for the benefit of the lay gentlemen present—I say that in the most complimentary fashion because they always abuse us lawyers and I am returning good for evil—it means that a person examined under certain circumstances will be told that the evidence he gives will not be used against him in any proceeding and that the only thing he is liable for is perjury in the giving of that evidence.

This house has not yet been told—and this is not *sub judice*. The Prime Minister pronounced that much better than I do although he does not belong to us. At any rate, that is not part of the *sub judice* end of the picture. This has reference to proceedings before that commission. I am not saying they were not given that protection. I will say to the prosecutors, whoever they may be, that if that protection were given, then they have a good deal tougher job than they think they have at the present time. But we were told that what was done was for the safety of the state. I am going to have something to say about that, inferentially perhaps, though I think it will be plain before I shall have concluded.

I turn quickly and in passing to two cases; first, the case of the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose), in which a very proper procedure was followed. He was arrested, charged and brought up in the court in Montreal the following day. We may also observe, with respect to the doctor, the professor at King's College, London, whose name escapes me at the moment—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Doctor May. He was arrested and charged in Bow Street the following morning. What does a man or woman want when he or she is arrested? Let us assume that they have not had my experience and have never been in gaol before. They go in there and are locked up by themselves. What do they want? The man first wants to see his wife, and then his

lawyer. The woman wants to see her husband, and then he tells her that she needs a lawyer just because she is there. I am sure that the Postmaster General will agree with me that counsel is sought in ninety-nine cases out of every one hundred when they have never been in the toils of the law before. That is a natural human reaction. I am going to assume that these people reacted humanly and naturally; that they were the same as everybody else and sought assistance. They did not get it.

Then a royal commission was appointed. I am not going to say anything at all against this royal commission. I am fortunate in having the acquaintanceship of the two judges; I am fortunate in having the friendship of Mr. E. K. Williams of Winnipeg. Both of these judges and Mr. Williams are highly respected in Canada in matters of civil law, but I do not think anyone of the three ever had very much to do with criminal matters.

An hon. MEMBER: What about Mr. Fauteux?

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): That does not apply to Mr. Fauteux. I think I heard an hon. member mention his name. He is one of the ablest prosecutors in Canada; but I leave the word "prosecutor" to rest just where the Postmaster General called it to my attention. There is not a word of criticism in my mind about the motives or about the honesty of purpose of these men; yet I ask this simple question: why was it that two judges of the Supreme Court of Canada were chosen when the appeals may ultimately come before that court? Why not two judges away from the industrial section, because apparently all these questions mentioned in the report of the commissioners apply to the industrial section of Canada? Why not someone from out there? I am not saying for a moment that either Mr. Justice Taschereau or Mr. Justice Kellock would sit on this appeal. They certainly would not; they respect their profession and their position too much to do that, but why were judges taken from a court to which in the ultimate end of proceedings this matter might come for final adjudication?

Let no one think I am saying that when the Minister of Justice chose these fine gentlemen to carry on this work he had anything in his mind of a nature which was not of the best. The most that I have said or ever will say about this matter is that in my opinion a terrible mistake has been made.

We were told by the Prime Minister that these people were offered counsel. I have no doubt that they were. The commissioners say in their report that they did it in conformity with sections 12 and 13 of the act respecting inquiries. I am going to read those sections because they are very short:

> 12. The commissioners may allow any person whose conduct is being investigated under this Act, and shall allow any person—

The first is "may", the second is "shall".

> —against whom any charge is made in the course of such investigation, to be represented by counsel.
>
> 13. No report shall be made against any person until reasonable notice shall have been given to him of the charge of misconduct alleged against him and he shall have been allowed full opportunity to be heard in person or by counsel.

Something that I think we need to be told is this. I gathered—and if I am wrong I hope I shall be immediately corrected—that once these men had given evidence before this commission they were offered counsel. I gathered that from the Prime Minister's remarks and from reading reports of this commisison. If that be so, let us hark back to the main principle upon which justice has been administered. Here you have people already in gaol, in solitary confinement with a man at the door. We heard something about failure to attempt suicide and that sort of thing. The man at the door is the only person they ever saw. They have never been in gaol before. They are brought before this commission. There you have two supreme court judges whose names are well known, and who are no doubt known to them, eminent and able counsel, clerks, secretaries, stenographers and all that sort of thing which go with royal commissions, and they were largely meant for us lawyers, generally speaking. But you have all this. These people come in singly, and what happens? They are examined under oath. If the newspaper report of the other day was correct they are sworn to secrecy as to what happened there. True, it is only a report in one of the Ottawa papers, and I do not know whether or not it is true, but that is what was said. What in the world is the good of offering people counsel after they have been in solitary confinement, after they have been examined by this commission?

You and I, Mr. Speaker, and all other hon. members know there is nothing so aimed to break down will power and voluntary action as solitary confinement and being rushed in before a tribunal of that kind. Under these circumstances no one suggests that these would be voluntary statements. To my mind, and I think the Postmaster General will agree with me, it is absolute nonsense. People need counsel before they are aiming for trouble, and before people are trying to cause them

trouble. Those are the people who need the protection of people who by their training are expert in giving them advice in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but he has already spoken for forty minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope Your Honour will allow the hon. member to proceed; I am sure it is the wish of the house.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I am sorry, sir, to have broken a rule and my promise that I would not speak for more than fifteen minutes, but time seems to get away from me. We did not commence our session until about five minutes after eight, sir, I would point out with the greatest of respect.

All I have to go on are the newspaper reports. I assure you, sir, and everyone in this House of Commons that I have not communicated with any of these accused nor have I communicated in any way, directly or indirectly, with counsel for any of the accused. So that I am speaking entirely from the record and from what I have read in the Ottawa newspapers only. I have not enough money to subscribe to the *Globe and Mail,* which I am told supports our side.

Just what has happened? We read in the newspapers that when Mrs. Woikin, the lady who came from Blaine Lake in Saskatchewan, appeared before the magistrate she was quite distracted and greatly disturbed, and endeavoured to plead guilty. I do not know Magistrate Strike but he must be an awfully good chap, because he refused to accept that plea. That was the physical and mental condition of this woman after having gone through experiences which I can perhaps better imagine than speak about. I am not going to use my imagination, but I have some idea of the things that run through the minds of people who are incarcerated in lonely silence.

We are told by the Prime Minister that they were waiting for Doctor May—I gather that it would be Doctor May—who was going to England in October to make a certain contact. Well, the mounted police are practical people; I have never known them to be naive. In September Gouzenko moves out with an armful of files and documents. This other man leaves Canada in October, and we waited to see if he would make a contact. Well, nobody is quite that dumb.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend is mistaken as to the time he left. I believe he had left earlier than that.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I thought my right hon. friend said October.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I believe he arrived in England on October 7.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Thank you. My point is that a month passed by. Let us consider the Russian embassy, which was engineering this spy ring. Gouzenko is gone; all their documents are gone. Who would think that Doctor May would make his contact in London under such circumstances? No one is quite that dumb. That is a simple statement of the situation.

I have said a word already about the plea of the hon. member for Cartier and the plea of Doctor May. Now I continue. How regular this procedure is! Will not our minds go back to the first great war when hon. members will remember Mr. Von Papen ran the German embassy in the United States? This whole thing seems to fall into line with that sort of thing. I am almost through, sir, and will not trespass much longer on your generosity.

What does this all mean? In short, what is my complaint? Many years ago one of the greatest judges in English law said something that has never been disputed in any courthouse in the Dominion of Canada; that in the administration of justice it is better that ten guilty men go free than that one innocent man be convicted. Do not for a moment think I do not agree that we need a royal commission. I believe we need something to purge the government offices of this country of people like those who have been turned up in this particular business. I think it is also time that in employing civil servants scholastic attainments should not be given the greatest consideration in appointing people to positions of responsibility. I go farther in my effort to be fair and say that of course this sort of thing is entirely new in this country. But I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this house to imagine the normal procedure under the law. In September we had the information, and an excellent police force which worked over it for five months. Now what happens? It is not of very great importance if two or three persons should escape imprisonment. Of course we have the statement by the Prime Minister at page 51 of *Hansard* that the idea of the continuation was to see that no one should escape the net. That is not nearly so important as that we should maintain what has really made us what we are, in other words the rule of law in everything we do. What is law? Law is nothing more than the codification of honesty in business and good morals in social conduct;

and I do not see why we have not been able to proceed along that line in the good old way. Surely the deputy ministers of the various departments in which these things have gone wrong are in a position to make a purge of their own departments. If we ever needed a house-cleaning we need it now. Surely it is not a matter of great importance that two or three individuals might escape punishment.

May I close by saying just this. It is true that we have had this commission. It is true that persons have been suspected of crime because, as the Prime Minister indicated, the documents pointed to them. It is true that they have been brought before the commission without warning, without protection, without an opportunity to see their families or to get legal advice. In six months, Mr. Speaker, this spy scare will be forgotten. Unfortunately our people are a bit too apathetic about matters of this kind. But I say to you, sir, that during your lifetime and mine the people of this country will always regret and will never live down the fact that we threw aside and abrogated the rights and liberties of our citizens. Indeed, sir, Canada now has seen black days.

Right Hon. L. S. St. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I expected that we would hear some pretty strong criticism of what it was found necessary to do under the extraordinary conditions this government has had to face in connection with what I think I may describe, without violating any rule as to matters being *sub judice,* as a conspiracy for the establishment of a dangerous fifth column in this country. I would have been disappointed had that criticism not been made; because it is good, when extraordinary measures are taken, that they should be looked at very closely, and that those who venture to take them should feel that they have to respond to the tribunal of public opinion for those actions of which they have been the authors.

But I did not expect that it would take the line that has been indicated in the last few remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat. For almost five years now I have occupied the office to which the leader of my party did me the honour to call me. It was my good fortune during the whole period of the war not to have been called upon to exercise any of the powers that had been conferred upon the incumbent of that office by the defence of Canada regulations.

Those regulations were quite drastic. Under them drastic action had been taken. But whether it be because drastic action had been taken or not, this country went through six years of war without any sabotage, and without any incident that retarded the effect of the will of the large majority of the people to put forth a gallant and valiant effort in the struggle for the maintenance of our institutions.

After I came into office it did happen that on two occasions internment orders had to be made. I suppose it was childish on my part, but I did take some satisfaction from the fact that, through no pre-arrangement, it so happened that I was not in Ottawa at the time those orders had to be made. And it was with great satisfaction that, when the war came to a close, I felt that the only orders I had been called upon to sign under those regulations were orders putting an end to the detentions that had been brought about under them.

The hon. member who has just taken his seat has said that he was speaking from the record; and it is quite natural that, in doing so, some discrepancies may creep into the facts as one states them. It is not the fact that the events narrated last night by the Prime Minister came to the knowledge of the Minister of Justice on that first day, when this Mr. Gouzenko tried to impart the information.

On the morning of September 6 he came to my secretary and asked for an interview. Being unknown to my secretary, as is the practice he was asked to state what his business was. When afterwards I was informed as to what his business was, I immediately said I could not receive an official from a friendly embassy bearing tales of the kind he had described to my secretary. And it was only after the police of the city of Ottawa requested the assistance of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police that, in the ordinary course of the exercise of their duties, which includes the giving of assistance to local authorities when called upon, they were put in possession of some of these facts.

We did hear that among those facts was the narration of an arrangement made for a contact to take place in London on a certain date, at a certain hour, at a certain street corner, where parties were to be recognized, with all the frills of an Oppenheim detective story—a newspaper under the left arm, or carried in one's pocket in a certain fashion, and by the exchange of greetings in terms which had been determined upon.

It did not seem to me probable, after this Mr. Gouzenko had disappeared, that this meeting would take place. Nevertheless, one of the gentlemen concerned did leave Canada on the date that the pre-arrangement indicated would be the date of his departure. I did not think much would come of it; but

on October 6 we were requested to be ready to take action here in Canada if an arrest were made in London on the following evening. It is under those conditions that the order in council printed in this white paper was made.

The meeting did not take place; and I felt a substantial relief from the fact that the provisions made in this order did not have to be carried into effect. I had other matters to attend to, I never saw that order again until after the order in council appointing the royal commission was made, and counsel for the commission came to me asking me to sign orders for the detention and interrogation of certain persons. We then had a quite lengthy discussion over it, and I told them that if the order were one that was going to be made, then it would not be in that form; that I did not think in peace time it was proper that any member of the executive should have the kind of powers the order expressed; that I thought no one should be detained, even for interrogation, without there being some form of intervention of the judicial authority; that we would act only as if that were the provision, and that there would have to be a recommendation from some organ of the judicial authority to make me feel that I should exercise those powers.

It went so far that I was finally asked if I was going to take the responsibility of refusing to exercise them. I felt that that responsibility would be a responsibility for the safety of the state, whilst the other would be merely a responsibility that might involve some political discredit, and that between the two I would choose to assume whatever political criticism might be directed against me for following the advice I got from counsel for the commission, acting on instructions from the commission.

I shall now refer to the statute from which my hon. friend read. I do not think there is anyone in this house who will disagree with anything the hon. member has said with respect to the prosecution of individuals. But does not the hon. gentleman realize that there is more than the prosecution of individuals involved in this investigation? Does not the hon. member realize that the Inquiries Act was put into the statutes precisely to take care of situations which concerned the safety or good administration of the state, whilst all provisions which deal with the prosecution or otherwise of individuals who have committed offences are in the criminal code? What was required here was not some form of prosecution of an individual; what was required when it was determined by this magnificent body to which the hon. member has paid tribute, the officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, that this was something serious was a commission to determine the extent to which it had vitiated the administrative life of this free country. It is for that reason that the commission was appointed to inquire into the matter.

The hon. member has stated before the house that a serious mistake was made in the selection of the commissioners, in choosing two justices of the Supreme Court of Canada instead of taking some other justices from some other courts in Canada. Well, I am willing to submit our judgment about the selection of those commissioners to the country as against the judgment of the hon. member for Calgary West.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): You can submit it in Calgary West at any time you want to.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): And in many other spots too.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It so happens that this is the spot it has to be submitted to at this time. We in this house represent no spot; we represent the whole of Canada. The Inquiries Act, which is chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, was placed on the statute books by the parliament of Canada for the purposes which are described in the statute. It provides:

> The governor in council may, whenever he deems it expedient, cause inquiry to be made into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof.

That is not the criminal code. That is a statute passed to enable the governor in council to have an investigation made under conditions which will satisfy him, the parliament and the public of Canada that it is being proceeded with in a fair, judicial, careful and prudent manner. For the purpose of making that investigation the government of Canada was happy to follow the advice of the gentleman referred to by the hon. member, whom both he and I know well and than whom no one stands higher in his profession in this country. That gentleman at the present time is the president of the Canadian Bar Association. His first suggestion was that the commissioners be three members of the Supreme Court of Canada, and he afterwards modified that to the extent of recommending that two commissioners might be sufficient for the purposes of this commission. It was his opinion, an opinion which commended itself to His

Excellency's advisers, an opinion which I think will commend itself to this house, that it was proper to ask these two gentlemen who are now the commissioners to undertake that service, that onerous and disagreeable service to the public of Canada, which this royal commission has to perform.

They made an examination of the papers which had been handed over to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police by this man Gouzenko under the conditions which were described last evening by the right hon. the Prime Minister and which I will not repeat. They came to the conclusion that there was no doubt about the authenticity of those documents. Not many of them have yet been published and I cannot speak of those that have not been published. This investigation is proceeding in camera, but they came to the conclusion that taking these documents as authentic it was necessary for the purposes of a full and complete investigation that certain persons be detained for interrogation and they recommended that that be done.

I did not think at the time it was going to take as long as it is taking. It has really been a disappointment that it was necesasry to hold these persons so long before they could be interrogated and the commissioners make their final report. That is unfortunate, not as much for the persons who are detained, although they have my full sympathy, as for the public opinion of this country. It has made it appear that the important question before the country at the present time was not whether the security of the state was being undermined by the infiltration of this fifth column into many of the public offices but whether there had been anything done which might be prejudicial to an accused person when he came before the court of justice. We are all as attached as the hon. member for Calgary West to the proper administration of justice, whether it be criminal or civil, as it has been practised under the British system which has become our own, but there has been nothing shown anywhere which constitutes any violation of any right which any individual may have when he comes to answer for any charge brought against him.

One person not reported against by the commission, who could not be reported against because he had not been heard by the commission and because he could not be called upon to appear before the commission, was mentioned in the evidence that was put before the crown prosecutor for the purpose of making charges against some one who had been heard and who had been examined. Counsel retained came to the conclusion that it would not be proper to prosecute one person for conspiracy with the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) without at the same time bringing charges against him. Those charges were laid, an arrest was made and the next morning he appeared before the court in Montreal and within a very few hours was released on bail.

Doctor A. N. May was arrested in London, certainly as much as three weeks ago, and the Ottawa *Journal's* five o'clock edition today reports:

> Bail refused for Dr. A. N. May in London Court—British scientist held for trial in spy case.
>
> London, March 19.—Dr. Allan Nunn May, 34-year-old British physicist who worked in Canada on nuclear research in the war-time pursuit of atomic energy, to-day was held for trial in Old Bailey Criminal Court, April 13, on charges of violating the Official Secrets Act by giving atomic information to an undisclosed person.
>
> Dr. May was refused bail by Magistrate McKenna of Bow Street Court, who said the defendant's release might be "against public policy."

Doctor May, like everybody else, is deemed to be innocent until found guilty, but Doctor May was refused, pending further investigation of the charges against him, to be allowed his temporary freedom on bail because it might be against public policy.

Here the royal commissioners held that it would be against public policy and would be apt to defeat the basic purposes for which this basic investigation had been instituted if the persons they wished to interrogate were not detained pending their interrogation. That has taken more time than we hoped it might take, but there was only one of two courses to follow. One would have been to treat this as of not sufficient importance to warrant any other action than perhaps a discreet dismissal of those who might be suspected of having engaged in the spying proceedings. The other was to take steps to make sure that we would ascertain, as far as it is possible to do so, to what extent this virus had penetrated into branches of the public service and, as is suggested to me, throughout the country at large. We knew that there would be serious political embarrassment for us in taking the latter course. One of the most embarrassing features about public life that I have been up against in the short time that I have been in it is the necessity of making decisions based upon facts you know but cannot fully disclose to the public. This is not the first time that I have been up against that difficulty. Some hon. members were here in 1944 when I had to take a stand based upon the facts which I knew and which in my opinion fully justified the stand I took, but at that time those facts could not be made known. Last May it was possible to go to places where my conduct

had been severely criticized and tell them then the facts which I knew at the time I made the decision and to say to them: Is there any one of you here who, had you been in my place and had known those facts, would not have done as I did? And I got a satisfactory answer.

This is another occasion where we are not free at the present time to disclose more than has been disclosed by public statements or by this white paper. We had to make a decision, well knowing that in the meantime it would involve the probability of criticism, the probability of serious criticism. My colleagues know to what extent I pointed out what criticism we would be up against when we had to defend this line of conduct, but I am confident that the public of Canada when this thing is over will, as did the public of other parts of Canada last May, feel that we took the right course, the courageous course, the only course under which it was possible to satisfy the responsibility we had for the safety of government—I do not mean the government of a party but the safety of our form of government in this country.

With respect to individuals, whenever the moment arises for them to have to answer to the charges against them, even before an adverse report is made about them by the commission, they are brought before the commissioners as required by these sections read by the hon. member are told what the facts are which indicate that they should be critically reported upon by the commissioners and are asked if they wish to have counsel. They are told that they are free to adduce further evidence if they see fit to do so, and after that they are not found guilty because the royal commission has no power to find anyone guilty or to impose any sentence upon anyone. The royal commission makes a report, and on that report the government has to take the responsibility, as the Prime Minister said in his statement of February 15 it would take, of determining whether or not such person will be prosecuted.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Will the minister permit a simple question? Was it after they had been examined under oath that they were given that opportunity?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It is after they are examined under oath that they are given that opportunity. They are examined under oath, not to determine whether they have done anything personally, but to inform the commission what they know about the extent of this conspiracy as it affects the body politic.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Including themselves.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Including themselves and including the rest of the 11,500,000 or 12,000,000 Canadians.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Agreed, but about 11,999,990 of the others are out of gaol, are they not?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: This investigation had to be made or had to be omitted. I would not have taken the responsibility of passing over the information that was characterized by the experienced members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as being probably authentic.

Some suggestion has been made that we first heard of this in September and that it was not until February that a royal commission was set up. In due time full explanations will be available to the Canadian public for that delay, and when those explanations are available I think the Canadian public will find them satisfactory.

The Prime Minister indicated last night that we did not feel that this country should be made the base for spying out information affecting our neighbours to the south or affecting the United Kingdom, and that it was proper to communicate to them beforehand such information as was available. The information on which Doctor A. N. May was charged was information obtained at the same time in the same way, and those proceedings, hon. members will recall, coincided with the institution of proceedings here. It was felt, and I think properly so, that our action should be synchronized with all such action as might be taken elsewhere arising out of the same set of facts.

The hon. member says that a great judge has stated that it would be better that ten guilty persons should escape condemnation than that one innocent person be found guilty of an offence which he did not commit. That is all very well, and that is no doubt the rule which will be followed and strictly applied in the courts of justice before which this case will have to appear. But in this royal commission the purpose was not to pronounce upon the innocence or guilt of any of ten or thirteen or more persons but to find out to what extent the security of this state had been endangered by a conspiracy to set up this fifth column in our country. I submit, and I take full responsibility for the view, that when gentlemen such as the two members of the royal commission, such as the eminent counsel who have been associated with them, report that the only effective way to make the investigation which the circum-

stances require is to detain and interrogate persons who may have knowledge about it, it was proper to accept that advice and to proceed with that investigation.

Had it not been at this time it could not have been done in that way. It was done in that way only because it so happened that an order in council which had been made on October 6, 1945, was still in force. If there had been no legal way of doing it I would have felt no responsibility. But when there was a legal way, when there was a way by which it could legally be done, I could not take the responsibility of refusing to comply with the advice which was given to me. I will not say I was happy that there was a legal way of doing it. It would have been much more comfortable for me to be able to say, "This cannot legally be done".

Reference has been made to the excluding of habeas corpus. That is not technically correct. There has been no setting aside of the statute of Charles providing for habeas corpus. All that the habeas corpus statute provides for is that anyone who is detained may require that he be brought before a judge so that the judge will determine whether or not there is a legal case for his detention. Any one of these persons could have applied for and obtained a writ of habeas corpus, but it would have done him no good, because as soon as the judge would have been shown the order in council under which such person was detained, and the order in council which authorized it, he would have said, "You are legally detained". And that would have required the quashing of the writ. So that no writ of habeas corpus would have had any practical effect under these proceedings, any more than the writ of habeas corpus which was issued during the last war and which was the occasion for the leading case that decides the effect of the War Measures Act.

The writ was issued and it went through to the Supreme Court of Canada, and the decision was that things done under the War Measures Act had the effect of a statute to provide a legal cause for the detention of the man. The same would have happened here. The writ of habeas corpus is not set aside. There is provision for the detention of an individual, something which is not according to the ordinary rules of law, and if it is regularly provided by parliament, or under the authority of parliament, it requires the writ to be quashed just as effectively as if it were a conviction in an ordinary court.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

Mr. FULTON: Will the minister permit a question? Will he tell us how a person held incommunicado could bring a writ of habeas corpus?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: My hon. friend is himself a lawyer and he does not need my advice—

Mr. FULTON: A lawyer, not a magician.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: —as to how that could be done. It is no business of the custodian of a person who is held to provide opportunities for the issuing of these writs. There may be facts which create difficulties in the way of having a writ. One could imagine, for instance, someone being arrested and detained in the wilderness of the north.

Mr. FULTON: Not in Canada.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It would not be easy for him to have a writ issued, but that would not mean that he did not have his legal right to the writ. These are circumstances which result from the facts, but they create no legal obstacle.

There is just one other point to which I wish to refer. It is personal. I do not like to have to refer to it but I think I should. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) called attention to a statement I made in the crossfire of discussion when the emergency powers bill was being debated in committee on December 6 last. There had been some discussion there over a secret order in council providing for the examination of seamen. It was an order which it was alleged had not been published but had been tabled in this house about a month before. I said that was not a secret order and that there were no secret orders. The leader of the opposition was kind enough to say he was quite convinced I had not meant to mislead the house, and I hoped no one in the house would believe that on any occasion I would wish to mislead the house. I had no thought at that time of this order, which had not been used, which had been prepared for use in the event that this rendezvous which the hon. member for Calgary West says no one would have been dumb enough to keep after Gouzenko had abstracted certain papers from the Russian embassy had not taken place.

As I said before, I felt a great relief that no orders were required to be made under this, and it had entirely slipped my memory. Had I thought of it at any time since and looked at it, I would have been inclined, before December 31, before the date when the War Measures Act ceased to be operative, to have had it modified, to require the proceedings which in fact I did ask to have accom-

plished before I signed any orders, because once again I do not think a member of the executive branch of government should in peace time have powers of that nature that he can exercise of his own volition. It is only very rarely that any extraordinary proceedings can be taken, because the whole of the normal legislation has to be statutory, and there is nothing in the Inquiries Act which authorizes the detention of persons for interrogation. They are compelled to appear. They are not allowed counsel unless the commissioners feel that they should have them. This denial of counsel of which so much has been made is something which has been provided by this parliament before the hon. member for Calgary West or the member for Quebec East came into this parliament. This parliament decided that in cases of royal inquiries the right to counsel would exist from a given moment. Parliament determined that up to that moment it would be discretionary for the commissioners as to whether those called before them would have counsel or not.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): They may.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The commissioners may do it, but they are not required to do it, and they may refuse to do it.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): They did, apparently.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: And they did; but in doing that they were carrying out a provision passed by this parliament which has stood on the statute book for a great many years.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): It was never intended to track down spies.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Until quite recently in this country it was never thought that any government would have to track down spies in its own service, and I hope that from this time onward the result of this commission will be such that that unpleasant duty will never fall upon any other government. But if it does and should it at any time again become necessary I hope there will be in office a government that will not shirk the responsibility of doing its duty.

Mr. COLDWELL: I see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) on his feet. Would he permit me to ask the Minister of Justice a question? I suggested last evening that two persons who had been held had been treated in a particular manner. To-night the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) referred to it. Would the minister tell us what he knows about it? I think it is something that should be cleared up.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I fully agree with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. Had it been possible for me to get to the Department of Justice to-day I would have been in a position to give the answer. Unfortunately I was not able to get to the department to-day. There was a meeting of the treasury board at half-past nine o'clock, and from that moment until this it has not been possible for me to get to the responsible officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to find out exactly what are the facts in that regard. I know that I discussed with the commissioner at the outset the treatment to be accorded to these persons, and we both agreed that they should be subjected to as little inconvenience as possible, and that we should endeavour in our representations to the commission and to the counsel to make the duration of that inconvenience as short as possible. I shall make inquiry, but I shall not promise to give the answer to-morrow, because I think it is serious enough for the commissioner to make a full inquiry and have before him all those who were in charge of the persons who were being detained for interrogation.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I be permitted to ask a question? When the minister was speaking he corrected the hon. member for Calgary West with respect to one factual matter. The hon. member for Calgary West thought that the matter had been brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice in September last. The minister said that was an error, but he did not tell us when it was brought to his attention.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: In a general way it was reported to me on the following day.

Some hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Hon. members need not laugh. I am trying to give the leader of the opposition the full facts as I am sure he would like to have them. If it is not suitable to other hon. members that I give them to him here I shall be glad to give them to him privately. The day after Gouzenko's visit to my secretary I was informed that the Ottawa police had requested the assistance of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police about this man, and I told them then they were free to see him and to get the story from him. Then as it developed in the course of a few following days I was apprised from time to time of what information was being obtained.

Mr. BRACKEN: When was the first day?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It was the day of the opening of the house, September 6, and on September 7 I was told that this same man

who had tried to see them the day previous, and with respect to whom I had told them that they must not see him, had been brought to them through the instrumentality of the Ottawa police.

Mr. BRACKEN: Was that contrary to what the hon. member for Calgary West said?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I think so. I gathered from the hon. member that he was under the impression that I had received this Mr. Gouzenko and had heard his story when he came from the Russian embassy. That I refused to do, and it was only when he was brought into contact with the police through the ordinary course of the police work that they were permitted to listen to his story and take notes from him.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with the speech that I had intended to deliver I should like to ask for your ruling on a point of order, and, of course, to be governed by it. I thought I would be the first speaker on the government side to follow the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) and to reply to a motion of want of confidence moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken). There has been injected into the debate discussion on a question which was raised on the main motion and nothing whatsoever has been said with regard to the amendment itself. What I should like to know is, am I in order to speak for more than forty minutes? I should like to know that before I begin because I had intended to review some of my experiences in Europe. If I am restricted to forty minutes I shall do it at some other time.

Mr. BRACKEN: Speaking for this party, I may say we shall offer no objection if the Minister of Agriculture requires more than forty minutes to make his reply.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is important. It is not a matter of consent. It is a question of the rules of the house and a matter of right. I think the Speaker ought to decide it. I believe the rule is that any member of the government replying to a motion of want of confidence has whatever length of time he wishes to speak if he is the first person to speak after the motion is made.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister of Justice spoke for only a little more than forty minutes, including his answer to the question which was put to him. Therefore I believe that if the Minister of Agriculture wants to answer for the government it is his privilege under standing order 37 to speak for more than forty minutes.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not know whether that is your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to the minister exceeding his time to-night, because we want to hear about this agricultural policy, but we do not want a ruling which will establish a precedent in this connection. It seems to me the rule is very clear:

> . . . such minister, or a member making a motion of "no confidence" in the government and a minister replying thereto, shall speak for more than forty minutes at a time in any debate.

It seems to me the minister who speaks immediately after the motion of want of confidence has been moved is the minister replying to the motion.

Mr. GARDINER: If I may be permitted, the question I raised was in regard to a minister who was not replying at all to the motion of want of confidence. I wanted to know whether in that case I would have the right to speak for more than forty minutes. I should like to have that clear.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I refer you and the house, Mr. Speaker, to a ruling which will be found on pages 22 and 23 of the *Journals of the House of Commons*, 1941-42, in which the Speaker of the day ruled that as many as six ministers of the crown whose departments were under attack in a want of confidence motion could each reply for more than forty minutes.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I say one word with respect to this matter. First of all, let it be clear that we want the Minister of Agriculture to have all the time he wishes this evening. With respect to the decision you, sir, are about to give on the technical point raised, I suggest that the Prime Minister spoke after I did the other day, and no doubt spoke for the government in reply to that motion of want of confidence. If there is some rule that six ministers each may speak for more than forty minutes, that is another matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Apart from what my hon. friend says, another motion was moved by the leader of the C.C.F. party.

Mr. COLDWELL: But was that a motion?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly it was a motion in the nature of a want of confidence motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Speaker has been asked for a ruling, and with the permission of the house I shall give that ruling.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I just say this, Mr. Speaker. I was on my feet and sat down because you rose; I did not wish to be disrespectful to the Chair, but I would point out that if mine was a want of confidence motion then I had the right to speak for more than forty minutes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: But you did not do so.

Mr. COLDWELL: I have been denied that privilege on other occasions in this house; the ruling of Mr. Speaker is there to confirm that statement. Consequently there can be only one want of confidence motion before the house, and I moved an amendment to it. The government cannot have it both ways.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar is right when he says that a member moving a motion of want of confidence in the government is entitled to speak for more than forty minutes. When the hon. gentleman spoke I did not ask him to resume his seat because he had spoken for more than forty minutes. I was asked by the Minister of Agriculture for a ruling as to whether he might speak for more than forty minutes. The question now before the house is the amendment and the subamendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and the leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell) respectively. The Minister of Justice did not answer for the government in regard to the amendment or the subamendment, so that I believe it is the privilege of the Minister of Agriculture to answer for the government. Therefore he is entitled to speak for more than forty minutes if he wishes to do so.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. KNOWLES: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will resume his seat, he knows perfectly well that the ruling of the Speaker is not debatable, so that he cannot raise the question now.

Mr. KNOWLES: The ruling is wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister of Agriculture has the floor.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): My desire was to have the question cleared up before I began my remarks, in order that I might govern myself accordingly; and I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the ruling you have given.

In discussing the question raised by the amendment and subamendment I desire to deal with the situation referred to in the speech from the throne, which has been commented upon by those who have been discussing this matter and particularly by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken). In his remarks dealing with food he made this statement, as reported at page 27 of *Hansard* of March 18:

> I now come to a discussion of agriculture and food. The speech from the throne tells us that the most pressing problem demanding immediate attention is the food problem. That is a fact we have known for months—that is, everybody except the government. We heard about their new policy first in the speech from the throne.

I do not know whether that remark was intended to leave the impression it left with me, which was that the speech from the throne was referring to a condition which related more particularly to Canada. The speech from the throne had this to say:

> Of world problems demanding immediate action, the most pressing is the provision of food to those peoples facing acute shortage, and, in some regions, widespread famine. The chance of a peaceful reconstruction of the world depends on food. The shortage at the present time is very great. The problem, moreover, is not only for the next few months, but also for the next few years.

With this statement appearing in the speech from the throne I am in entire agreement, and I wish to say a word in regard to discussions in which I took part during the last session. Last fall, when we were discussing in this house whether we should have rationing of meat I made a statement which was quoted in the press from one end of Canada to the other and commented upon by quite a number of newspapers. I repeated a remark I had heard a few days previously made by a minister of the gospel in one of the churches of this city, to the effect that there was a possibility there might be as many as three hundred thousand children on the continent of Europe who would lose their lives as a result of starvation, particularly in those areas with which we in this country are concerned, unless something was done to provide them with more food than it was then apparent they were going to receive. Since making that remark I have had the privilege of visiting most of the countries I had in mind when making that statement, and I think I am in duty bound to make some report to the house in regard to what I found in that particular area and the effect upon any policies the government may be called upon to announce now in regard to foodstuffs and their distribution.

During the six or seven weeks I was on the other side of the ocean I had the privilege of travelling across Great Britain at two different points by car, and of travelling by train throughout the length of the greater part of the island known as Great Britain. I also had the privilege of covering a considerable part of France, of Belgium, of Holland and of Denmark, as well as a considerable part of Germany both by aeroplane and by automobile.

I did not do as I was warned not to do when I was in Paris. A guide who was taking me about the city said, "Do not go back to Canada and say what one other person said who was here in Paris lately, upon returning to the United States." I asked the guide what had been said, and I was told that particular person had lived at the Ritz hotel—where I myself was stopping—had gone back to this continent and had made the statement, which had appeared in the press, to the effect that conditions were no worse in Paris than they were on this continent.

With that warning I was careful not to remain all my time in the Ritz hotel. I drove out into the country districts of France and other countries, in so far as it was possible for me to do so, and visited in those country places as well. I took my meals not only in the Ritz hotel, and in other hotels similarly situated, but took some of them in country districts, in ordinary restaurants, just as anyone would walk in off a street and order a meal. On other occasions I was at farm houses when meals were being served. While I did not have meals in all those farm houses, because I was not invited in some, yet I did stand and watch people who were eating their meals in houses where I was not invited. Therefore I did gain some knowledge as to what conditions are in the areas I visited.

In addition to that, I had an opportunity to visit with men who have been placed in charge of the occupied areas in Germany, and with men who are looking after food supplies in some other sections. What I wish to report to the house is this, that each one of the men I interviewed, who had responsible positions in connection with the distribution of food, and all those with whom I came in contact, assured me that no one had died from starvation in those areas, at least since the armies moved from active battles of warfare to occupation.

I state that merely to impress upon the minds of members of the house and of the people of Canada generally the reports that were made, and the results of what I myself saw. I hope that the decision which we did reach last year, and similar decisions reached in other countries did have the effect of placing sufficient food at the disposal of those who are administering those areas, to avoid having children dying from starvation.

But having said that, I would not wish members of the House of Commons to conclude that there is no hardship, that there is no trouble on the continent of Europe in the matter of food supplies. There are very serious difficulties, as the speech from the throne indicates, and I am sure that we as a people have a desire to do everything we possibly can in order to right a condition which does exist there, and to do it as rapidly as possible.

But in order to impress further upon the minds of hon. members what I believe to be the condition there, may I say this, that one can say the worst of which he could conceive with regard to conditions in certain spots or in certain areas, more or less limited so far as their effect upon the population as a whole is concerned. For example, if one is in the centre of the city of Hamburg, where there has been great destruction, he will see smoke-stacks sticking out of basements, with smoke belching from them, indicating that there are people living under the rubble covering the basements of buildings which were blasted by bombing.

No doubt there is great hardship there, and perhaps great difficulty in getting sufficient food to those people. But on the other hand one can go into the rural districts in the different countries about which I have spoken, and sometimes even into the smaller urban communities, sometimes even into sections of cities, and find that the people who are living in those particular areas have sufficient food to ward off anything in the nature of starvation. In some places one even finds it possible to receive meals that are just as good as those received by the American who stopped only in the Ritz hotel, and who went back to America and reported that one can be just as well fed there as he could be anywhere on this continent.

Well, then, you may ask me what the great difficulties are in connection with the situation. I would say they are threefold. First, there has been great damage done to the transportation systems. And even where food is available, in certain areas it is almost impossible to have it transported to other areas where it may be in great need.

In addition to that, there is the difficulty in connection with exchange. Some of the people who are there have been supplied with funds during a time when a government which does not now exist issued currency. As a result of that, there is great difficulty in disposing of

commodities for a currency which will be accepted at its face value by those who have it for distribution.

Then there is a most serious condition, one with which we are most concerned here, namely that there is not sufficient food in any event to feed all the people in those areas as they ought to be fed, even when we take into consideration the amount which under present conditions we are able to ship to them.

Those are the three outstanding difficulties, as I see them; and they are the difficulties which must be overcome before people can be properly fed. Indeed, two of them must be overcome before they can be properly fed, even if we supply the full quantity of food required in those districts.

I wish to say something at this time respecting the control conducted by the armies of occupation in those three sections of Germany at which I had the pleasure of looking for a short time, and over limited areas. I was along with officials who gave me whatever information was available in connection with the matter.

I feel that we have in the administration of the three armies of occupation, in so far as I was able to see them working, as complete and as effective an organization as can be set up for the distribution of food under the conditions existing on the continent of Europe. I say that in order to indicate that possibly we can best meet the situation which exists there by putting any food we have available for distribution in that area—so long as those armies of occupation are in charge—at the disposal of those who have been placed there to administer its distribution, rather than by placing it there in some other way.

In addition to that, I should like to say I was agreeably surprised at the provision made in camps in which people have been congregated by the occupation forces, to take care of people who came, we will say, into Berlin, ahead of the armies. They are being taken care of by those who are in charge of the administration in the certain sections of that city.

I had the privilege of going through one of those camps in which five thousand of those people were congregated, and of seeing conditions there at first hand. I need only say that the property upon which they were congregated is the barracks in which the German army in that section had been trained since possibly the time of Bismarck. The buildings are well constructed and the equipment for taking care of 5,000 people is all that one could expect in any refugee camp or any organized camp anywhere. What this reminded me of more than anything else I had ever seen was my experience in Winnipeg when we had people coming to this country from central European countries in hundreds of thousands during a twelve month period. I used to go down to the immigration hall in Winnipeg and see people who had just come off the trains seated about on the floor, on benches, on whatever equipment they may have had, on bundles of clothing or anything else they might have with them. These people were living under exactly the same kind of conditions and they looked like the same type of people. They seemed to be just about as well satisfied as you could have people who are forced away from home.

Another thing that surprised me more than anything else was that the British government, which was the government that had charge of this particular camp, was not only taking care of and clothing all these people, as well as feeding them, but had schools organized with school teachers teaching the children. I must say that the children in those schools showed by the satisfaction on their faces that they were being as well treated and as well cared for as any group of children could be under the conditions that exist when an army has moved across a country and people have moved in ahead of the army and must be taken care of until they can be redistributed back to where they came from or somewhere else.

I wanted to say these things, not only to remove from the minds of members but from the minds of people in Canada some of the ideas that we get when we listen to propaganda put on at great distances away from the scene of activity. I just wish to say, in order that I may not be misunderstood, that one could go to any of these areas one day or one week and look around, then go back three weeks later and look around and get an entirely different picture. I was in Paris on a day when there were fifteen degrees of frost, when army trucks were still moving about the streets, when buses were being overthrown at street corners in spite of the fact that the local police were trying to direct traffic. One found a condition there which gave one a certain impression. I came away from Paris feeling that I had seen a very dejected people, a people who were suffering because of need, a people who were not properly clothed, a people who required a great deal of sympathy and care from those of us outside. As a result of that experience, we cabled to this country and asked for more wheat for France. I wish to report to the house that those who were in authority here, the wheat board, saw to it immediately that

more wheat was sent forward, and actually increased supplies have gone forward weekly.

I went back three weeks later. I dropped into Paris on a day that was springlike, a day when there was no frost. The troops had all gone and the city was in the hands of the civilian population. I was reminded of the Paris I had seen ten years ago in 1936, not by the number of people who were on the street but by the manner in which they were conducting themselves, by the way in which they were dressed and everything else that had to do with the conduct of the city itself. If one were in France during the time of war, if one were there within two months after the war was over, if one were there six months after the war was over the picture would be entirely different at each time. I presume if one went back six months hence it will have changed even more than it has up to the present since the end of the war.

With that background I want to discuss the policy of this government in relation to food, both in the days that have gone by and in the months that lie ahead of us, and try if I can to leave an impression, not only on this house but on the country, as to what our intentions are in following the line of policy that we are following and have been following up to the present time in relation to food production during and after the war. In doing that I should like to call attention to one or two statements made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken). The hon. gentleman is reported on page 28 of *Hansard* as having said:

> It has been my business for thirty years, both in research and in practice in connection with farming, to understand that.

That is the argument in dry areas, that a certain proportion of the land should be allowed to lie fallow to conserve moisture for next year's crops. He says that he understands that from the experience he has had. He continued:

> But I know also that the only way to get extra food for hungry people is either to share what we have or to grow more. We have done splendidly in both directions, particularly in the line of production, during the last few years, but we can do more.

Then there is this statement:

> The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), according to press reports, holds the view that the acreage of wheat ought not to be increased in this emergency. As I have said, the Prime Minister has taken the same position on behalf of the government. I hold a different view. I hold the view that wheat acreage can be increased, and that it can be increased without serious risk to good farming practice and without lessening the normal acreage sown to feed grains.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

That is the opinion expressed by the leader of the opposition in this house. I refer again to his statement that for thirty years he has had experience, first as a civil servant working for the department of agriculture in one of the provinces of Canada; second, as a professor in a university of that same province; third, as the leader of the government in one of the provinces and now as the leader of the opposition in this house. In other words, that experience has been a three-way experience. Probably one might add to it the practical experience of having owned and operated farms on his own behalf.

With that statement before us I wish to examine into some of the recommendations and some of the undertakings and some of the opinions offered by the leader of the opposition in those different capacities. I have here a pamphlet which is entitled, "The Summer Fallow," and which was issued under the name of John Bracken, professor of field husbandry, university of Saskatchewan. I think it can be taken as authentic and as expressing at least the opinions which were held during the time he was educating the young farmers of Saskatchewan how to farm. This is what it says:

> The functions of the fallow
>
> Yet water in large quantities is absolutely essential to growing crops. The best "dry farmer" in the world cannot grow crops without rain. But he can grow crops in a limited rainfall if he understands and puts into practice the methods now understood of (1) storing the rainfall in the soil and (2) conserving it there for the use of crops. This is the first principle of "dry farming." In Saskatchewan we call it "summerfallowing."

I am quite sure that the leader of the opposition will still agree that that is a good definition of what we mean by summer-fallowing. I would agree with it also. He goes on to say:

> In farming practice it is not possible to store and retain in the soil all of the rain that falls in any year, but it is possible to store a large portion of it. In a foot of normal soil 2 or 3 or more inches of water can be stored and retained. At the end of the summer season the soil after a good fallow is moist to a depth of several feet, while adjoining cropped or prairie land is practically dry. (At the university in the dry year of 1914, fallowed land yielded 30¼ bushels of wheat; well cultivated fall ploughing, 16 bushels 53 pounds, while spring breaking failed to produce a crop.)

I think that that gives in as few words as possible the general experience of farmers in western Canada in dealing with a condition which is customary in that section of the country, namely, that we have from time to time drought years which we must be careful

in dealing with. That statement was made while my hon. friend was a professor of the agricultural college in the province of Saskatchewan. I have here another statement which he made when he was a civil servant in the government of Saskatchewan. His other statement was in a pamphlet on summerfallowing explaining why we have summerfallowing in the drought years in western Canada.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Would the minister give the date of that pamphlet?

Mr. GARDINER: It was in 1919.

Mr. ROSS: A long time ago.

Mr. GARDINER: Our methods of farming, I am sure the leader of the opposition will agree, are fairly consistent.

Mr. ROWE: There were not as many starving men as now. And were bonuses paid then?

Mr. GARDINER: I will give another statement by the leader of the opposition in 1916, three years further back. This statement was made when he was professor of field husbandry in the university of Saskatchewan. He said then in an article headed:

The Saskatchewan crop growers' plans in war time.

To those of us who are not in khaki but who are nevertheless anxious to do their share in bringing victory to the allies' cause the question of modifying our farm practices to meet the needs of the present crisis is one that deserves our most serious consideration.

The call has come to the Canadian farmer to increase his production because, in this way, he can be of very material service to the empire.

No one doubts the favourable effect a large crop will have on our staying powers in this war. The question is, can we get the larger crop?

Of the 10,500,000 odd acres that were cropped this year very little has received any preparation for next year's crop. Under ordinary circumstances at least 3,500,000 acres of this land should be fallowed.

It will be noted that figure is very close to the figure stated by the leader of the opposition yesterday, being the government's idea of the proportion of the land which should be summerfallowed. But now that he speaks as leader of the opposition he thinks that figure should be lowered. He went on in 1916 to ask:

Under these conditions what is to be done?

Here you had conditions where the correct thing was to summerfallow 3,500,000 out of 10,500,000 acres. Here you had a situation where the British government was appealing for more food in order that they might prosecute the war to a successful conclusion; and remember, that at that time we were assisting in feeding France, assisting in feeding part of Belgium and assisting in feeding some other countries to which we then had access but to which we had not access in this last war. He went on to say:

Under these conditions what is to be done? Shall we sow ill-prepared land and take a chance, as, fortunately, many of us did in 1915, or shall we sow only the land that can be well prepared? In other words shall we, having made a fortunate stroke, take another turn at the wheel, or shall we play safe? There can be no doubt that the latter is the better plan, not only for the nation but also for the individual.

The empire's needs must receive first consideration from the farmer as well as from the soldier. But poor farm practice will not result in satisfying the empire's needs. If we expect that the war will be concluded within from twelve to twenty months, the most patriotic among us may be led to sow all or nearly all of our land, including a portion or all of what should be fallowed. We would serve an immediate need at the expense of the future. We would take chances on our 1916 crop and run an even greater risk with the crop of the following year.

Without a reasonable amount of fallowed land in 1916, what would be our contribution to the empire's needs in 1917, providing the war continues two years or more? Where would the individual be financially? It is conceivable that the 1917 crop might be a failure. It is not only conceivable, but it is quite probable that it would be a small one—small in direct proportion to the absence of fallowed land.

That is sound policy, sound advice. It is just as sound in the year 1946 as it was in the year 1916, in fact, more so, because the land of western Canada to-day is thirty years older in cultivation than it was away back in 1916. We are in a position to-day where I believe the proper policy to follow is the policy that was indicated by the leader of the opposition during the period of the last war when similar demands were being made upon us as are being made now. They are demands for production over more than one year. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the people of western Canada did not take the advice of the professor of the university of Saskatchewan and, as he suggests, they may not take the advice of this government now. The reason why the farmers of Saskatchewan did not take the advice of the then adviser to farmers in western Canada as to how to farm properly was that a great many other people, not too responsible to anyone, were making statements contrary to the advice given by the most experienced agriculturists in the public service that we had in western Canada at that time. As a result, our acreages in wheat were increased, and the result was that following

the war we had in western Canada a condition of which western Canada has been trying to avoid a repetition.

With those statements before us I should like now to deal with the situation that exists. The leader of the opposition in his speech yesterday said:

> To-day in western Canada nearly one-third, thirty per cent, of the cultivated land devoted to the growing of cereal crops lies fallow each year, producing nothing. Prior to 1941 the normal amount lying fallow for that purpose was about twenty-five per cent. We have increased the percentage of fallow land lying barren every year since we started paying people not to grow wheat.

My hon. friend across the way asked me a few moments ago if I would still be in favour of paying people not to grow wheat. I will answer that question as well as the suggestion. Prior to 1941—

Mr. ROSS (Souris): If the minister will permit a question, does he believe that under the present system of agriculture in western Canada that the bare fallow is the best system? Is it in keeping with the more recent advice of the professor of farm management in the Saskatchewan university? The whole picture has changed in the last few years.

Mr. GARDINER: I will still abide by the opinion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition which I quoted a few moments ago. The leader of the opposition did suggest in his speech yesterday that we return to the acreage of the period preceding the war. Let us see what the results were of having those acreages preceding the war and what the results have been of following the policy which the government has followed, namely. of encouraging people to go to a very much higher level in summer-fallowing for a period, then returning to a level which is considerably lower than that proposed by the leader of the opposition yesterday. He suggested yesterday that we might put another four million or five million acres of land into wheat this year without exceeding the crop acreage which we had in the years up to 1940. That is perfectly true. We had in the neighbourhood of 29 million acres of land in wheat in 1940; in the year preceding that, 27 million acres, and in the years immediately preceding that, the acreage were higher than the proposed acreage for this year.

What results did we obtain during that period of time? The results we obtained were reported to the December conference and I quote from the report. The average yield of wheat in the years from 1935 to 1939 was 312 million bushels. What was the result in the years following 1940 down to 1944, during the period when we were paying people to take land out of wheat and put it into summer-fallow and thus prepare their land better, as suggested by the professor of husbandry in Saskatchewan in earlier years, which advice the farmers have tried to follow under our leadership since 1940. The result was this. The average crop from 1935 to 1939 was 312 million bushels, and the average from 1940 to 1944 was 426 million bushels. Just as stated in the article by the leader of the opposition, it is possible to grow more wheat on less land if you properly summer-fallow the land. So it has proven that from 1940 to 1944, with an average of 426 million bushels a year, more wheat was produced than in the period to the practices of which he wishes us to return, when only an average of 312 million bushels was produced.

Mr. ROWE: Does rain have effect on that?

Mr. GARDINER: It has about as much effect on that as moisture has on my hon. friend.

Mr. TOWNLEY-SMITH: Were those years fairly comparable? That is to say, was the rainfall just the same in the latter years as in the former?

Mr. GARDINER: I suppose no two years are comparable. One can say this, that it would be improper to suggest that any one thing had everything to do with the increase or decrease in production. It has been argued on the floor of the house and outside that summer-fallowing is not a proper policy to follow under present conditions, and I am suggesting that we did follow that policy of greatly increasing summer-fallow and we got the best results we have had in the whole history of Saskatchewan. In 1944-45 the one year between then and now, we had 436 million bushels.

In oats, from 1935 to 1939 we had 338 million bushels, and the average from 1940 to 1944 was 464 million bushels, while for the year 1944-45 it was 500 million bushels. In barley the average from 1935 to 1939 was 89 million bushels.

Mr. BRACKEN: Would the minister mind repeating those figures for oats?

Mr. GARDINER: For oats, it was 338 million bushels in the first group of years, the average for the five-year period from 1935 to 1939 inclusive, and from 1940 to 1944 inclusive it was 464 million bushels, while production for 1944-45 was 500 million bushels. In barley, for the first period the production was 89 million bushels; for the second period, 177 million bushels, and for the year 1944-45

it was 195 million bushels. If we had had the increase only in grain production it could be argued that by that policy you do not get more food than by following the other policy, and therefore it might still be argued that we ought to go back to the same policy we followed from 1935 to 1939. But let us look at the figures.

In addition to these enormous amounts of grain, we had delivered to the market in the first period an average of 3,338,000 hogs and in the period from 1940 to 1944 we delivered 6,783,000 hogs, or more than double. In 1945 we delivered 5,900,000. Coming to cattle, the figure was 1,031,000 in the first period, 1,144,000 in the second period, and 1,720,000 in 1944. In eggs the production was 219,523,000 dozen in the first period, 287,447,000 dozen in the second period, and 395,019,000 dozen last year.

Let us now take dairy products. Let us take milk—the total milk production. There was an average of 15,282,097,000 pounds in the first period, 17,032,239,000 pounds in the second period, and 17,618,810,000 pounds in 1945. In creamery butter there were 254 million pounds in the first period, 289 million pounds in the second period, and 293 million pounds in the year 1944-45. In cheese we had 119,922,000 pounds in the first period, 168,650,000 pounds in the second period, and 184,451,829 pounds in the year 1944-45.

What I wish to call attention to is this. The government followed a certain line of policy in the first period. We did not ask the farmers to do anything in particular in the way of farming. We said, "We will try to market the products you produce, no matter what kind. We will try to do our best to take care of the surpluses you have in other directions." That was the same government that is in power now. If my hon. friend had suggested that we should have gone back to the preceding five years it would not have been the same government and the results in those preceding five years would not have been as good as from 1935 to 1939. Taking him at his word, he asked us to go back to the period in which this government was in power from 1935 to 1939, when we obtained the results I have indicated by following that policy. In 1940 we changed the policy, and I may say that when changing it I made a statement on the floor of the house which I believe hon. members will allow me to read now since it comes so close to giving almost to the bushel what has been produced that I feel like claiming some of the characteristics of a prophet in connection with it. I may say that there was no one on the opposition side of the house—and I am inclined to think there were not many on the government side—who agreed with me when I made this statement on my return from Britain in 1940. I will read it and hon. members will see what it sounds like now. I am reporting here what I had stated in Britain while I was there in October, 1940. On my return to this country in November I submitted a report in which I stated—

Mr. BRACKEN: What was that document?

Mr. GARDINER: This is *Hansard*. It is my speech, but it is taken out of *Hansard*.

Mr. BRACKEN: 1940?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, November. I said:

On the supply side, Canada could expect to produce on an average 380 million bushels of wheat a year.

She has produced around 426 million recently.

That is her average for the last fourteen years and more than her average for the last five years, including the last two crops. Her total production in five years thus would amount to 1,900 million bushels. To this should be added the 280 million bushels carried over into 1940-41 from previous years, making a total quantity of 2,180 million bushels, which it would be necessary for Canada to dispose of in the five-year period.

That was in November, 1940. We are now in the spring of 1946, or just a little beyond the end of that five-year period.

It appeared, therefore, according to the above figures that Canada would have 2,180 million bushels of wheat to sell in the five-year period, and that during the same period she probably would be able to market 2,080 million bushels of wheat, leaving a carry-over at the end of that time of only 100 million bushels.

It must be recalled that we had 280 million bushels of a carryover at the beginning of that crop year, and that we were on the upgrade in production. Most people did not believe that it was possible that we would be down to 100 million bushels of wheat by the end of the five-year period if the greater part of that period was taken up with war; but the statement was made, and I continued:

Moreover, if Canada continued to be able to sell 30 million bushels a year to those countries outside Europe—

And we can do that at the present time.

—which were not being blockaded, instead of there being a surplus of 100 million bushels at the end of the five-year period the demand for Canadian wheat would be 50 millions bushels greater than the supply.

Well, that is just about where we are. I went on to say:

I do not consider, therefore, that Canadian wheat producers need be pessimistic, but may I

say again that there is nothing in these figures which should induce Canadian wheat growers to increase their acreage this year.

That was in 1941.

As a matter of fact there is very much in them upon which to ask farmers at least to go back to the acreage they had in the year previous to last year which was two million acres lower than the land sowed to grain last year.

The leader of the opposition suggested yesterday that the farmers are not prepared to accept the advice of the present government and went on to say that it was really the $4 an acre which induced them to reduce their wheat acreage and increase their summerfallow land. I do not care much which way he prefers to give the credit. Whichever way he gives the credit it comes to the government. The government offered the policy of paying $4 an acre to get land taken out of wheat and put into summerfallow. The farmer accepted the advice, and he not only took two million acres out of wheat as we suggested on this occasion, but took over six million acres out of wheat in 1941 and put a very great part of the land into summerfallow. Then in the following year, with the greatest acreage of summerfallow we have ever had in western Canada, 23 million acres or more, the farmers of western Canada reaped a crop of 560 million bushels of wheat, 500 million bushels of oats and between two and three hundred million bushels of barley. As a matter of fact the greatest crop that they have ever grown in western Canada.

That, Mr. Speaker, should be sufficient reason for believing that the wheat policy my hon. friend advocated back in 1916 was right, the policy advocated again in 1919 was just as right, and the only reason he is wrong now is that he is speaking politically instead of as an agriculturist.

Mr. BRACKEN: Is the minister speaking about the 1942 crop?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, which I think everyone admits is the best crop we have ever grown and is the year in which we had the largest acreage of summerfallow in wheat that we have ever had. That is the position which has been proven sound by the facts throughout the years in connection with agriculture on the western plains.

I submit again that I prefer to suggest to the farmers of western Canada that they accept the government's policy in connection with acreage in western Canada at the present time rather than the politically considered policy of the leader of the opposition.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

The policy which was suggested by the government is one which requires a little investigation because of the remarks made by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party (Mr. Coldwell). In speaking to the address and in moving the amendment to the amendment which, incidentally expresses not only lack of confidence in the government but lack of confidence in the policy of the opposition because it wipes out the amendment completely, the leader of the C.C.F. party suggested that we should be planning. I submit to him that the policy to which I have already referred indicates that there has been some planning. That planning began prior to the war. The policy underlying the planning was given expression to in 1940. I submit that it was well outlined and that farmers have followed it almost to the letter in acreage from year to year, and they have got almost the identical results which we indicated they would obtain at that time if they followed that policy.

I quite agree that we ought to have planning, but I suggest to the leader of the C.C.F. party that when planning has been adopted as a part of the policy of the government, when it has been put into effect and has had the kind of results which planning during the last six years has had, the least that members of the opposition can do is to admit that there has been some success reached as a result of that planning.

In the first period from 1939 to 1943 we were following a certain line of policy which was suggested to us by the British who were expecting to obtain food from this country It had been suggested to us then that the facts were as they were stated in this house in other language by the leader of the opposition yesterday, namely, that it takes five to eight pounds of grain to produce a pound of meat, and that a pound of grain will keep an individual who is threatened with starvation alive as long as a pound of meat. Therefore the proper thing for them to do when threatened by blockade which might bring starvation is to produce cereals. The appeal made to us was that during the period when they were putting six million acres of land into cereals we might take land out of cereals and put the emphasis upon the production of meat. Therefore we took about ten million acres out of the production of cereals for human consumption and put it into summerfallow and those coarse grains and grasses that were necessary for the production of live stock products. What is the result? We reduced our wheat acreage from some twenty-nine million acres to under seventeen million acres, and we increased our

production of live stock and live-stock products as well as grain in the amounts that have been suggested in the figures that I have given to this house.

That policy was carried on until the fall of 1943. Then a change was made. That change was announced in the setting of a price for grain very much higher than that which prevailed prior to the fall of 1943. The floor price of wheat was raised from ninety cents to $1.25. The price of oats was subsidized at ten cents a bushel; the price of barley was subsidized at fifteen cents a bushel, with the result that we had criticism from almost every hon. member on the other side of the house. They said that our hog production was bound to go down. Well, like my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) who spoke a few moments ago, I can say that there are times when you have the facts and cannot give them to the house. There are times when you have the facts and cannot give them to the people of Canada or to the people of any particular country. We were still at war in 1943. In and following 1943 we had ministers coming here from Britain telling us that in the first and probably the second year after the war there would be greater difficulty in feeding the British people than there had been in the most difficult years of the war. They said the reason for that would be twofold; that they would be required to feed people on the continent of Europe, and that it would not be possible for them to retain in the British isles all the food their people would require unless they could get much greater production of the foods necessary to stave off starvation than they would be able to obtain under the policies followed up to that time.

As I say, in 1943 we were still at war. The further suggestion was made that the allies would be required to feed the people of the western portion of Europe, including most of the industrial areas; that the food for those sections must come largely from the continent of North America. So in 1943 we changed our attitude in the matter of production. We did not go to the conferences at that time and say, "Don't increase your wheat acreage any further." We went and offered a higher price for grain. I personally addressed twenty-five meetings in western Canada. I said, "We have been appealing to you to produce meat supplies. We are now coming to you and saying this. You can sell all the meat supplies you desire to produce between now and the end of the war and for a year or two after, at a price comparable with the price you are getting now." At the same time, however, I said, "We are giving you a price for grain which compares favourably with the price you are receiving for live stock products, and for the time being we are prepared to leave which you produce to the judgment of the farmers." We suggested that they might decide it on this basis. If a man had to have cash immediately he had better stay in live stock production. If he could afford to hold his grain for two or three years or more, then we had no objection to his going into the production of wheat.

Under that policy what happened? In two years—and the greater part of it in one year—the farmers increased their wheat acreage by over six million acres; they went back into the production of wheat to that extent. What I wish to point out to the house is that we did not wait until the end of the war; we did not wait until everyone over in Europe was shouting for more food, before we changed our policy from one of encouraging the intensive production of meat and dairy products to one of increasing the production of wheat. We started that policy in 1943, and as a result we were the one nation in the whole world to which all the other countries were coming to plead for some of the wheat we had conserved during the preceding war years. Why, at the beginning of this year we had still in our elevators some 258,000,000 bushels of wheat. In spite of the fact that we had a light crop last year because of difficult weather conditions, there is more wheat to market in 1946 than we marketed in any single year in the history of this country, prior to the last few years, since 1928. As a result, this year we are marketing to the people of the world an average of about a million bushels of wheat for each of the 365 days of the year. Of that wheat about 160,000,000 to 180,000,000 bushels are requested to feed the British people. Most of the remainder is going to those countries of Europe that are crying for more food.

I repeat that the plans which were laid down in 1940 and carried through in 1941, 1942 and 1943 resulted in the highest production of meat products and live stock products generally that we have ever had; and, in the last few years, have resulted in the highest production of cereals, including wheat for human consumption and cereals for the feeding of live stock. As a result the highest production of live stock itself that we have ever seen in the whole history of this country was produced in one year, 1944.

What is the situation, Mr. Speaker? In most of the last six years we have produced almost forty per cent more food, in tonnage,

from the lands of Canada, than we have produced in any previous six-year period during the whole history of this country. In western Canada we have produced more than in any other six years. This is the land which in 1936 and 1937 I defended in this house against speakers on the opposition side who were saying we ought to move the population off it, that we could never again make this land produce as it had produced previously. In spite of all that was said during the drought period, however, in the last six years we have produced more tonnage on that land than was produced from it in any other six-year period.

What bearing has that upon the question which is before us tonight? All the exports of food products from the Dominion of Canada now have their origin directly or indirectly in that section of the country which a few years ago we were calling the drought area. All the wheat that goes out of this country comes from there. The greater part of the grain produced in other sections of the country, as, for example, Manitoba, would be consumed in this country in feed, in seed for the next year's crop, or in food for human consumption. The greater part of the wheat we have for export comes out of the area sometimes spoken of as the Palliser triangle. When we do not have a crop in that area we have very little wheat to export. When we have a crop in that area we have large quantities of wheat to export.

The same thing applies to live stock products in this country. If we produced no live stock other than what could be fed with feed grown on the farms of eastern Canada we would not produce enough live stock in this country to feed our own population. Out west we have lands on which we cannot carry live stock in any great numbers, but where we can produce grain to advantage. When we have good rains or when we summerfallow the land properly, we get a reasonable production in that area. It is almost exactly as the leader of the opposition said in his article back in 1919. If you summerfallow it you get thirty bushels to the acre. If you do not summerfallow it you get sixteen bushels to the acre. If you try to grow wheat on new breaking you will not get anything at all. That is correct; that is the experience we have had and are still having.

So we say that under this policy we not only increased our production of grain but also increased our production of live stock, not only in the area itself but by shipping the surplus feed grain to eastern Canada. We have paid the freight from Fort William to all over the east; we have given it to the eastern farmers under a ceiling price, and have asked them to feed it to live stock. Under that policy we produced more live stock and more cereals in Canada, I believe, than could have been produced under any other policy that might have been conceived.

Before closing, I wish to say a word about the wheat policy, as such. This is a matter which concerns my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) more directly than it concerns me. He has suggested, however, that I say something about it tonight, and I shall do so.

Our wheat policy has been criticized during this session. Our wheat policy has been criticized during other sessions. I have dealt with it in relation to the production of live stock products, and I think I have demonstrated that in the policy we are following we have produced the greatest possible volume of food.

I do not know whether the leader of the C.C.F. party had in mind this telegram when he spoke yesterday.

Mr. COLDWELL: I have never seen it.

Mr. GARDINER: Then I shall read it, so that my hon. friend will have full advantage of the information it contains. This telegram, under date of March 13, was addressed to me by the minister of agriculture of Saskatchewan. This is what it says:

Hon. J. G. Gardiner, Ottawa, Ont.

Note meeting Combined Food Board Washington fourteenth. Growing pressure here for all out food production to meet world needs. We suggest each farmer produce to maximum consistent with good farm practice. Your reaction to above suggestion appreciated.

I. C. Nollett, Minister of Agriculture.

Well, I gave him my reactions, and I should like to put them upon *Hansard*. They are contained in my telegram of March 13, 1946, as follows:

Hon. I. C. Nollett, Minister of Agriculture, Regina, Sask.

Re tel Dominion Department of Agriculture acting on advice from the dominion-provincial conference has been advising farmers across Canada each December since 1939 how to produce to maximum consistent with good farm practice. Following this plan we encouraged increased live stock production until 1944. In Sept. 1943 we began encouraging wheat production by increasing advance from ninety cents to a dollar twenty-five a bushel. This was done in anticipation of the present situation and was so stated at the time. We have continued in this policy in spite of criticism of reduced hog production until wheat acreage has increased by seven million acres. We are now considering three to five year agreements with Britain which necessitate production of other farm commodi-

ties as well as wheat. We consider that following the recommendations of last December will result in maximum production consistent with good farm practice.

James G. Gardiner.

In other words, we have said that we believe that the farmer will get the maximum of production not only this year, but for the three or four years with which we are concerned tonight, and not only of wheat but of all essential food products.

Mr. COLDWELL: Since I have heard the telegrams may I say I have not seen either of them.

Mr. GARDINER: It is so nearly what my hon. friend was trying to say this afternoon that I thought probably he did see it.

Mr. COLDWELL: I said it; I was not "trying" to say it.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, you said it.

Mr. BRACKEN: Would the minister let me have a copy of that telegram.

Mr. GARDINER: It will be in *Hansard* tomorrow. I have not an extra copy.

Mr. BRACKEN: I should like to have it tonight.

Mr. GARDINER: Then my hon. friend may have this copy when I have finished with it.

The position, then, is this, that we believe this country has done all that has been expected of it; indeed, something more than has been expected of it. As the Prime Minister said yesterday, we have had very kind messages from Great Britain. We have had very kind expressions of opinion from France. We have had very kind expressions of opinion from most of the countries. As a matter of fact, Holland and Belgium have released, for France, some of the grain they were getting from this country, because they believe that they were supplied with more than they actually needed. That was done in order to assist France.

In other words, we believe that, up to date, we have followed a right policy in asking our people to produce wheat from greater acreages during the last two years than previously. But we believe, too, that to go any farther in the matter of taking land out of summerfallow, in order that we might put more land into wheat, would be a mistake. Let me indicate why I think that. We are asking the farmers this year to put in approximately 24 million acres of wheat. This means that they must put in five million acres more than we have in summerfallowed land. In other words, they must put in all the summerfallow of last year amounting to 19,300,000 acres; and then they must put in another five million acres which have not been summerfallowed. That is land which had a crop on it last year.

Land cropped last year can be cropped again this year in certain areas. It can be done in Manitoba. It can be done in the northern part of Saskatchewan and in certain areas of Alberta. But I am sure hon. members from western Canada will agree that in our areas where we have strip farming, and in areas where we are carrying out dry farming, such a practice is neither advisable nor can it be carried out under the plan which is followed there. They summerfallow half their land—not a third, not a quarter, but half of it. Under the plan which they follow it would be impossible for them to change satisfactorily, even it it would give better results in 1946.

But I think we are all agreed that in areas of that kind better results would not be obtained. So what we are suggesting is that in certain areas they put five million acres of land, or approximately that, into wheat crop which was not summerfallowed last year. And then we say, "Try to summerfallow this year about twenty million acres, or an area similar to what you summerfallowed last year." We believe that if they do that we shall get the best results, not only in the production of cereals but in the production of live stock products; and that we shall get those results not only in western Canada, but in the eastern part of Canada as well, and not only in 1946 but throughout the three or four years referred to in the speech from the throne.

I wish to repeat what I said this afternoon, namely, that there is no intention on the part of this government, nor is there any intention on the part of the British government to ask farmers to take a lower return for these farm products including wheat at any time during the years 1946, 1947 and 1948 than they are getting by way of price to-day.

I would suggest that there is a possibility of agreements being concluded within the next two or three days in which the return by way of price—I do not necessarily mean the return by every means—will probably be higher than it has been in any of the years of war.

With that information in hand I hope the farmers of this country will follow the advice given by the dominion-provincial conference which met last fall, with all the information I have given the house before them, and produce, as we believe they can under that policy, the greatest quantity of food products it is possible to produce on the farms of Canada.

Mr. J. W. BURTON (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, for a number of reasons I will not follow the suggestion that has been made that at this late hour I should ask your permission to move the adjournment of the debate. One of those reasons is that I believe we should make use of all the time we possibly can to facilitate the business of the house. The suggestion has been thrown out in previous sessions as well as in this one that the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne should be curtailed, although the leaders and a number of front-benchers would be able to take part in it. I am absolutely opposed to any idea like that. I believe in the time-honoured custom of having the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne and the budget debate provide opportunities to back-benchers to bring to the attention of parliament and the people as a whole the problems of their constituencies and those in whom they are interested.

Rather than have these two important debates curtailed, I would make the suggestion that instead of their being curtailed we could well convene earlier in the day in view of the fact that no committees are as yet sitting. Also the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne could be carried on without us all being here. To ask us later on to sit morning, noon and night when we must attend committee meetings, to ask us to rush business through in the last hours of the session is something that I have always opposed.

If I may be so bold, I should like to offer my congratulations to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) upon the speech he has just made. Regardless of whether a person agrees with him, I think he is always interesting to listen to. While his speech always sounds good when you are sitting here, when you read it next morning in *Hansard* you begin to wonder just what it was all about. Then, when you get out into the country and hear different versions of it you begin to wonder which speech the minister gave.

While I agree with some of the things stated by the minister; while I agree that at certain times and under certain conditions summer-fallowing is good husbandry, I must say that under the circumstances such as those in which we now find ourselves, as my hon. leader, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), said yesterday, we need to take some risks.

I may deal with some of these matters later on, but while there is yet time this evening I should like to deal with one part of the minister's address. With his usual ability to defend his policies of years gone by he took a considerable amount of credit to himself and to the government for that wonderful crop that we raised during the year to which he referred. Far be it from me to take away from him any little bit of credit he has coming to him; I am still old-fashioned enough to want to give to the Lord a little credit for having sent us the most wonderful weather we have had for many a long year.

May I on this occasion join with those who have preceded me in congratulating the hon. member who moved the address in reply (Mr. Viau) and the hon. member who seconded it (Mr. Winters). Both of them did credit to themselves and to the constituencies they represent by performing such a difficult task in such an able manner, especially in view of the fact that the subject material, the speech from the throne, gave them very little to work on. In my humble opinion it would have been much more appropriate and to the point to move an address congratulating His Excellency upon the high sense of duty which caused him to read a speech that displayed such a bankruptcy of ideas on the part of his ministers.

It has been my privilege to listen to quite a number of speeches of one kind and another from the throne, but never before have I heard one that displayed such callous indifference to the needs of the people, that showed such a lack of proposals to solve their problems. The greater part of the speech should be rewritten because as it is it is meaningless; it suggests nothing; it departs from the time-honoured custom of forecasting legislation. The remainder of it should be framed as the farewell message of His Excellency.

During the six years of war many members on this side of the house refrained from severe criticism of the government. Possibly we erred on the side of leniency, but we did not want to do anything that might possibly interfere with the war effort. Many times suggestions made in good faith were disregarded. During the session of last fall I for one took the stand that on the basis of certain promises the electors of this country, may I say for better or worse, had returned the government to office and therefore the government should be given an opportunity to wind up the business that had been left unfinished at the time of dissolution and to prepare their plans to fulfil their promises. But look at the speech from the throne, as barren as the minds that conceived it.

For my part the truce is over; the gloves are off. I would be unworthy of the trust placed in me by the great majority of the

people I have the honour to represent were I to remain silent any longer. When I think of those who died so that the rest of us could continue to live our way of life; when I think of those who were fortunate enough to return, and when I think of the hard work and the suffering and the sacrifices made by the vast majority of them, I would be neglectful of my duty if I did not protest against the inadequacy of the government's methods of dealing with our many problems, especially in view of the fact that during the past year and more we have been urging the government to prepare for the needs of peace. But the government has been so deaf to our warnings, so determined to follow its own course, which apparently was the line of least resistance, that it now finds itself unprepared to meet the problems which confront us and which have confronted us during the past six months or more. Those problems are becoming worse at an alarming rate. Thousands of our people are drifting back to the conditions which they had to endure during the 1930's.

The capitalist system—

Mr. MacNICOL: Do not blame the capitalist system. Blame it on the government.

Mr. BURTON: The capitalist system of so-called free enterprise failed the people before the war; it failed the nation during the time of war, and it will inevitably bring disaster to the people and to the nation unless we hasten to replace it before it breaks down completely with a system of social democracy which will give us economic democracy as well as political democracy, a system that will serve the needs of the people and the nation instead of the whims and insatiable desires of the few.

I pause for a moment to refer to something which the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), the leader of the Social Credit party said this afternoon. He is reported in the *Evening Citizen* to have said, and it is headlined "Social Credit or Communism is His Thesis":

> **There is no other alternative for the future;** it is social credit or communism.

I am convinced that there is a middle way between those two. He went on to say:

> From now on capitalism and free enterprise must compete with communism.

I am also informed that he said that Christian democracy was synonymous with free enterprise, and if I am misquoting him I hope he will correct me. May I point out to him that there are many Christians who believe that private enterprise should not be allowed to dominate and exploit the people.

Mr. LOW: Hear, hear; I believe that.

Mr. BURTON: I could give him quotations from leaders of many religious denominations along that very line, but I shall give only one with which I am familiar:

> It is rightfully contended that certain forms of property must be reserved to the state since they carry with them the opportunity for domination too great to be left in the hands of private individuals without injury to the community at large.

Mr. IRVINE: Who said that?

Mr. BURTON: His holiness the late Pope Pius XI in Quadragesimo Anno. I draw attention to that, Mr. Speaker, because there are so many abuses and terrible things committed under the capitalistic system that those of us who know what is going on cannot as Christians continue to tolerate those conditions and the things that brought them about. I have always been anxious to give every hon. gentleman a chance to stand for the things in which he believed, but I contend that when we have conditions as grave as we have had for years under the capitalist system, when we have the suffering and the privation and the want that we have had, surely those who are trying to find a better way, a middle way, should not always be sniped at. I have said that the capitalist system has failed us in the past. Do I need to bring any proof of that? If so, I call on the million or more of those who were on relief in this country in the so-called hungry thirties. I call on those who were in the soup-kitchen lines. I call on those who were dispossessed of their life savings, and on those who were dispossessed of their homes. Do I need to bring any more proof? Then I would remind the house of the 42 per cent of our young men who in the early days of the war were rejected for military service because of physical disabilities most of which were brought on by malnutrition during those depression years.

On motion of Mr. Burton the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, March 20, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

WHEAT

INITIAL PAYMENT, 1946-47 PROGRAMME—PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with wheat.

The government will continue the present initial payment of $1.25 per bushel basis No. 1 northern in store Fort William-Port Arthur or Vancouver for another crop year up to July 31, 1947. There will be no over-all restriction on the deliveries of wheat during 1946-47, although temporary delivery quotas will probably be used in the early part of the marketing season to distribute local elevator space as evenly as possible among the producers. Delivery permit books will be used again.

Discussions are continuing with regard to other items in the 1946-47 grain programme, and further announcements will be made as decisions are reached. These announcements will include the prices to be paid for oats, barley, flaxseed, rapeseed and sunflower seed in the western provinces and for winter wheat grown in Ontario and marketed in 1946-47.

To cover one of the points in the new food programme, a statement will also be made soon on the procedure to be followed in an effort to expedite the delivery of wheat in western Canada. This will be along the lines of encouraging immediate delivery of wheat.

The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. McCuaig) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) have advised me that they purpose asking questions today with regard to the payments on the participation certificates for the 1943-44 wheat crop. I have this statement ready and I am taking advantage of this opportunity to make it. I believe it will at least cover, as far as I am able to do so at this moment, the information sought by these hon. members.

The payments on the participation certificates for the 1943-44 wheat crop will be started by the Canadian wheat board in June of this year. The 1944-45 barley equalization payments will be made in the month of May. Both of these payments apply to the prairie provinces. The payments on the 1944-45 Ontario wheat equalization fund will begin in May.

While the accounting and auditing on these payments are well advanced, it is not possible at this date to announce the amount of each payment to be made. That announcement will be made just as soon as possible.

May I also take this opportunity to state that I am fully aware of the anxiety existing, particularly in certain parts of western Canada, for the earliest possible payment of these wheat participation certificates. The hon. member for Maple Creek asked if it would not be possible to select the most needy areas in western Canada for prepayment. We have discussed that suggestion with the wheat board, and have been advised that it is not possible to make payments in one district in advance of the general payment across western Canada, but that when payments are being made in June it will be possible to make the first cheques payable in those particular districts. The matter of getting out these payments is purely a physical one, a matter of staff and space.

Mr. BRACKEN: The question I sent the minister a while ago was prompted by the urgent requests of those interested in the matter. I gather from the minister that the dates he has mentioned are the earliest at which it is practicable to have the payments made. In that event I suppose we shall have to accept the situation, and I want to thank the minister for giving us this information.

VETERANS LAND ACT

PRIORITIES AND DISCOUNTS FOR FARM MACHINERY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs): Yesterday the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. McCullough) asked a question of the Minister of Veterans Affairs, as follows:

> In view of the urgency of increasing agricultural production and of the early and satisfactory reestablishment of veterans on farms, would the minister give immediate consideration to allowing veterans not coming under the Veterans Land Act, but who wish to become bona fide farmers, the same priorities and discounts for farm machinery as those who now come under the Veterans Land Act?

The Minister of Veterans Affairs has no control of farm machinery which is not purchased for the use of veterans being established under the Veterans Land Act. In the early months of 1945 arrangements were put into effect whereby a certificate of identification was provided by the Veterans Land Act administration to establish the agricultural bona fides and service with the armed forces of persons not being established under the provisions of the Veterans Land Act. The farm implement industry undertook to give preferred treatment to veterans in possession of such certificates. According to my information this undertaking has been implemented as far as available supplies and farming machinery would permit.

Discounts available to veterans being established under the Veterans Land Act derive from bulk orders placed by the director of the Veterans Land Act many months prior to delivery dates and are direct sales to the government.

Discounts to veterans not being established under the Veterans Land Act are solely at the discretion of the implement industry but it is the information of the director of the Veterans Land Act that many implement dealers have in fact granted discounts to veterans in possession of certificates issued by the Veterans Land Act administration.

According to present indications the farm tractor equipment ordered by the director for delivery in the spring of 1946 will be insufficient to meet requirements of veterans being established under the act this year. Consequently it is very unlikely that any such equipment can be released by the director for other disposition by the machinery companies.

MAPLE PRODUCTS

RATIONING AND PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. MAYHEW (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance): Yesterday the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser) asked if there was any chance of the government easing the rationing of maple syrup or maple products in order that production might be increased.

The answer is that there is no intention of removing maple syrup from the ration this season. This decision is supported by recommendations for the continuance of rationing and other controls which have been received from the representatives of the maple syrup producers and processors. As in previous years, the coupon value of maple syrup has been doubled for the duration of the active producing season; in other words, until May 31 maple syrup can be procured at the rate of one gallon for two sugar-preserves coupons. The ration regulations for 1946 will leave the producers and consumers in the same position as in 1945.

There is no indication that the ration regulations have curtailed or will curtail production.

CANADIAN ARMY

POLICY IN CONNECTION WITH WEARING OF KILTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. LESLIE A. MUTCH (Winnipeg South): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence; I did not have an opportunity to give him notice. Will the minister assure the Canadian people that it is not proposed to abolish the practice of the wearing of the kilt in the Canadian army?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question of urgent public importance. Personally I would very much regret it if the wearing of the kilt were to be abolished. The answer to my hon. friend's question is that the wearing of the kilt will continue to be autnorized for walking out purposes, but that, as in the other arms of the service, battle dress will be worn for operational duties.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

The house resumed from Tuesday, March 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fernand Viau for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. J. W. BURTON (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, at the adjournment last night I was referring to how badly the capitalist system had failed us in the years prior to the war, and to the fact that eventually it would break down completely and lead the people of the nation to inevitable disaster. I also stated that we did not have to go to the extreme right or to the extreme left, but that there was a middle way. Should there be any doubt in the minds of hon. members as to the path I intend to follow, let me hasten to assure them that I have always believed in moderation in all things. With that same thought in mind, thousands of people from all parts of Canada banded themselves together under the banner of the C.C.F., which they themselves wove. Together they planned and are continuing to plan that middle way, step by step. Their ultimate goal is the common brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

I also said there was no hope of the capitalist system serving us properly in the future. Apparently, by its attitude, the government does not believe that. Again I could bring many witnesses to prove my case. However, time permits only the calling of one, and that, by the way is a friend of the government. I should like to quote from a pamphlet issued by the Canadian federation of agriculture, entitled "Principles of post-war reconstruction for agriculture" in which they quote Mr. Donald Gordon, chairman of the wartime prices and trade board, as having said:

> Selfish and private interests must be ruled out completely and the competitive system must be replaced with one which is based entirely upon the criterion of maximum production . . .

While I have this pamphlet in my hand I should like to continue and quote what the Canadian federation of agriculture had to say on the same page:

We do not believe that we can ever again rely on the automatic processes (of what was in the thirties erroneously termed a "free competitive" market) to establish fair economic returns and security for primary producers. Such automatic processes broke down hopelessly in the depression years, and are now almost completely discarded as incapable of the supreme test of wartime conditions.

And later on the federation has this to say:

Having failed us in these two periods it would in all probability be disastrous to risk the return to such automatic processes for the post-war period, which promises to be the third and not the least of a series of national emergencies.

During the first world war we heard the slogan repeated over and over, "Make Canada a fit place for heroes to live in." Well, Mr. Speaker, ask those who went under the old soldier settlement scheme. Ask those who stood in the soup kitchen lines. Ask those who lived in the jungles which formed the suburbs of almost every town and city from one end of Canada to the other.

What is in store for the veterans of this war? Well, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) may say that things are not yet as bad as they were after the other war. The speech from the throne had this to say:

Every effort is being made to ensure the orderly reestablishment of veterans in civil life.

To complete consideration of the "veterans charter" you will be asked to reconstitute the special committee on veterans affairs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, isn't that fine! At least it seems that way on paper. But I suggest to you that you ask the thousands of veterans who find it difficult, if not impossible, to become reestablished.

It had not been my intention to discuss veterans affairs in this debate. However, after reading that part of the speech from the throne I have just quoted, I could not help raising my voice on behalf of the veterans in my constituency, many of whom are not receiving a square deal.

Nor had it been my intention to deal with the housing problem. But here is another gem in the speech from the throne which I cannot pass by:

Special efforts are being made to expand the supply of building materials to meet the demand for permanent housing, and, meanwhile, to provide emergency shelter. The Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has been established. Its activities are being closely coordinated with those of Wartime Housing Limited and the Veterans Land Act administration, with a view to having all matters relating to the construction of housing brought, as largely as possible, under the administration of one minister of the crown.

[Mr. Burton.]

Under one minister!—well, Mr. Speaker, that minister may be quite an umbrella, but I am certain that many of our people would rather be under a roof.

I now find it my duty to discuss a problem which is so serious, and about which so little, if anything, has been done, that the government, despite all its twisting and turning, will not be able to avoid the condemnation it so fully deserves. Let me quote one sentence from the first paragraph in the speech from the throne:

Hunger, privation and suffering, have become the lot of millions.

During the war our government, in words to this effect, kept telling the British people, "Go to it, Tommy; keep on fighting and we will see that no one starves while your fields and factories are put to other uses." We in Canada live in a country which is not only the bread-basket of the empire but also its pork barrel. Furthermore, the government kept repeating to peoples of the European continent, "Throw off the yoke of Hitlerism, and we will feed you." It told the world, time after time, that food was the greatest weapon for peace, and that we had an abundance of it. But now they tell us that hunger, privation and suffering has become the lot of millions. That brings me to the reduction programme defended last night by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner).

Mr. GARDINER: I did not mention any reduction programme. I indicated there has been a programme for increased food production throughout the war and that programme is continuing.

Mr. BURTON: At the same time the minister went to great pains and attempted to take great credit for what he had done in the past. I would agree that he deserves some little credit, but would suggest that there are others who deserve a lot more.

In connection with the reduction programme I think I should tell a little story—and it is a true story. For years it had been my practice every spring to buy four cans of gopher poison to be distributed so as to prevent those rodents from destroying too much of my crop. This spring, when the announcement of the reduction programme was made, I had already secured my four cans. The customary procedure is to mix a spoonful of the poison with some wheat or oats, leaving it in places where the gophers may find and eat it. That is the end of the gophers and they do not destroy any further crop. I had laid out one can of the poison, after which for some reason or other I had to go to town. While in town I ran smack up against a

poster on which were these words, "Less wheat in 1941 will help win the war." This, it states, was published by the authority of the Hon. J. G. Gardiner, federal Minister of Agriculture. You know, when I returned home I simply did not have the heart to lay out those other three cans of gopher poison. For a while I rebelled at the idea of reduction; as a tiller of the soil it went against my grain to think that less of anything in the nature of food could be a blessing. Eventually however, like thousands of other farmers, I fell into line.

To-day, reading these words in the speech from the throne, that hunger, privation and suffering have become the lot of millions, the few dollars gained by reduction of wheat acreage remind me of the thirty pieces of silver. To the extent that I benefited from the minister's ill advice, just to that extent I accept my share of the responsibility. But may I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that for several years my colleagues and I endeavoured to warn the Minister of Agriculture, and the government to which he belongs, of the crisis that is now confronting us. If time permitted I could quote speeches made in the house—yes, even back to the time I sat in the Saskatchewan legislature. But our warnings went unheeded. From time to time the minister even attempted to ridicule us for our fears, and made light of our suggestions.

Let me quote further from the speech from the throne:

> Of world problems demanding immediate action, the most pressing is the provision of food to those peoples facing acute shortage and, in some regions, widespread famine.
>
> The chance of a peaceful reconstruction of the world depends on food. The shortage at the present time is very great. The problem, moreover, is not only for the next few months, but also for the next few years. Unless the need is met, grave disorders, endangering peace itself, must be anticipated.
>
> The government is seeking by all practicable means to make available for export the maximum supply of foodstuffs. Every encouragement is being given to increasing production. The gravity of the situation demands, on the part of the people of Canada, a united and whole-hearted effort.

Let me call special attention to that last sentence, and emphasize the necessity of a united and whole-hearted effort. I agree with that in full, and I can assure the government, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, and I believe on behalf of the great majority of the producers of foodstuffs, that there will be whole-hearted cooperation on their part.

The preceding paragraph in the speech from the throne states that every encouragement is being given to increasing production. That is so far from the truth that were I to repeat what most farmers have to say about it, my language would certainly not be parliamentary. Suffice it to say that instead of every encouragement being given to us to increase production, quite the contrary is the fact. So vital is this question that I should like to place on the record a resolution which was passed unanimously on the seventh of this month by the Saskatchewan legislature. It reads:

> That this legislative assembly of Saskatchewan pledge the support of the people of Saskatchewan to the hungry peoples of the world in the vital battle of bread now being fought, and request the governments of Saskatchewan and Canada, respectively, to make a special effort to increase production of foodstuffs to meet this emergency, and to encourage the utilization of the adequate farm labour supply now made available through demobilization of the armed forces, members of which are only too anxious to work in this new and important battle.

Furthermore I would add that the Saskatchewan minister of agriculture, Hon. I. C. Nollett and his department are going all out on an increased production programme. They believe in displaying some action, not just merely using words. The only action that counts at a time like this is to make it possible for the farmers to produce every pound of foodstuffs that their farms are capable of producing. Should there be any one so deaf to the cries of the hungry, permit me to read again these few lines:

> Of world problems demanding immediate action, the most pressing is the provision of food—

And again:

> Hunger, privation and suffering, have become the lot of millions.

The only worth-while action that can be taken to meet the situation is an all-out production programme, but if the farmers are to accomplish the task before them they must have more just and equitable treatment than they have had as a rule in the past. We realize also that if the farmers are to win this battle of food they must have the protection of a long-range programme. What do the farmers want in such a long-range programme? I have numbered their desires as follows, but not necessarily in order of preference.

1. An over-all agricultural policy that will give stability to the various branches of that industry in all parts of the country.

2. Adequate floor prices with a proper relationship between the different products they have to sell.

3. Prices for all farm products must bear a fair relationship between them and the cost of the things the farmers need to buy.

4. The right to negotiate from time to time, through their respective boards and organizations, the adjustment of prices for their commodities so that they will at all times receive a fair share of the national income.

To meet the needs of the present and to give to the farmers that sense of security and stability which they so urgently require, I suggest the following:

(a) The encouragement by the government of an all-out production programme to help raise the nutritional standard of the Canadian people and do our full share in helping to feed the people of Britain and war-ravaged countries in Europe.

(b) A dominion marketing act to establish commodity marketing boards under producer and consumer control, with power to regulate the assembling, transporting, grading and processing of live stock products, fruit, dairy products, poultry products, et cetera.

(c) Present ceiling prices plus any subsidies at present in effect to be the floor price on all farm products for the next ten year period, unless changing conditions warrant an increase or decrease after proper negotiations by the respective boards.

(d) Abolition of the Winnipeg grain exchange; the continuation of the Canadian wheat board, and the inclusion of coarse grains under the act.

(e) Amendment to the Income War Tax Act so that the farmer, his wife and children shall not be penalized for their long hours of toil.

(f) Prevention of regional discrimination such as the recent increase in the price of petroleum products in the west.

(g) Amendments to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act in order to make it a dominion-wide crop insurance act which will cover all types of agriculture.

(h) Extension of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act to all parts of Canada, with regional branches giving special attention to soil conservation.

I should like to deal with each of these points, but I see my time is going by. A number of my colleagues will deal at greater length with the different points I have laid down. I should like to refer, however, to the last one, the extension of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act to all parts of Canada, with regional branches giving special attention to soil conservation. In this connection I should like to quote what the president of the Canadian federation of agriculture had to say about soil conservation:

> Since the soil is the basis of all food production it is the greatest national asset we have. The security, not only of those who till the soil, but of all the people, depends upon how well it is cared for, and how widely it is used. Therefore, a programme of security for agriculture in the post-war years must, of necessity, include a long-range programme for soil conservation.
>
> Such a programme will be given its proper place in our national economy when it is generally recognized that money spent to save the soil should not be regarded as a subsidy to the farmer but as a national investment for present and future generations.

The problems of agriculture are of such importance that no time must be lost in solving them. The standard of living in this country depends upon the tiller of the soil. While that has been true in the past, never has so much depended on a proper solution of these problems. When hunger, privation and suffering have become the lot of millions, we realize that every effort must be made to remove the handicaps which prevent the farmers from properly fulfilling the mission of their noble calling, namely, the feeding of the human race. I have no hesitation in saying that the adoption of the proposals I have just made would be a big step forward in helping the farmers to take their proper place in our national economy. Too long have the farmers of this country been discriminated against. Too long have they been exploited. As never before they are determined to see to it that they receive a fair share of our national income, that they be allowed to take their right place in our national life.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I wish to join with previous speakers in expressing regret at the departure of Lord Athlone and the Princess Alice and to express my appreciation of the work that they did while here. As Minister of Munitions and Supply perhaps I saw a side of their activities that others may have overlooked. They were tireless visitors to war plants. I can say that walking through a war plant is a tiresome business. I have done it occasionally, but the governor general and his gracious consort visited almost every war plant in Canada at least once. Their visits invariably resulted in an inspiration both to the management and to the workers, and had a great deal to do with the pleasant relations that were maintained in the war plants of this country. I am sure every Canadian feels a sense of loss at their departure and we all wish them good health and happiness in the future.

I should like to say a word of congratulation to the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I was not in the house when their speeches were made but I have read them with great interest.

To-day I wish to speak particularly with regard to the remarks of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) to the effect that reconversion had bogged down and that the labour situation in Canada to-day is similar to that of the early 1930's. It has always been a mystery to me why members of the opposition feel that, in describing the present and future situation in this country, they must invariably picture both in a gloomy light. I have listened to speeches in this house predicting wide-spread unemployment, not only after the war, but during the war. I have never heard anyone express the hope and expectation that after the war we would have reasonable employment conditions in this country.

The first two or three years of the war were occupied by parliamentary committees sitting continuously devising public works in great numbers which could be put into construction immediately after the war to take up the inevitable unemployment that would come at that time. In 1943 I ventured to make a prediction of my own. Speaking before the Canadian club in Toronto I predicted that this vast accumulation of public works would not be needed. I pointed out that every returned man would not be a construction man. I pointed out that the expansion that was taking place in industry would find means of absorbing war workers and the returned men without excessive resort to public works. I was accused by a very large portion of the press of Canada of being a super-optimist. I was called an optimist at first, and then I was promoted to super-optimist. I never was as optimistic as the present position would justify.

I have recently made a trip to the Pacific coast, the first time I have been there in more than six years. I used to live in western Canada. I lived there, and practised my profession there, for some twenty-five years. I have lived in Saskatoon, Calgary, Vancouver, Regina and for many years in Port Arthur. I have seen western Canada in good times and in bad times, and I think I know what good times look like and what bad times look like in that country. But I have never seen western Canada in the state of prosperity in which it is to-day. I tried to meet in my travels a fair cross-section of each of the communities I visited, and I came away from western Canada convinced for the first time that perhaps our efforts toward reconstruction are meeting their objective.

There is a good deal of work in reconstruction that does not meet the eye. When V-E day came there was a cut-back of about thirty-five per cent in munitions production, so that we could have a more or less gradual change-over from war to peace production in certain of our manufacturing plants. But on V-J day there was a complete cut-off of all war contracts except in the few cases where examination indicated that there would be more salvage value by completing production than in cutting it off. Before a war plant can change over to a peace-time plant, many things must happen. The surplus inventories in the plant must be moved. An adjustment must be made on the contract. There must be a cut-off and an adjustment made of the amount due the contractor and proper means found of paying the contractor. Those adjustments relate to several thousand contracts and the work involved is tremendous. I worked fairly hard during the war years, but I never worked as hard in my life as I have in the period since V-J day, and I think that is true of the staff of my department.

The termination of the contracts is handled by the contracts settlement board. It has a large staff. That staff goes into each factory, makes a rough determination of the amount due, arranges for immediate payment for a portion of it so that the contractor can have funds to start his reconversion work, and then follows that up with auditors who make the final adjustment. In the course of that adjustment the profits that have been made by the operation are studied and, if the profits seem excessive, a renegotiation is undertaken. That may seem a minor operation, but I can say to hon. members that these renegotiations to date have resulted in a recovery to the crown of some $365,000,000, of which about thirty per cent represents money that would not have been recovered through taxation in the ordinary course.

The custody of surplus materials from war plants, as well as the custody of all war materials surplus to the requirements of the armed forces, is handled by War Assets Corporation. That corporation is responsible for movement of materials out of the plants, for holding custody of government-owned machinery and equipment, and for disposing of that equipment in a way that will make the maximum contribution to the cause of reconversion. About 4,000 men are now engaged in the custody of equipment, in moving equipment out of plants and arranging for storage, and in guarding the equipment pending its sale. The total staff of War Assets Corporation, including the custodian branch, now exceeds 5,000 men and women. That staff has been built up within a very short time. The task of War Assets Corporation really began shortly before V-J day and is growing in size as each day passes. To date

War Assets Corporation has sold goods which have netted the crown over $100,000,000, a recovery for account of war expenditures. The work is just getting well under way. Sales are stepping up each month. Last month they were $17,000,000 and this month they will considerably exceed that figure.

There has been some criticism of individual transactions of War Assets Corporation. I think that was bound to be the case. To find a civilian use for a product built for war is not simple. When we consider the vast diversity of materials that passed through War Assets Corporation I think no one will be inclined to be too critical of individual transactions if it can be shown that by and large the policies of the corporation are sound and that the work is being honestly conducted. The cost of storage and handling of the material that was removed from war plants is enormous. It is greatly to the advantage of the crown to get those assets into private hands and into private use as rapidly as possible, and the activities of the corporation are governed with that thought in mind.

Rather a significant thing has happened recently. The United States government has tried several methods of disposing of war assets. About three months ago they scrapped all their disposal procedures and set up the exact machinery which we are using in Canada, stating quite frankly that they did so because they thought our machinery worked where theirs did not. Therefore the disposal agency in the United States is now the War Assets Corporation, exactly the same name and exactly the same type of organization that we are using here in Canada.

We now come to the labour situation. We must, I think, look at the labour situation from the background of six years of war, when about fifty per cent of all those receiving an income in this country obtained their income directly or indirectly from war expenditures. On June 1, 1944, which marked the peak of the war programme, there were in the armed forces 784,000 persons, and in direct war industry, 1,055,000 persons, making a total of 1,839,000 persons who derived their income from war expenditures and whose occupation would end when the war ended. As I have said, between V-E day and V-J day there was a cut-back in war contracts, and about 300,000 men and women were returned to private industry. From V-J day to the end of February discharges from the armed forces have numbered 420,000, while the decrease in the numbers employed in non-agricultural war industry has amounted to approximately 500,000. In total, close to a million people have given up their war-time occupations since V-J day. Over the same period the number of unplaced applicants registered in employment offices has risen from a low of 75,000 to a maximum of 263,000 at the end of February, a net increase of 188,000. It is therefore apparent that close to 800,000 persons have found employment, or have voluntarily withdrawn themselves from the labour market. It was only in January and February that there was some increase in the number of unplaced applicants. These are the months in which there is normally a seasonal contraction in employment in Canada. Hon. members will know that there are great numbers of people in this country who have never made it a practice to work in the winter months. Those engaged in transportation along the St. Lawrence river and the great lakes have been accustomed to work in the season of open navigation and not to work seriously in the winter months. We all know that a great many people on the prairies have been accustomed to seek the cities or the climate of British Columbia during the winter months. In the old days that movement was automatic: these people did not expect to work and did not work, and that was all there was to it. Today, for many reasons, they register as unemployed. They must do that to obtain their unemployment insurance benefits. So that seasonal unemployment today is more conspicuous than it was before the war, but it is the same type of unemployment now as then.

Discharges from the armed services in these two months stood at 57,000 in January and 65,000 in February. During January the number of unemployed increased by 45,000, and during February by 30,000. With the turn in the seasonal trend of activity, an improvement in this condition has already become evident. As between the first and last week of February the weekly rate of increase in unemployed has dropped from 10,000 to 4,000. During the first week in March the number of unplaced applicants has actually shown a decline, although this does not necessarily mean that the high point in unemployment has been passed. It does mean, however, that we have come through the most difficult period of the year with fewer unemployed than we had anticipated or had any right to anticipate.

Mr. LOCKHART: Would the minister permit a question? I do not like to interrupt him.

Mr. HOWE: No, no.

Mr. LOCKHART: I would just like to ask him—

Mr. HOWE: The absorption of veterans and war workers has been facilitated by a steady process of reconversion. A survey of plants previously engaged in war production indicates as of March 1 that, of those faced with a reconversion problem, slightly over half had now completed the reconversion process. Of the remainder, fifty per cent expected the process to be complete in six months, and seventy-five per cent by the end of the year. Apart from reconversion work some forty-five per cent of the plants have completed or are undertaking modernization or expansion programmes. Of this group, only a small proportion—ten per cent—have already completed their programme, while around sixty per cent anticipate completion of their expansion work by the end of 1946. The foregoing would indicate that a very considerable volume of employment is still to come from reconversion and expansion which have not yet been completed.

There is, in addition, an impressive number of new establishments coming into operation to produce for the peace-time market. Numerous firms still report shortages of tools, equipment, materials and skilled labour as factors which are temporarily retarding production and employment. While increased employment in manufacturing can henceforth be anticipated with the continued progress of reconversion and the normal seasonal upswing, even greater proportional increases can be expected in construction, agriculture, transportation and some of the service trades. With the unprecedented demand for consumption and investment goods in Canada, together with the urgent food and material requirements of other countries, the number still to be discharged from the services—some 220,000 at March 1—should be readily absorbed, while steady reduction in the number unemployed can be anticipated once the spring and summer expansion gets fully under way.

So far as the present labour situation is concerned, if it is an unhealthy situation I do not think the people of this country are aware of it. Certainly in western Canada I saw no indications of unemployment; I was told that there were people unemployed; but I was told frequently that a large number of employers were short of men and unable to obtain the class of men that they required.

The shift of men back to peace-time employment is as difficult as was the mobilizing of man-power for war. Many of the skills used in war time are abolished. For example, we had over 100,000 people in aircraft production; today, I suppose, the employment in that industry numbers less than 10,000. To employ those men at equivalent wages means retraining. We are very short of men in the construction trades, and the training schools of the Department of Labour are devoting a great deal of attention to training men for that industry. A great retraining programme is going on, and only as that programme proceeds can we step up industries such as the construction industry, which has an unlimited field of activity and which must be expanded greatly to fulfil the requirements of the reconstruction period.

We have greatly expanded industrial production in Canada during the war years. The government itself spent $730 million in building new war plants during the war period. At the same time private industry spent $500 million in building plants of the same type for the same purpose. A great deal of fear was expressed that the end of the war would find empty factories. Nothing of the kind is occurring. Instead of its being said that wartime expansion is sufficient, industry is still continuing to expand.

In the fall of 1944 provision was made for the encouragement of further reconversion expansion by granting double depreciation to those who made capital expenditures of a type promising substantial industrial employment during the years 1945 and 1946. Those applications are filed for approval with the Department of Reconstruction. The result has been that to date about $270 million worth of industrial expansion has been filed for approval to be completed in the years 1945 and 1946. These projects are now under construction. The very much larger employment that will emerge when the plants are completed and in operation is before us.

For a time I was pleased with the rate of expansion. To-day I am rather alarmed by it. It seems to me that the expansion is coming too rapidly and that we shall face an insoluble problem of shortages of material as well as shortages of man-power when the programme now under way comes into full production.

The work of reconstruction is being helped in a number of ways through a number of agencies of the department. One of the most important is the agency of reconstruction councils. We have at least one council in each province. In two provinces we have two or three councils in each. It is the work of these councils to keep in touch with conditions in the provinces, to keep the department advised of requirements of materials and requirements of any kind. It is also the duty

of the councils to give every assistance to those engaged in reconstruction work in the province.

I found it very interesting to visit these councils and to discuss their problems. I was particularly impressed by one activity new to Canada, namely, the service being furnished in each province by the national research council. Attached to each of the reconstruction councils is a representative of the research branch. He is a first-class man, thoroughly familiar with the work of the research organization. He is available to discuss the problems of industry, whether from large industry or small, with anyone who wishes to discuss them. If he is unable to give the help immediately he refers the matter to headquarters. If it is a piece of research, that research is undertaken. If it is information that is in the library of the council that information is furnished. I may say that I think no government service of the kind is being taken advantage of more widely than this new service. It is a sort of introduction of Canadian industry to the national research council; it is also a contact between the council and industry which will be very helpful to both.

The success of our war programme was due largely to the work of the national research council, and we are all convinced that the council can continue to offer just as important help to industry in peace time.

Mr. PROBE: May I ask the minister a question at this time?

Mr. HOWE: I have only a short time; would the hon. member mind waiting for another occasion?

Some very interesting devices are coming out of the war. The application of war inventions is just emerging as a factor in our peacetime work. One device that I think is particularly interesting is a radar set called No. 268. It was wholly of Canadian conception. The idea was worked out by a professor in the university of British Columbia. A prototype was built in the laboratories of the national research council and the equipment itself was built in Research Enterprises.

The equipment was adopted by the United Kingdom as the standard equipment for motor torpedo boats and was used in that capacity during the war. When the war ended the British admiralty adopted this device as the one most practical as an aid to navigation on ships. Today I think some two hundred of these devices have been installed in merchant ships in the United Kingdom, and we are installing the equipment on ships in Canada as rapidly as we can. We were in large production when the war ended. Fortunately we had a number of sets that had not been shipped abroad, and these are being held here and used in our merchant marine. By the aid of this device the navigator of a ship on the foggiest night can see on a screen before him the shoreline nearby, the buoys that he is passing, the obstacles ahead, other ships and floating logs, just as clearly and to the same extent as he could see them from the bridge on a bright sunny day. Already this device is changing the whole character of navigation on the west coast of British Columbia, and I believe that undoubtedly it will be standard equipment in all ships as rapidly as the device can be installed. It is also a means of harbour control. With the device erected overlooking a harbour one can find the location of ships on a foggy night just as distinctly as on a sunny day. Using the device the harbourmaster can direct the ships to their moorings as well in fog as in sunshine.

A similar device is being placed on aeroplanes, so that both marine navigation and air navigation are being made vastly safer and more flexible as a result of this one application of a war-time device to a peace-time service.

I am giving the house only a sample. Similar applications are being made all along the line. Through the help of the research council I am certain that war-time inventions will play an increasingly important part in the reconversion period.

I come now to the matter of housing. There has been some question as to the number of housing units that were completed in 1945. I have given two or three figures myself, each based on the best information I could get at the moment. But before I went to western Canada I asked the bureau of statistics to use its facilities to make a thorough count of the actual number of housing units built in 1945. This is the report I have received:

> The dominion bureau of statistics has just completed a survey to ascertain the number of dwelling units constructed in the calendar year 1945.

Mr. FLEMING: What is the date of the report?

Mr. HOWE: It came to my hand from the bureau two days ago. I doubt whether the report itself has been made public. I continue:

> The survey included 623 cities, towns, villages and incorporated rural municipalities, namely, all municipalities in the twelve "greater cities" of Canada; the remaining larger municipalities, mainly those with a population of five thousand and over; and a sample coverage of municipalities in the urban and rural groups with population less than five thousand.

From this survey it is estimated that around 44,000 dwelling units were built in 1945, of which some 39,000 were new building construction and an additional 5,000 were brought about through conversions. It is also shown that about 36 per cent of the new dwelling units are located in the twelve greater cities; a similar proportion are in other urban centres, while the remainder, some 27 per cent, are located in rural municipalities. That is the best information I have to-day, and I think it is accurate information, as to the number of housing units built in 1945.

Mr. SKEY: Were those all built by the government?

Mr. HOWE: Built by the government and every other agency.

Mr. SKEY: What percentage did the government build?

Mr. HOWE: I could give that information with a little study, but perhaps the hon. gentleman would not mind letting me finish my remarks; after all, this is not committee of the whole.

The greatest building year Canada ever had prior to the war was 1929, when the number of housing units built was 34,000; so that the year which saw our greatest war effort and which brought the end of the war, was not a failure as far as housing was concerned when, as compared with the 34,000 housing units built in 1929, we were able to find sufficient labour and material to build 44,000 units.

Perhaps I could clear up some doubts about the lumber situation. There is a wholly incorrect impression abroad that Canada is exporting far greater quantities of lumber now than before the war. For the years 1934 to 1944 the average quantity of Canadian lumber consumed in Canada was about two billion board feet, and during that period about 48 per cent of the Canadian cut was exported. In the calendar year 1945 only 41·5 per cent of Canadian production was exported, and a total of 2,860,000,000 board feet was consumed in Canada. It is expected that in 1946 the Canadian cut of lumber will reach 5,200,000,000 feet, the greatest in our history, and that well over 3,000,000,000 board feet will be retained in Canada. Surely this should be sufficient for all Canadian requirements. The export of items such as doors, millwork and flooring is totally prohibited; and although shortages of those materials continue, new sources of production are being or have been brought in, and everything possible is being done to increase production.

Some months ago building control was lifted. It was felt that, after the war ended, the difficulties of enforcement of building control would outweigh the benefits which would accrue from it. Black markets were developing, and those responsible felt that just as good results would be obtained without building control as were being obtained with it. It has now been found necessary to reestablish building control to some extent. Perhaps I should give a statement to indicate the exact extent to which controls are now being reapplied. Although good progress has been and is being made in increasing the supplies of building materials for the housing programme, many such materials are still in critically short supply. With a view to making the best possible use of available supplies a formal priorities rating has just been worked out for limited use. This has been done by the issuance of priorities office order No. PO-11, dated March 12, 1946. The new priorities rating is designed to assist in channeling the required quantities of building materials as defined in the order into government approved low cost housing projects in order that such projects may be completed as expeditiously as possible. With certain exceptions the order requires suppliers of building materials to make prior shipments of all purchase orders carrying the new priorities rating. Details of the new order, of interest to all suppliers of building materials in Canada, are now available.

Among other recent actions taken by the Department of Reconstruction and Supply to aid home building is the establishment of special procedures to assist individual veterans of world war II to obtain the remainder of building materials required to make ready for occupancy homes which are at least seventy-five per cent completed. I may say this is the first occasion on which we have been able to lay down a rigid procedure which could be followed by individual veterans building their own homes, as well as in the construction of homes for veterans under government auspices. Requests for such priority assistance may now be made to the priorities officer of the department on form PB-1046. No request for assistance should be made unless the veteran's home is at least seventy-five per cent completed, since this procedure has been set up specifically to expedite the completion of homes which have reached at least this stage of construction. We are making a special drive to finish homes now under construction by the end of April, and when we have accomplished that, the priority mentioned for veterans will be extended to veterans commencing new construction.

The number of homes that can be built to-day depends entirely upon the material that can be made available for the building

of such homes; and when I mention material I am not referring to lumber alone. Perhaps lumber is the least of our problems. I am referring also to the vast list of materials that enter into the building of a home, from hardware and plumbing fixtures to wallboard and all the great array of materials that are familiar to most of us. We have been taking active steps, and have had the benefit of the assistance of a committee of the construction association itself. We asked the construction association to give us their most experienced men to make an independent examination of sources of supply and advise the department on ways and means of increasing those supplies. The reports are coming in as each branch investigation is being completed, and as those reports come in they are being acted upon. The valuable assistance of the association most deeply concerned with the enlargement of the supply is being very helpful in solving the supply problem. Supplies have improved greatly, though we are not yet out of the woods.

We expect a considerably larger house building programme for 1946 than we had for 1945, but there again I believe the number of houses to be built will be limited by the amount of building materials that can be made available. We are running into other shortages. It has been suggested that reconstruction has bogged down. If anyone had told me two or three years ago that the steel productive capacity of this country could be doubled to meet the requirements of war; that an industry which had never operated at more than sixty per cent of its then capacity, in pre-war days, six months after the end of the war would be operating at greater capacity than at any time during the war, and that in addition there would be a heavy backlog of requirements, I would not have believed it. For the last two or three days I have been sitting down with the steel controller to see what can be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but already he has spoken for forty minutes.

Mr. BRACKEN: We will offer no objection if the minister is permitted to go on.

Mr. COLDWELL: The minister's statement is of such importance that I think permission should be given.

Mr. HOWE: I shall make my further remarks as brief as possible. We have doubled our production of steel in the war years. We are producing more steel to-day than we ever produced during those war years. We are operating even our stand-by equipment at full capacity, and we find it necessary to step back our export orders by months, to conform with our ability to produce steel.

In getting the work of reconstruction under way it seems to me I have had too many enthusiastic helpers. I asked for exports, and I think every producer in this country has felt I was speaking to him personally. We are in danger of attempting more than our physical resources will permit. So that, instead of encouraging further expansion we must now enter into a period of balancing our sales with our ability to produce.

Wrapped up with the problem of steel is that of coal. We have had some close calls in connection with obtaining sufficient coal during the war years. Steel production makes a very heavy demand upon coal in the form of coke. Having in mind the fact that coal controls in the United States are being abandoned, it seems to me that the problem of finding sufficient coal for Canada for the next twelve months is going to be a major problem, indeed. Let no one think that because we have been able to keep sufficient coal in our bins to meet the situation during the war years the consumer may now relax and buy his coal at any time he chooses. If it was ever necessary for the consumers to fill their bins early, that time is now.

Then, as to base metals, as hon. members know, Canada is the greatest exporter of base metals in the world. We had vastly expanded our production of base metals. To-day one of the greatest shortages in the world is that of lead. It has become almost a precious metal, and is limiting production in a great many fields.

Zinc and copper are in the same active demand which maintained during the war, with the result that our base metals mines, with the exception of nickel, are called upon for full production. Nickel is a metal which enters largely into war production and while it is also important in peace time, its use is not as great in peace time as in time of war.

The most amazing situation relates to the production of aluminum. As hon. members know, during the war we multiplied, to the extent of about twelve times, our capacity to produce aluminum. I am told that the demand for aluminum to-day is such that it will be necessary to use almost Canada's full capacity to supply the needs of Canada and of other countries for that metal.

As I said before, I was accused in 1943 of being an optimist. If I had been attempting to predict Canada's position in a period

six months after the end of the war I would have been, indeed, a pessimist when confronted with to-day's situation as it now appears. And even then I could not find anyone who was as optimistic as I was in that period.

My hon. friend has criticized the removal of controls. He stated:

> The government's policy of decontrol is so slow and so lacking in skill and foresightedness that the dangers of inflation increase.

His attack seemed to centre on price controls, which he said were, in peace time, laws against production; but his general statements appeared to embrace every sphere of the government's economic policies. As I read it, the burden of his extremely general and vague comment was that the remaining government controls were in some undescribed manner restricting production.

As Minister of Reconstruction, I have a very profound interest in this charge, and I think my hon. friend should state just what controls he has in mind, and just how they are restricting production. A certain amount of vague criticism of this kind has recently come to my attention. It is not always easy to track down. Sometimes it is honest and well-intentioned, and sometimes it is based simply on the selfish desires of a few people to be rid of controls, which prevent them from taking advantage of the great majority of citizens in these continuing conditions of emergency. Unless it is specific, it is seldom helpful, and it frequently plays right into the hands of those few unprincipled characters who hope to profit by a descent into economic chaos. I am sure that this is the last thing my hon. friend would wish to encourage.

The government is removing controls just as promptly as is feasible, in the light of its responsibility to maintain orderly economic conditions, and to protect Canadians from sharp advances in living costs. Many controls have been removed, some as long ago as mid-1944. Almost all the controls administered by the former wartime industries control board have gone, and the great majority of the restrictive production controls administered by the wartime prices and trade board have been rescinded. A start has been made on price decontrol, and both price control and wage control have been made more flexible. All controls are being continuously reviewed, with a view to their relaxation and removal at the earliest feasible time.

As Minister of Reconstruction, I am particularly concerned to see that production is not impeded by unnecessary restrictions. I am not aware of the existence of the needless controls to which my hon. friend refers. Does he think that allocation of steel should be dropped in the present conditions of shortage? Does he believe that lumber allocations, which protect the Canadian supply of this material so vitally needed for housing, and which fairly apportions our exports, should be removed? Or is he intimating that rationing of meat should be eliminated, without which our desperately needed shipments to Britain and liberated Europe would be restricted, and domestic price control would be impracticable? Or is he simply objecting to price control, without which we should be in the throes of a violent inflation?

In regard to price control let me say this, because in my job of reconstruction I have fairly definite opinions about price control: It is very easy to say that price control is holding back production, without explaining how, or without paying any attention to what would happen to production if price controls were ineffective, or were dropped. It is easy enough to talk in general terms about unnecessary controls, to say that price controls are laws against production in peace time, and then to qualify these remarks by urging the government not "to engage in rash efforts of decontrol." But what does my hon. friend mean? The government is moving as promptly as it can toward the ultimate removal of price control, without engaging in "rash efforts of decontrol".

I am sure that my colleague, the Minister of Finance, (Mr. Ilsley) will bear me out when I tell the house that a break-down, or a removal, of price control would be rapidly followed by extreme advances in the price level, and by particularly drastic increases in the prices of the very necessities of life—food, clothing and rentals. My hon. friend criticizes the government for not controlling the prices of houses—a type of control which presents enormous difficulties, and which the government of the United Kingdom, for example, whose housing problem is even more acute than our own, has not found feasible to institute, after very careful consideration. Yet, at the same time, when he says that price controls in peace time are laws against production, he can be taken to suggest that the Canadian people should not have any protection against soaring prices, for food, for clothing, for rents.

I do not have to emphasize the obvious fact that soaring prices would cause suffering and dislocation of our economic affairs. That is clear enough. But I do wish to emphasize that soaring prices would pare down the large demand for goods and services, on the maintenance of which our objective of high pro-

duction and high employment is based. The incomes, and the great accumulated savings, of the Canadian people would lose their purchasing power, and it would not be very long before the demand was insufficient to sustain the rising level of production in a number of directions. Then we should have a depression with its consequent unemployment, suffering and loss of income. To remove price control, or to ease it to the extent that it was not effective, would be simply to invite a wide boom and a severe depression. If my hon. friend imagines that the removal of price control is the way to reach and maintain a high level of employment and production, he is advancing a most unusual theory, a theory which the experience of other countries around the world, both to-day and in the past, provides no shred of evidence to support. But then he says that he would not urge rash efforts of decontrol. If that is the case, let him say just what controls are in his opinion restricting production. If he advocates their widespread removal, let him explain just how inflation and economic chaos are to be prevented.

This government is not maintaining controls because of any inherent liking for them. Not only do the continuing war imposed controls represent a heavy and difficult administrative burden, but they represent a degree of interference with economic processes which can only be justified in emergency conditions. But we are still faced with a real and urgent emergency in our economic life—the aftermath of the most destructive war in history. And while these conditions prevail the government cannot ignore its plain responsibilities to the Canadian people.

I had intended to cover one or two other subjects, but I feel I am imposing sufficiently on the time of the house. Let me say in conclusion that providentially Canada has emerged from the greatest war in history with a greatly expanded productive machine and with at least temporary prosperity. We are in the happy position of operating in an economy which is not inflated. It is an economy which allows us to produce and export and sell our products in every market of the world. I believe it is a balanced economy. I believe that a bushel of wheat will buy more goods in Canada than a bushel of wheat produced in any other country will buy goods in that country. I believe that the wages received by our workers will buy more goods in Canada than will the wages paid to workers in other countries buy goods in those countries. As I say, providence has given us a great inheritance at the end of the war. We have come out of the war with a splendid reputation. The men in our armed services and the men in our factories have brought us to the attention of the world in a way that, I think, has given us a new place among the nations of the world. We have come out of the war in splendid shape; let us not fritter away that which has been granted to us.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak for a few moments, somewhat handicapped by the lack of a powerful voice because of a current malady which has struck some of us. I hope, therefore, that you, sir, and hon. members will bear with me while I make the remarks that I have to make.

This afternoon I shall deal largely with the question of external affairs, and that for two reasons. First, because of the fact that during the last ten months I have had the high privilege and honour, along with other members of the House of Commons and the public service of Canada, to represent this country at three world conferences. Second, because today the question of external affairs has reached into the homes and lives of the people of this dominion in a way that perhaps it never did in the past. The question of external affairs has assumed a position of vital importance in our whole national picture, an importance which perhaps we never thought it could assume in days gone by.

Canada has a great stake in her foreign, commonwealth and empire policy. She has a great stake in the questions of peace and war. After two great wars over 100,000 Canadian men and women lie buried in other parts of the world as a sacrifice in the battle for democracy and civilization in which this country took such a noble part.

I was a representative of Canada at San Francisco, then at the preparatory commission in London, and later as alternate delegate at the first general assembly. First, I think I should indicate to the house some of the improvements which I think might be made with respect to our Canadian representation.

One of those improvements is envisaged by the amendment which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said the day before yesterday was to be made to the Department of External Affairs Act, by which it is proposed that in the future we shall have a separate and full time minister of external affairs. This is a move in the right direction, and I heartily commend it on behalf of my party. We have been agitating and pressing for such a reform.

There was a distinct advantage in having a delegation such as we had at San Francisco, at the preparatory commission and at the

general assembly, representing as it did the three main political parties in this house. But, if I may say so, I think on other occasions the Prime Minister, without affecting the character of the delegation, could also bring in the fourth party, the Social Credit party to my left. Such a move in the final analysis would create better understanding generally of world problems.

There is a decided advantage in having the various political parties represented when this country is speaking outside of Canada. There is not only the advantage of having men of various political parties as members of the delegation; there is the advantage of giving to our foreign policy, as in Great Britain and other countries, an added continuity, and creating complete understanding on the part of every individual represented. It is a step toward having, as nearly as that is humanly possible, one voice for the Canadian people when they speak outside of Canada. For that reason I want to endorse the plan which has been so fully agreed upon by all parties in the house.

There will always be some differences with respect to policy—foreign, commonwealth, empire and domestic. It would be unthinkable that delegates to international conferences representing the various political parties should always have the same views on matters that arise for discussion. As a delegate representing my own party at the three conferences I know that from time to time occasions arise on which entire agreement cannot be obtained among the delegation, but I have always tried to exercise that sense of responsibility which I think is so necessary in matters of this kind. If there are differences among the members of the delegation, and there have been, the place to discuss them is within the delegation itself, or at home, and not wash Canada's linen on any public line at San Francisco or London. That has been the position most people having a sense of responsibility would have us take.

There was for instance, in the preparatory commission a matter which did to a large extent divide our delegates. It is a question I brought up in the house before I left for London and upon which I took a stand while there. I refer to the matter of the site of the united nations headquarters. I had always felt—I may be wrong, but everybody is entitled to his view—that Canada was the one place in the world where we might have expected the headquarters of the united nations organization to be located, and before I left for London I thought I had advanced in the house many cogent and powerful reasons for that view. It was one of the points upon which the government and I failed to find agreement. In addition I did feel that the delegation ought to have taken at least a neutral position as between Europe and the western hemisphere if they could not see their way clear to giving complete support to the western part of the world. I point that out only to indicate that men sincere and anxious to do the right thing as they see it cannot always be expected to agree even in delegations representing this country, and I think the same is true of the delegations of other countries as well.

With respect to the question of leadership of the delegation itself, one of the reasons why I placed, before the house met, a resolution upon the order paper calling for a separate minister of external affairs was that I felt that it was not fair to the Prime Minister or to those leading the delegation from time to time not to have that close liaison which there naturally would be between a minister of external affairs and his officials. I want to make it clear that I am making no reflections upon anybody who acted in a leadership capacity to our delegation in London. At San Francisco, of course, the Prime Minister himself as Secretary of State for External Affairs headed the Canadian delegation, and I am not referring to San Francisco when I make these suggestions. But at the London conference at different times we had leadership from three or four ministers of the crown, and I thought it was obviously unfair to them to project them into the position of leadership when they themselves were not the ministers presiding over the departmental officials whose work they had to coordinate and supervise from time to time.

There is another aspect of the matter, and I hope that these will be taken as constructive suggestions, because from beginning to end they are meant to be such. There was the question of personal contacts with the representatives of the other countries at the conference, and in my opinion that is one of the major factors of importance at an international gathering. I think no one will agree with me there more completely than the Prime Minister himself. I am thinking more particularly at the moment of the San Francisco conference, which I attended strictly as an amateur in international affairs—and who is not an amateur considering the trends and turns that international affairs take? At the San Francisco conference there were five official languages and two working languages. Again, when the San Francisco conference opened, there was not one among that great gathering of international figures who could

offer a single prayer to open the conference. Why? I understand now that it was impossible under the circumstances because so many religions were represented and the delegates worshipped so many deities. But this is the point I wanted to make. Despite the fact that so many different religions were represented, so many nations worshipping not even the same god, and despite the fact that they did not speak each other's language, the surprising fact is that they were able to reach the measure of understanding which they did achieve. This seemed to me to indicate how important it is for the average representative of a nation to try so far as he can to make his personal contacts with the representatives of other countries.

I come now to the question of leadership of the delegation itself. If we had a man who had a full-time job as minister of external affairs he would have the opportunity of making these contacts at conference after conference, of making and renewing friendships and acquaintanceships in an effort to reach understandings; and after all, world understanding often finds its basis in the personal understandings between individuals amongst the different peoples represented. It seems to me that the really fundamental factor in world understanding is not to get an understanding simply among the delegates from different nations, or among the heads of governments, or among diplomats, but rather that the fundamental thing is to get a rock-bottom understanding between the ordinary common peoples of the world. This, it seems to me, is one of the things we must develop so far as it is possible for us to do so. I leave those ideas with the house with respect to the Canadian delegation. Seeing these things as I did I thought it would not be quite fair for me not to mention them here rather than in London, for the purpose of seeing if we cannot improve the representation of this country in the days that lie ahead. Let me say that this country stands high in prestige among the nations of the world. My idea is that we should make it stand higher still.

With respect to the united nations organization itself, one cannot have been at three world conferences without having formed some opinions as to how it may be improved. As I have said on another occasion, it is impossible to think of UNO as a perfect organization; it cannot but be an imperfect organization in an imperfect world. Nevertheless we must move towards improvement. I humbly hope that we shall not find the united nations organization becoming a sort of backyard debating forum for the world, and, when any acute problems arise, having to call in the heads of three or four nations to solve them before UNO can move to greater things. That is not right. I think before such a situation can arise the united nations organization ought to take such steps as will prevent that coming about.

With this end in view, let me suggest that the general assembly, the security council, the economic and social council, the trusteeship council, and other similar bodies, should receive from the leaders of the nations the prestige which only they are in a position to give. The heads of both the little nations and the big nations should honour the meetings of UNO occasionally with their presence. In the general assembly, for some considerable time, one great country was represented only by its fourth ranking national leader. In another instance of a great power the second ranking national leader represented that country. I am not making any undue criticism in this respect. But if this country, Great Britain, the United States, Russia and other states intend to place their confidence and trust in the united nations organization, they should go the whole way in doing it. There is danger in half measures; and I fear that, unless the principal leaders of the nations, great and small, honour from time to time the united nations organization by being present, so enhancing its prestige by indicating their regard for it as the one organization for peace, it may become something less than this country hoped and determined it should be.

I have a further suggestion in this regard. At the San Francisco conference there was a generous representation of both sexes, of representative organizations and occupations. But in London—and for this Canada perhaps bears some responsibility in its own small corner—there were only three accredited women delegates I believe among the entire representation of the fifty-one nations. I believe everyone in this house will agree that, apart from those engaged in the very fighting fronts of battle, none bear a heavier brunt of war than do the women of the world, and there is no group in our society more interested than womanhood in the questions and problems of peace. I hope and believe that in the days which lie ahead that interest will be recognized in a more direct and concrete manner than it is to-day.

We have heard a good deal about world government. I was not here when eloquent speeches were made by the Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr.

Coldwell) and others. I read those speeches and I agree that world government is a great ideal, but I would caution hon. members that it must be a gradual development, having in mind conditions in the world to-day. Nothing could be more hurtful to the chances of world peace than to project world government too quickly upon a world not ready for it. This does not mean for a moment that we should not keep it as a great ideal; for it is a great ideal. But before you can have a free world government you must have a free world press. Let us not move precipitately towards world government. Let us first consolidate the steps which have been taken at San Francisco, in the general assembly, and so on, but let us not regard the ideal as a solution of the problems of a world which is not yet quite ready for that step.

I come now to the question of Canada's position in world affairs. This country is in a position of vital importance, of course, both in peace and in war. Some representations have been made in the house respecting the Canadian army of occupation in Germany. With other delegates I had an opportunity of visiting that army and having Christmas dinner with the forces. I also had an opportunity of sizing up, in personal conversation with men from my own part of the country, the province of Ontario, their sentiments with regard to the army of occupation. I came to two conclusions. One was that the government had a definite responsibility towards the Canadian army of occupation which it had not discharged. It kept this force too long in the dark with respect to its policy for the occupying of Germany. Time after time one had evidence of this in the unanimity with which the men demanded to know, in their own words, "what is the score?" The army heads were unable to tell them; the government itself did not announce its policy until serious unrest had occurred among the troops occupying Germany. I am of opinion that one of the chief difficulties in this connection was the absence of any clear declaration to the army of what the government's policy was, whether the men were to be kept there two days, two months, two years, or for the duration of the peace. As I saw it, the proposition seemed obviously unfair, and I was glad that the government finally made some announcement of policy.

With the kind of army we had in Germany, with everyone, except a small percentage, wanting to get home, a difficult position was created, as the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott) well knows, both for officers and for men. Nevertheless it seemed to me, and this may be confirmed by those who are better informed about the situation than I am, that, while those now in the Canadian army of occupation should be brought home, there should be some force, taken perhaps from those who are here and are desirous of serving in an army of occupation, that could properly undertake this job of discharging Canada's international obligations in this connection. I leave that suggestion as one which is perhaps worthy of consideration by the minister.

In connection with our foreign affairs policy I have felt that we shall always have to base that policy on the principle that this nation is still, and I hope always will be, part and parcel of the great British commonwealth and empire. There are other considerations, but I think the one I have just mentioned must be the basic one. In addition, we have our close relationship to the United States to the south of us, a relationship which is the pattern, as is the empire, showing to the nations of the world the way to peace.

I have felt that this country cannot afford to be provocative in its relations with other nations. A sense of responsibility on the part of our public men is essential in that regard. This is no time for provocative talk, nor is it the time for this country to indulge in any kind of polished diplomacy. I like the system which was employed and which I think ushers in a new type of diplomacy, a diplomacy which had such a widespread approval in the security council in London. People said that there was plain speaking there. Of course there was plain speaking, and there was clear speaking. There was an attempt to lay the cards of nations face up on the table. I come to this conclusion: the old days of varnished talk, polished diplomacy and hush-hush relations between nations are rapidly giving way to something healthier and leading to a far more sensible understanding among the nations of the world.

Once before when I was entering this country after coming back from the continent I said—it was somewhat impromptu—and I say it again, that the international washing will dry out far more quickly when it is exposed on the clothesline outside to the winds of world opinion than it will if it is put on some clothesline down in the damp cellar where world opinion cannot get at it. I made those remarks because someone said to me, "What about the talk that went on in the security council in London?"

So far as our foreign policy is concerned we in this country must take the responsibility of recognizing that we are grown up. Our whole foreign policy must be geared with that consideration definitely in mind. We must realize that this nation now sits very close

to the major powers of the world. It is all very well to say that our prestige is high. But with that prestige of course goes heavy international responsibility. In the last few months we have had some taste of our position with respect to international affairs. While the espionage matter has been dealt with fully by some of those who have spoken—I am very sorry I was not here when the Prime Minister gave his eloquent address on Monday night—I do hope that one of the lessons this country will learn is that we just cannot take everything for granted; from now on we just cannot decide that whoever makes an application for a position in the civil service or in government affairs, and particularly where secrecy or responsibilities of a public character are involved, can be taken in without being given at least some kind of test. It is all right for the government to say they have done a good job in hunting out the spies and quislings in our midst. Before the session is over I hope the government will indicate the measures they took to prevent the spies and the quislings from getting into the positions they occupied before this thing happened. I find myself pretty much in agreement with the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Low) when he speaks about that aspect of this particular matter. There are people who say that this is our lesson, and it is a lesson that has to be learned. I am glad that we are learning a lesson, but may I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the country from which I come, when these things happen and are cleaned up afterwards, they say it is not always quite good enough to lock the stable door after the horse is gone. I believe there is a responsiblity resting upon the government with respect to the people who were so chosen.

In our general movements during peace let us realize that there are many people in the world who subscribe to a certain doctrine—I am not so sure that I am not one who subscribes to the doctrine; if I do not, I come pretty close to it—that a factor in bringing about the last war was the invitation which was given by some great nations to a breach of the peace because these nations were not armed. In the days that lie ahead I hope that this nation, the British commonwealth and empire, and other nations will see to it that we do not discard all our defences; that at least we carry our own share of strength into the united nations organization, because a strong Canada and a strong commonwealth make for a stronger world.

We talk about military aggression, but there are other kinds of aggression abroad as well—ideological aggression, and aggression which has to be met by different kinds of defence. I believe that one of the great parts played by Canada in the united nations organization has to do with the economic and social council. Today we are living in a world which is only a shadow of its former self so far as size is concerned. It is a shrunken ball compared with the world of fifty years ago; it takes a person going from Ottawa to the farthest point in the world less time than it use to take our grandfathers and great-grandfathers to travel from Toronto to Ottawa. When you throw into that concentrated surface science's greatest instrument of destruction you realize that in the world of to-morrow it is not just a question whether we shall have peace or war, but a question whether we shall have peace or international suicide and mass annihilation of mankind.

That is the choice, and in that regard of course we must take our position. But the security council regulations, armed forces and all these things heavily endowed with might are only part of the picture. We have to conduct our war also not only against armed forces but against unemployment, against poverty, against disease and suffering. One of the things I liked about the work of Canada in connection with the united nations organization was the fact that we played such a prominent part in respect to the work of the economic and social council. That is an adventure, an experiment which in my opinion is a move in the right direction; because we shall have peace in this world, Mr. Speaker, when we have abolished the root causes of war. The root causes of war have to be eradicated before war itself can be stamped out. So it seems to me the proposals of the economic and social council, providing the ounce of prevention on the theory that it is worth a pound of cure, is something to which Canada may point with justifiable pride. No nation in the world had more words in the united nations charter relating to social and human welfare than did Canada. No nation has taken a stronger stand than Canada took at the various conferences. I was proud to listen to the proceedings at one of the opening meetings of the council, and to realize that Canada had been one nation that had lived up to the spirit and letter of her contract in regard to contributions to suffering humanity through the united nations relief and rehabilitation administration.

Of course people will ask, will the united nations organization bring peace? I say that of itself the united nations organization cannot bring peace; but the great nations of the world, working closely in collaboration with the organization, can do so. While the San

Francisco charter showed the way to peace, the great nations of the world must show the will to peace. As one looks at the question of our future one realizes that we cannot have peace without paying the price of peace. A cheap peace could not be a lasting peace; but whatever may be the cost of peace it can never be as high or as heavy as the cost of war.

Having this in mind as we go forward in the great adventure toward lasting and permanent peace, I want to bring to the attention of the house my honest conviction in regard to the united nations organization. True, there are great hurdles to get over. True, there are many difficulties in sight. True, there are stumbling blocks which to the average person may seem almost insurmountable. But I still have an optimistic feeling with respect to the question of the united nations organization and lasting and permanent peace. The united nations organization deserves a chance to succeed. What would this world have been like had we come to the end of this war without some structure moving toward the great goal of permanent peace and lasting security?

So I conclude my remarks this afternoon by expressing my confidence that the difficulties we have been experiencing in recent times may yet be satisfactorily adjusted, and that the united nations organization will move forward to accomplish the great things for which it was intended. Before coming into the house this afternoon my eyes struck some words written by Tennyson a hundred years ago, and with this I close my remarks:

Ring out, wild bells, to the wild sky,
The flying cloud, the frosty light;
The year is dying in the night;
Ring out, wild bells, and let him die.
Ring out the grief that saps the mind,
For those that here we see no more
Ring out the feud of rich and poor,
Ring in redress to all mankind.

Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife;
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.
Ring out old shapes of foul disease;
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold;
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the speech of His Excellency the Governor General depicts in the following terms the woeful conditions against which mankind is now struggling:

The world is full of unrest. Hunger, privation and suffering have become the lot of millions. Other millions are homeless, many of them in exile. The problems which face the statesmen of every nation are formidable indeed.

Those problems are made more difficult by the persecution of millions of human beings who are dominated by barbarism immediately after a victory won in the name of Christianity and civilization. Why should we conceal the fact that Soviet Russia has broken the most solemn pledges? She disregards treaties and brushes aside all protests. The right of those small nations which she is crushing is non-existent to her. Where and when will the Russian dictator stop? Neither Washington nor London knows. The united nations are in desperate straits and they dread the direst misfortunes. Some people show too much interest about the Spanish dictator and not enough about the Russian dictator. Will those who have fought for Christianity, civilization and the four freedoms permit Russia to spread communism all over the world? What happens in Canada? The government has brought to light the Russian espionage organization. They have appointed a royal commission which is now conducting an investigation. This investigation has resulted in the arrest of persons occupying important positions.

The government can count on the wholehearted cooperation of all real Canadians in this clean-up attempted in the interest of the security of the state. It is necessary to proclaim before the whole world that millions of human lives have not been sacrificed in vain. Peace must be proclaimed, and the united nations must at all costs safeguard the fruit of countless sacrifices. No dictatorship, no empire should stand in the way of the peace treaty so sorely needed by a troubled world. Before conciliation treaties are shattered on the formidable apparatus of imperialism or dictatorship, let the united nations exhaust all the peaceful means at their disposal and then adopt an implacable attitude towards the aggressive nations, whoever they may be. Another war would bring about a dreadful catastrophe. Man has invented the instrument of his own destruction. Let it not be said that in the twentieth century of the Christian era, humanity slipped back two thousand years into barbarism. We can and must be spared war. But can another conflict be avoided or not? The salvation or annihilation of the world depends on the alternative chosen.

Canada's contribution to the present war, which is not yet over since peace has not been proclaimed, has cost and still costs billions of dollars a year. The loan of $1,250 millions which the government has just granted England is part of our continued contribution to the war. Loan without interest until 1951, gift of over $400 millions to the United

Kingdom, representing the cost of training British airmen in Canada, extravagances of all kinds, maximum exportation of our agricultural products and foodstuffs, and all this gives but a small idea of our prodigality. Is Canada such a land of plenty that she may give so much away? Our people are overburdened with taxes. After a decade of sufferings caused by unemployment they have to give away the few dollars they have earned during the fictitious prosperity brought about by the war. We would be better off by using the country's income for the achievement of a vast programme of public works. We must give work to the thousands of unemployed. The Dominion government could cooperate with the provincial governments in carrying out drainage projects, in the construction of public buildings, bridges and highways required to increase our business and industry. I am aware that several members of Parliament have been disappointed at seeing that the sessional programme did not make the slightest mention of public works. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has even asked to curtail expenses during the next fiscal year. How is it possible to lend billions of dollars to other countries when the government is reluctant to undertake a vast programme of public works? Is this sound political economy? Would it not be wiser to put order in our own house rather than spend our money in foreign lands? I am convinced we should first direct all our efforts to the rebuilding of our national economy.

Is it conceivable that in such a country as ours, people have to go without butter? Is it reasonable that wheat should be rationed in Canada as the government is preparing to do? A short time ago, I registered protests against the reduction of wheat acreages, at the time when the government was paying a bonus to farmers for reducing their production. Was I entirely wrong? Now, instead of reducing production, the Government is rationing consumption. Is not this an evidence of a poorly planned economy? It is important that production and initiative be stimulated in all fields of our economic life. Conversion of war industries to peace enterprises has been imperative for months past.

I wish to say a word also on another aspect of our legislation. Parliament is considering bills on Canadian citizenship and a national flag at a moment when our returned men are without homes in a country whose wealth in natural resources is fantastic. As for the national flag, if one is ever adopted, our veterans will see it for the first time, for it will not be the emblem which witnessed their acts of heroism. The Canadian flag was never unfurled by our fighting troops in action since we are still a nation without a distinctive flag. As long as a large group of complacent colonials consider Canada as a colony following in the wake of the Empire, I fear that colonialism will remain an obstacle to the development of a real Canadian spirit. Let us hope for the contrary, in the best interest of both the Canadians and the colonials themselves. Our returned men are proud of being Canadians. Most of them want a national emblem symbolizing the distinctive character of their country. However, in this land of theirs, they are entitled to nourishment and work which will assure them a position worthy of the sacrifices they have made. This end will not be furthered by the government through the maintenance of numberless restrictions and controls. I earnestly hope the housing problem will definitely be solved.

I wish to speak on another subject. Canada has fought to ensure the victory of Christianity, freedom, justice and right. At least these were the objects expounded by our leaders. If those were our real aims let us stop now the prosecution of defaulters and deserters. Let the government release the thousands of defaulters and deserters presently detained in camps and prisons. Punitive justice is not the best kind of justice. Punishment for punishments' sake is sterile. The sole enforcement of punitive justice is base and mean. Our lawmakers have much worthier tasks to perform.

Such raids by the military police and the R.C.M.P. debase a country whose repute had been enhanced by the victory of our arms. Let us put a stop to such prosecutions and concentrate all our efforts on the general welfare of our people and on the reconstruction of our country which has been shaken to its very foundations. Let everyone play his part in the great and essential work of reconstruction. The veteran and the discharged serviceman are entitled to employment worthy of the sacrifices which they have so courageously made. But the defaulters or the deserters who are deprived of their freedom are unable to do something useful for their country. By granting them an amnesty, the government will not tread on anyone's rights, but they will do something worth while for thousands of young Canadians urgently needed by industry, commerce and agriculture. Extreme severity is not the part of wisdom. The relentless tracking down of defaulters and deserters, besides being odious, will only result in disunity, distrust and hatred. It was not with this end in view that Canada put all her

resources into the prosecution of the war. It is in a spirit of charity, justice and liberty that I request a general amnesty for defaulters and deserters.

A moment ago I expressed my views on punitive justice. It would not be necessary now to apply the law in all its rigour if so many pledges to our youth had not been broken. It would have been better to deal with them with frankness and loyalty. The desertions are largely due to the misgivings and distrust prompted by those whose first duty was to enlighten the young men. Preventive justice is much more human and efficient than punitive justice. I ask the government to take into serious consideration the mitigating circumstances in favour of defaulters and deserters.

Just a few more words. The relations between capital and labour in the United States let us foresee a world troubled by strong influences. Private enterprise cannot survive without cooperation that will ensure fair wages to the workers. A sound labour and industrial legislation is the only means of saving the nation from the economical and social disasters which hang over us. The time has come to build the relations between employers and employees on a sound basis. We must at all costs maintain and increase industry and employment. It is impossible to base our social security on the unemployment insurance fund. Family allowances are very helpful, but only serve to increase the family income. Canada's social and economical reconstruction is not solely dependent upon the government, but on the joint efforts of farmers, workers, industrialists and professional men. In a word, it is dependent upon the people themselves.

Agitators are the worst enemies of a free and prosperous nation. For over twenty years I have tirelessly denounced in this house the communist doctrine based on revolution, atheism and godlessness. I have frequently warned the government of the state of things which might arise from the subversive ideas current in the country. Last December 5th, I said in the house, and I quote:

> Europe is, to a certain extent, dominated by communism. A system which is worse than the dictatorship crushed by the united nations rules over the liberated countries in the name of justice, Christianity and right. The Atlantic charter, the Yalta resolutions, the war objectives of the allies are trampled under foot. Soviet Russia is causing its whole weight to bear on nations which it is its mission to revive and not to overrun. Religious authorities of Lithuania and the slavic states have protested against such brutal treatment.
>
> Let us beware lest, under cover of the critical times which Canada will experience, subversive elements might spread through the land. Having won the war would be of no avail were we to lose the peace.

As I speak, the situation is exceedingly critical. It is the duty of the government to uphold in Canada the traditions and prerogatives without which justice and liberty will be entirely submerged in a catastrophe the magnitude of which no one can possibly fathom.

(Text):

Mr. E. O. BERTRAND (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on the address in reply to the speech of His Excellency the Governor General may I first extend expressions of appreciation of our population for the representation given to our country by His Excellency and the Princess Alice during their tenure of office. The example they have set to our population in the part they have played during the troublesome years through which Canada has just passed is one that we all appreciate.

I should like also to take this opportunity to congratulate the mover of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau) and the seconder, the hon. member for Queens-Lunenberg (Mr. Winters). These two hon. members on Friday last made a very good contribution to the debate. Both of them at one time were members of the Canadian armed forces and served in different capacities to defeat the common foe. One of them comes from a far eastern province and the other from the middle west, and consequently they represent a fair cross-section of our population. May I add that they also represent in this house different races in our population. From what they accomplished in the defence of our country while in the armed forces and from their participation in this debate we must surely realize that they are Canadians whom we desire to see amongst our population. Both spoke with wisdom and at times with eloquence. Their appeals for unity amongst our different populations in the provinces of Canada and between those of different creeds and races and religions were surely worth while, and I am happy on this occasion to congratulate them on their efforts on Friday last.

Before proceeding further may I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to read the first two paragraphs of the speech from the throne which His Excellency addressed to the Senate and House of Commons:

> It is just over six months since Canada emerged from six long years of war. The turmoil which has followed in the wake of war has created new problems for governments in all parts of the globe. The world is full of unrest. Hunger, privation and suffering, have become

the lot of millions. Other millions are homeless, many of them in exile. The problems which face the statesmen of every nation are formidable indeed.

It is only in the light of the world situation that all our problems can be seen in true perspective. The future of our own and of every country depends upon success in the task of world reconstruction, and the establishment of an enduring peace. Many of the measures you will be called upon to consider at the present session will be concerned with this wider aspect of human affairs.

These two paragraphs are indicative of the present formidable world problems whose ramifications affect the Dominion of Canada.

We must admit that Canada is really fortunate in having as its Prime Minister at the present time the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King. His experience as a leader of a country is unsurpassed amongst the allied nations, and his proverbial prudence of pronouncements and his wisdom as a statesman make it a privilege for Canada to have him as Prime Minister in the strenuous times through which we are passing. May I add that he is even more than that, as he has proven in the last year. He is a stalwart in comprehension of international affairs amongst the united nations for the welfare of all populations in the world, but principally for the welfare of those nations that stand for peace, justice and liberty. It is under his guidance that Canada has done so much for victory and to help the allied nations in the last six years. It is under the Prime Minister's guidance that Canada will continue to cooperate with the allied nations for the peace and reconstruction of the world. But while participating in these international conferences to assure everlasting peace, Canada must at the same time attend to her own domestic, social, economic and commercial problems.

What will the year 1946 bring to us? Historians of to-morrow cannot fail to note 1945 as one of the greatest of all years—the dividing line between an age that is past and the new atomic era.

Because the second world war was commenced in 1939, that year was the most momentous up to that time. In 1945 came the end of the conflict, and the return of our youth who had gone to the wars—wars at all the ends of the earth. But it was also the year of the atomic bomb on the one hand and, on the other, the birth of the united nations organization. All the events of this closing year will determine the shape of things to come in a very large degree. The problems before us, as the speech from the throne indicates are formidable indeed.

[Mr. E. O. Bertrand.]

(Translation):

And, Mr. Speaker, those tremendous problems are not wholly Canadian, their ramifications are international, and in their solution, we must take into account the rights of each country, as well as the ways, customs and aspirations of every racial group and every nation. A great deal of tolerance and charity will be required in order to adjust difficult situations to the best advantage of all concerned.

For the time being, the important thing is the preservation of world-peace, and I am firmly convinced that every country genuinely desires peace. However, the differences of opinion and the aspirations of the various countries make this problem infinitely difficult of solution.

If peace is to prevail throughout the world, it must be predicated foremost on Christian charity. Now, in my estimation, Rome is surely the greatest Christian centre in the world.

About twenty-five great countries now have a representative in Vatican City, and I feel that if Canada has been in a position to play such an important part during the war which has just ended, if she is called upon to cooperate in future in order to safeguard the peace of the world, it would be only reasonable that Canada, whose diplomatic representation is constantly increasing in various countries, should have an official diplomatic representative in the Vatican, the seat of the princes of the Church.

The reconstruction of our country is largely dependent upon its foreign trade. It has always been the aim of the Liberal party to create and maintain prosperity in our country by developing our export and import trade. In recent months, we have striven more than ever to develop our foreign trade, and it might not be out of place here to congratulate the hon. minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) for the many trade agreements which he has concluded with several countries which, until recent years, had traded with Canada on a very limited scale.

Our trade with devastated countries will surely require loans and credits and we will be called upon to approve such loans and credits to those countries that may need them. In the last few months, UNRRA has supplied large quantities of goods to the population of devastated countries now in the grip of hunger or famine, but more than such relief will be required to rebuild the various devastated countries of Europe. Canada must keep on doing its share and more than its share by increasing those credits. That is why it is

stated in the speech from the throne that we will be called upon to approve a loan of $1,250 million to Britain.

We must not look only at the seemingly fabulous amount of the loan, but must also consider Canada's bounden duty to help the European countries while furthering our own trade and development.

Canada must make credits or loans available to Britain, France, Belgium and other countries, I do not see why it should not. As a matter of fact, these credits and loans would be used to purchase goods in Canada, and then our people will derive the greatest advantage from these financial arrangements.

With no wish to prejudice the interests involved in these various credits or loans, I will frankly admit, that in principle I am convinced Canada must contribute to the re-establishment of the Allied nations by granting them the credits and loans necessary to bring about their reconstruction.

The countries of Europe and Asia are at present suffering from hardship. Hunger and even famine are rampant in large and important countries. Canada can increase its present output and at the same time render service to its veterans; that is why our people must take an interest in this problem.

Canada must not be asked to produce simply from charitable motives and in order to help needy countries; it must feel vitally interested in producing more, and if we are to encourage our people to increase their output of foodstuffs, the farmer's income must be boosted.

Nevertheless, the Canadian farmer holds an important position in our national economy at this time. Let us see what has been his income in the past twenty-five years. According to the *Agricultural Economist* of November 1945, issued by the Department of Agriculture. This publication takes the index number 100 for 1926, when prices of farm products and the cost of living were normal. On the basis of that index number, statistics prove that all products the price of which was equivalent to 100 in 1926 have decreased to 66·7 in 1932 and gone up to 104 in July 1945. On the same basis, that is, taking the 1926 index number, 100, farm products have gone down to 48·4 in 1932 and risen to 107·8 in July 1945; field crops have gone down to 41·1 in 1932 and increased to 99·2 in July 1945; live stock products have declined to 60·7 in 1932 and increased to 122·3 in July 1945. These figures might offer a partial answer to the hon. member of the C.C.F. who stated this afternoon that if some credit can be given to the policy of the honourable the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), that credit is nevertheless not very great. Since it is fair to refer to statistics, we must admit that the Minister of Agriculture has carried to its highest level the income which farmers have had during the last twenty-five or thirty years. If this is true, the fact remains that statistics show an average income of 108·3 for the four factors I have indicated, whilst the cost of living, in July 1945 stood at 123·7 for the farmer. The goods and services used by farmers for those eight factors on the farm have stood on the average at 125·7 in July, 1945, and for eleven factors at 144·2, also in July, 1945. It means that the cost of living and the cost of farm production for those various factors, stands at an average of 130·9 for the farmer, therefore, the farmer's cost of living and production is still higher by 22·6 than the price he obtains for his products. If the farmer is to produce more, he must certainly have a higher income.

On motion of Mr. Bertrand (Prescott) the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, March 21, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT

STATEMENT AS TO TREATMENT OF PERSONS DETAINED BY MOUNTED POLICE

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I should like to communicate to the house a report I have received from the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police with respect to the treatment afforded the persons who were detained at Rockcliffe for interrogation by the royal commission appointed to inquire into the so-called spy activities. It is dated March 20, 1946:

Dear Mr. St. Laurent:

With reference to Mr. Coldwell's statement in the House of Commons on March 18, in respect to the persons detained in the present espionage inquiry at Rockcliffe being accommodated in rooms which were brilliantly lighted and in which the lights never were out, the following particulars are submitted for your information.

On the occasion of the detention of the individuals referred to, in view of the fact that they had to be kept incommunicado, it was necessary that each have his own personal guard so as to prevent them from conversing with other persons detained and also as a safety measure to prevent escape.

Certain of the persons detained were given accommodation individually in large rooms measuring approximately 60 feet by 22 feet, while others were placed in small rooms, approximately 10 feet by 9 feet in measurement, due to no other large rooms being available. The small rooms are those allotted to sergeants of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and are comfortable. As there is no proper cell accommodation at Rockcliffe barracks, it was necessary that police guards remain in the room with the prisoner throughout the hours of daylight and darkness; consequently, it was necessary that a section of the room be lighted at night, as the guard was not permitted to sleep. These were the normal lights installed for the rooms in question, but after the first few nights were replaced by a shaded reading lamp. Any charge that brilliant lights were installed in any of the rooms is not only untrue, but ridiculous.

All those detained were treated exactly alike in all respects, and were given exercise daily in the company of an escort.

The complaints mentioned by Mr. Coldwell, M.P., and Mr. Solon Low, M.P., are denied by two or more of those who were detained, as indicated by the attached press reports. No undue pressure or what is known as "third degree" methods were employed by the police, and there was no occasion or reason for any unauthorized treatment.

The meals served were those prepared for members of the force, under the supervision of a dietitian.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) S. T. Wood,
Commissioner.

The first clipping annexed to the report, and referred to in the report, is from the Montreal *Standard* of March 16, 1946:

"Third-Degree" Grilling
Denied by Spy Suspect
Special to *The Standard*

Ottawa, March 16—One of eight espionage suspects who had been held incommunicado for nearly a month at the R.C.M.P. barracks at nearby Rockcliffe told the *Standard* to-day that no third degree methods were used in questioning him.

This suspect, now at liberty on bail, refused to allow himself to be quoted by name on the advice of his lawyer. Otherwise he talked freely.

"If any coercion was used, it was of a most subtle nature," he said. "There was no physical discomfort—just adroit questioning by the mounties."

He spoke of his own experience only, but believed that his treatment was not substantially different from that accorded twelve other persons held in the police barracks. Eight of these, including the *Standard's* informant, were arraigned in court this week and freed on bail.

(Last week an unnamed lawyer representing one of the detainees said the Mounties were using coercion and third degree methods to extort confessions, and that his client was confined to a "stuffy little room in which a bright light was left burning continuously." R.C.M.P. Assistant Commissioner H. A. Royal Gagnon immediately denied the third degree and coercion allegations.)

"I was treated quite decently," the *Standard's* informant said. "Even the guards were respectful—they called me 'Sir.' We were confined one to a barrack room, and I had practically everything I wanted—my sun lamp, my pastels, all my own clothes, good food and use of the barracks recreational library.

"What I disliked most was that I wasn't allowed newspapers, was refused permission to see any visitors, even my wife, and that I was held day after day with no charge being placed against me.

"My room was a large one, usually used as a dormitory for a number of policemen attending courses at Rockcliffe. I had it all to myself, but I was never alone in it. There was always a guard with me, and at night only the lights in the half of the room in which I was sleeping were extinguished."

The constant guard and lights were believed to be precautions against any of the detainees attempting suicide. The *Standard's* informant said he was allowed possession of a safety razor only while shaving in the morning, and then only with a guard near. He was allowed to keep his belt and shoe laces.

"I was taken outside the building for a walk each day, but my only companion was a policeman. Occasionally, I could see other civilians through my window taking similar walks under guard. I recognized two of them, but was unable to speak to them."

"The adroit questioning" by police was conducted by Inspector Harvison of Montreal, he said. All questioning by the Royal Commission was conducted in the Justice building, to which the *Standard* informant was taken by police.

He protested strongly against what he described as the injustice of holding a person for weeks without allowing him to see a lawyer. He said that when he was arrested he asked his wife to engage legal counsel but that the lawyer was not allowed to see him.

It was only after the commission had finished questioning him that he was given the opportunity of calling in his lawyer, he asserted.

The other clipping is from the Ottawa Evening *Citizen* of March 6, 1946, but it does not purport to be a report from anyone who had been detained. It is merely a statement made by someone who had been retained as counsel for a person who had been detained. I do not think I should read it to the house as being pertinent to this question.

If I may be permitted to do so, I will table the report with the clippings annexed thereto.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, and in connection with the statement just made by the Minister of Justice, may I point out that the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police made an error in bringing my name in as having been associated with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). At no time have I made comment upon the detention of these suspects at Rockcliffe, nor have I said anything in connection with it.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: In fairness to the hon. member, may I say I do bel eve the commissioner made a mistake. So far as my recol-

lection goes, the only references made were those of the hon. members for Rosetown-Biggar and Calgary West. In both instances they were merely asking for information, which I tried to secure as quickly as I could get it.

POSTAL SERVICE

RATES ON FOOD PARCELS OVERSEAS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, the question as to a reduction in postage rates on gift parcels to the United Kingdom has been raised by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce), the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce), and by members of the general public. Because this subject is one of general interest, I am making a brief statement at this time.

The present parcel post rates to the United Kingdom are fixed in agreement with that country, and are therefore not entirely under the control of the Canadian Post Office department. They consist of the actual cost of handling in Canada, conveyance by ship, and the charges which are handed over to the country of destination for delivery costs. For instance, in the case of a gift parcel for the United Kingdom weighing the permissible limit of 11 pounds, and one cubic foot in over-all size, we pay 75 cents for sea conveyance and 90 cents to the United Kingdom, leaving Canada only 40 cents to cover all handling costs here, including rail haul.

Any reduction of these rates would mean in effect a subsidy to the senders. There may well be an objection to this which I present for the consideration of the house. It is that the sending of gift parcels is a matter between individuals on the chance happening of a person overseas having a friend or relative in Canada. Government assistance should, I believe, not be granted on this narrow basis. Rather we should continue as at present to provide relief to those in need through official agencies operating for that purpose.

If the United Kingdom authorities wish to confer the benefit of reduced charges to their own people, we should be happy indeed to pass on to the Canadian mailers the reduced postage rates thus made possible. There has been no such disposition, however, on the part of the United Kingdom postal authorities. Recently when they were approached as to the possibility of accepting less than they now require for the handling of parcel post parcels, they pointed out that their charges are at an absolute minimum, and with rising costs at the present time they might even have to increase the charges which they now require.

A comparison has been made with the rate charged for soldiers' parcels. May I point out that these parcels were handled from the time of mailing to the time of delivery by the Canadian postal service and the Canadian postal corps. The conditions were, therefore, quite dissimilar to those prevailing in the case of civilian parcels.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 7, respecing citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens.

He said: The house will recall that on October 22 last I introduced a similar bill, and asked for first reading. My remarks, in which I set out the purpose and intention behind the bill, are found at page 1335 of *Hansard*.

The measure to which first reading is now sought, with some slight editorial revisions, including a definition of "domicile," is the same as that introduced last year. On that occasion the definition of "domicile" was left as interpreted in the Immigration Act.

A further provision in the bill now presented to the house is that it affords to members in the armed services the prerequisite of having spent only one year in the country, as a condition to their becoming citizens under this new legislation. So that for all practical purposes under the bill now before the house a member of the armed forces will almost automatically on application, subject to other qualifications, be eligible without going through the residence requirement for admission into Canadian citizenship.

As I stated on a previous occasion, an attempt is now made to give a new definition to Canadian citizenship and to clarify the ambiguity which follows from the Canadian Nationals Act, the Immigration Act and the Naturalization Act. The underlying purposes of the bill are really two: first, to achieve a clear and simple definition of Canadian citizenship which will remove the complexities which exist in the present legislation and, second, to provide an underlying community of status for all our people in this country that will help to bind them together as Canadians.

Mr. CHURCH: That is a nice bill for an Ontario minister to introduce at a time like this when coal and houses are needed. It will lead to wide disunity.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

HOUSING

PROGRAMME FOR VETERANS IN REGINA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. O. PROBE (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Reconstruction, of which I gave notice a couple of hours ago. Will he please inform the house if it is the intention of Wartime Housing Limited to extend its present programme of temporary housing for veterans in Regina beyond the number of 300 units announced last year? If it is intended to go beyond this number, what is the projected allotment for Regina for 1946?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I received notice of this question and I communicated with Wartime Housing Limited and found that Wartime Housing Limited had had no communication from the city of Regina since last August. If an application comes through the official channels from the city to the department, Wartime Housing and the department will be glad to give consideration to its contents.

FATS

INQUIRY AS TO SAVING-FATS CAMPAIGN TO RELIEVE UNITED KINGDOM SHORTAGE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Will the government initiate a save-the-fat campaign as the United States has done, to help relieve the serious shortage of fats in the United Kingdom.

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The question should be directed to the Minister of Agriculture, who has charge of this campaign.

Mr. BRUCE: I thought it had to do with Mr. Donald Gordon's branch.

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. BRUCE: Will the minister direct the question to the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

WHEAT

SPREADING OF PAYMENTS FOR DELIVERIES—INCOME TAX

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Mr. Speaker, there is a question I wish to direct to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) based on his statement yesterday requesting increased deliveries of wheat from the farms of western Canada. Will the minister give consideration to giving the farmer the option of spreading payments for such deliveries for income tax purposes over the years in which he may have crop failures? As the minister is not in his place, this question might serve as a notice and could possibly be answered to-morrow.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

The house resumed from Wednesday, March 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fernand Viau for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. E. O. BERTRAND (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, when the debate was adjourned last night I was speaking of the possibilities of the expansion of production in Canada, mainly that of agriculture. Having completed my remarks on that subject may I turn now to the possibilities of the expansion of Canadian industrial production to supply the domestic needs of this country and those of other countries throughout the world, and to maintain a high level of employment and national income in Canada. In order to do this we shall have to study many things, and we shall be confronted with many problems. I would not want to prevent financial resources from coming into Canada from other countries in order to open up new industries, but there is one matter I think should be called to the attention of the house. I refer to international cartels, and I should like to say a few words about this type of organization.

The *Labour Gazette* for November, 1945, contains an article on Canada and international cartels which is of great importance. Referring to the effects of cartels, the report states:

> Cartel arrangements which impede industrial innovations and slow down the effective development of new opportunities for investment tend to diminish the supply of goods available for human use. Attempts by cartels to protect old investments by limiting the introduction of useful new techniques and new production have a prejudicial effect on government policies to secure high employment.

And again:

> Examples of cartel arrangements affecting Canadian production, consumption, and trade are reviewed by the report. It refers to restrictive aspects of external financial control of Canadian industrial and commercial companies, and the use of patent rights by cartels to establish comprehensive systems of market control.

There is a comprehensive system of market control in Canada and throughout the world, thus balancing world trade to avoid competition. The report continues:

> The interest of Canada in the revival of world trade and in the adoption of policies of expansion transcends any such balancing of possible advantages and disadvantages.

And again:

> The report is not concerned with the legitimate use of individual patent rights, and no suggestion is made that would involve any restriction of rights conferred under the Patent Act. But cartel members frequently employ patent rights to establish a comprehensive system of market control by (a) formation of patent pools; (b) systems of cross-licensing; and (c) imposition of marketing control upon licensees. These mutual agreements for patented articles tend to spread to unpatented articles also.

Consequently destroying in large measure the possibility of individual enterprise. Cartels are surely no solution for depression, and in this regard the report continues:

> Cartelization offers no solution of the economic distress of widespread depression. Indeed, in the aggregate it probably acts to intensify the general distress, although some have contended that cartels have given the necessary minimum security to permit continued investment. Renunciation of cartels without other action is no solution. Positive expansionist measures are necessary. The cartel is a natural development of depression; and the most effective way of eliminating it is to create conditions of expanding trade which will render it unnecessary, and which will enable competition to render the cartel ineffective.

We have anti-trust policies in this country, and the report goes on to state:

> Anti-trust action is only one aspect of public policy and must be allied to the use of other legislative powers such as those relating to tariffs, patents, trade-marks, taxation, crown companies, if the problems created by industrial concentration are to be met adequately.

May I conclude by saying that if our country is to expand in order to be able to supply properly both the domestic market and the markets of many other countries of the world, the government must take the necessary steps to avoid the control of trade by cartels, and probably it will be necessary to make representations to other countries in which cartels are practising restrictive trade practices to bring about effective measures through international collaboration for checking the abuses of cartels. It is recommended by the commission that the government of Canada give its support to the establishment of an international office to deal with cartels in connection with the economic and social council of the united nations. Close study should be given to other considerations which have been tentatively put forward by officials of the United States government for the international control of cartels. That is all I shall say on the subject at the moment. But if hon. members would take the trouble to study not only the extract I have read but the whole report they would find it a mine of information for the building up of a safeguarded Canadian industry for private enterprise. I am quite sure that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) will be quite ready to deal with that aspect of this important problem in connection with the development of a labour policy and the development of our country industrially.

The speech from the throne makes mention of redistribution of the representation in this House of Commons. This is always a very important measure, of the utmost importance to our whole population. Canada throughout its history, and particularly in recent years, has given proof of its broad-mindedness and attachment to every democratic principle, and I am quite sure that the redistribution bill that will be introduced here fixing the representation in this house for the next ten years will be a charter of justice that will safeguard minorities and provide adequate representation to all the provinces. In achieving such a redistribution may I suggest that minorities respectfully ask for the support of the majority of its citizens in this great task. Such a redistribution giving fair representation to all portions of Canada and to all our peoples would be a new cornerstone of justice and unity in this country.

On September last I spoke in this house and referred particularly to two things, the civil service and the income tax. May I be permitted a word with regard to the civil service? To be as brief as possible, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall quote what I said on that occasion:

> For the benefit of hon. members and of those who expect to obtain positions in the civil service, I would venture to suggest that at the earliest convenient time during this session, or during next session if this is to be a short one, a special committee should be appointed to study and review the Civil Service Act and its regulations. This is a time when many changes will have to occur in order to establish a new order in the world and there should be a clear exposition before this committee of all that is to be expected from the civil service commission under the operations of the Civil Service Act and its regulations. This would be conducive to a better understanding by all concerned.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the same reasons for appointing a special committee on the civil service still exists. I agree that last session the committee on veterans affairs made a comprehensive survey of positions giving a

preference to the veterans and I can quite understand that the veterans committee will be reappointed this session to give further study to veterans' problems. Nevertheless the civil service commission is charged with the responsibility of replacing or keeping some 60,000 temporary employees, and this will necessitate from 50,000 to 60,000 new examinations. I realize that my request for a special committee for a better understanding of the work of the civil service commission is only one means of giving more information to the members of the house and the public at large, but I believe it would be helpful to all those interested. Owing to the pressure of work on the commission at the present time the committee should make its inquiry only after the civil service commission has completed the task in which it is now engaged, but I would ask for the appointment of such a parliamentary committee at the earliest opportunity.

I indicated that I was going to say a word about income tax. We were pleased to learn from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) last session that a reduction of sixteen per cent, roughly speaking, had been made in the 1945 tax. That was a simple cut in taxation. It might have been too much of a reduction in some cases and not enough in others. It was quite all right to accept that for the past year, but I feel sure that the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann), who within the past few weeks has predicted a further tax reduction, would not be satisfied with the reduction that was made last year, and I make an appeal again particularly for the fathers of families. At the risk of holding the house for a moment or so I should like to repeat what I said last year when asking for such a tax reduction:

> I would venture to suggest that the following exemptions on income taxes should not only be considered but granted in the coming budget. I am not so much concerned with the criticism that we have not reduced the Income War Tax Act to the degree that people expect, because, after all, the people do not expect a real reduction of taxation on a large scale at this time. But I believe we should give a chance to the married man and his family.

I am not quite so generous as the hon member for Humboldt (Mr. Burton) who asked for tax exemption in his speech yesterday.

> I ask for an exemption of $1,500 for married men and for each child below eighteen years of age or who is going to college or university I ask an exemption of $400, all of these to be reduced directly from the net income of the taxpayer. These, in my opinion, would be only fair, and would go a long way to help fathers of families and married people in this country.

[Mr. E. O. Bertrand.]

It would also help to further the college education of our younger generation. I am very sorry that I cannot go so far as to suggest any further help for our bachelors in this time of stress.

I again make a plea on behalf of the family head. I hope that when the budget is brought down some alleviation of his lot will be made by way of tax reduction.

Although our country has many problems to face at the present time, some of them domestic, many having international ramifications, we all agree that Canada is fortunate in having possibilities of production which are nearly unlimited, and fortunate also in that at the present time we have at the helm a government which is a safeguard for the welfare of our people.

The returned men can count on the Minister for Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie). Already we have on the statute books most advanced and generous legislation to help in reestablishment, and it is proposed that the veterans committee shall again study what should be done and establish a veterans charter for those who served so well in the last conflict.

So far as labour is concerned, there is a certain amount of unemployment, more seasonal than anything else, in this country, but we have probably less difficulty than is experienced in most countries, and our present situation in no small measure is due to the efforts of the Minister of Labour.

As to reconstruction, the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) has indicated to the house the efforts the government is making in this respect. Of course this is a subject on which criticism is easy, but it is not just so easy to find solutions. I believe that every citizen of Canada, reading the papers this morning, was proud to learn what is being done by the minister.

As regards agriculture, I have stated previously, and I want to repeat, that agriculture in this country has been brought up to its highest standard in the matter of income in these past few years.

An hon. MEMBER: At whose expense?

Mr. BERTRAND (Prescott): And if we ask who is responsible for this state of things, I would say credit is to be given to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), who has so well administered the department during the time he has been in charge of it.

In closing I would refer again to what I said yesterday with regard to the leader of the Liberal party, the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King). Canada is indeed fortunate to have at the helm at the present

time the present Prime Minister—fortunate both in its domestic affairs and in its international ramifications.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, my first words must be of commendation and congratulation—and they are not perfunctory, either—in respect of the excellent addresses delivered by the mover of the address, the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau), and the seconder, the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Winters). These young men are of a type much needed in public life. So far as the mover is concerned, he is a personal friend of mine and a fine example of the many young men of French ancestry who have come into this parliament and who will do their part towards making this country what we hope its destiny will be.

I wish to say a few words arising out of the remarks of the last speaker (Mr. Bertrand, Prescott) in connection with redistribution, because it peculiarly affects the province of Saskatchewan. The speech from the throne states that this matter is to be dealt with in the current session. Ordinarily redistribution would have been effected in 1942, but it was postponed until after the war because it was realized that the loss of population in Manitoba and Saskatchewan during the ten years following the census had been occasioned in large measure by the movement of men and women from those provinces to the coast and to eastern Canada for the purpose of working in war industries. I agree that redistribution should take place at the earliest possible day, and I agree also with the hon. member that it should provide adequate representation of all provinces; but since many of the people who left western Canada temporarily during the period of the war have now returned, I suggest that redistribution should be postponed for two or three months, within which time a census can take place in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, which otherwise would lose three and four members respectively. I believe that a census taken now would indicate that there has been no decrease beyond the one-twentieth which is allowed under the constitution, and if a census were taken the representation in the two western provinces would not be decreased. In any event, even if on the present basis of representation, as determined by dividing the population of Quebec by sixty-five, it were found that the population had decreased as revealed in the 1941 census, I suggest that Saskatchewan should have eighteen members, not seventeen as at present indicated.

In view of the fact that I am the only representative of my party from the province of Saskatchewan, it becomes necessary for me to say a word in regard to agriculture and the opinions of my province in that regard. I am not going to enter into any discussions of a recriminatory nature; conditions in the world are too serious for that. A hundred million people in Europe and Asia are facing starvation. My criticism of the government is that as yet it has no plan by which the Canadian farmer can determine the contribution he should make during the next year or so towards relieving the distressing situation which prevails in other parts of the world. Call it what you will—political considerations, or political reasons actuating it; it is difficult for western farmers to understand why there is any justification for their receiving approximately 40 cents a bushel less than they would on the world market to-day if it were not for the fact that the Canadian government has seen fit to sell our wheat abroad at $1.55 per bushel. I am not here to criticize in any way the need of Canada—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I shall come to the criticism after a while. I was saying that I am not here to criticize the need of Canada to prepare for markets in Europe and elsewhere and to aid Britain during her dark days and reward her in part for what she did for us when she saved civilization. The farmer believes, properly I think, that if Canada intends to advertise, if Canada's government intends to secure markets abroad, then it should be done at the expense of the Canadian people and not at the expense of the farmers who produce the wheat.

One problem which faces the country was accentuated the other day when I visited Chatham; I refer to the necessity of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) doing something immediately to assure the necessary labour supply for the Canadian farmer.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is something you should look after. You may be on the farm yourself.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that there is never any fear of the genial Minister of Labour moving anybody around like that if the record of the past is to be any augury of what will happen in the future. When I was in Chatham I found that many of the farmers had been on sugar beet production, others on vegetable production. But these farmers, by reason of the failure of the government to face this situa-

tion and to assure them the necessary labour supplies, are unable to determine what to do this summer. While the minister says that things will be bad for some of us in the future, the farmers in the county of Kent and in the part of Ontario to which I refer, are asking that a decision be made now, not on April 1 or April 15 or later, because, notwithstanding all the unemployment in the country, it seems impossible now to secure men who will return to the farm and assist in that kind of work.

What I am about to say applies particularly to western Canada. During the war a tax of three cents a gallon was imposed on gasoline with a view to discouraging its use. This tax added to the cost of the farmers' production. Why was it not removed immediately upon the conclusion of the war? Instead of the tax being removed, permission was given to the great western oil corporations outside the city of Winnipeg to increase their prices by two cents a gallon, effective during the present months.

I represent a rural constituency. I visited farmers everywhere in that constituency during the recess and I find they are willing to work in order to meet the challenge that faces the world. But, as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has said, unless they are assured that longer hours will not penalize them in income tax, the production that is asked for now will not be obtained. If the government will not consider it proper to provide a real inducement in the form of relief from income tax for the extra production, what must be done is to increase the income tax exemption to the extent of $2,000 for married persons and $1,200 for single persons. In the second place, I suggest that while a great deal of wheat has been sold at $1.55 a bushel, the farmer should be given the reasonable price of $1.80 for every bushel of wheat sold since August 1, 1945, to the end that, by means of that encouragement, the production we ask for will be forthcoming.

The farmer is most insistent that he be given assurance of a market, and that he be given equality for agriculture, to use the expression of my leader; that by means of a well organized programme he be given security in prices several years ahead. I suggest that even at this time the government should turn its attention to these two matters—first, the provision of labour, not a month or six weeks from now, but immediately; and second, that the government give some hope to the farmer and to the other citizens of Canada of some relief from high income tax through an increase in the amount of exemption.

Having dealt cursorily with these two questions I come now to the spy situation. I do not think there is any place better fitted for the discussion of this subject than the parliament of Canada, which, if it is to discharge its responsibilities, must be the bulwark of the liberties of the Canadian people. I am going to ask my hon. friends in all parts of the house to listen to the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, delivered in the House of Commons on March 19, 1918, words which I can never hope to emulate, setting forth the responsibilities of members of parliament in the determination, and in the securing and maintenance, of those rights which are dearer to no one than they are to people of British birth, dearer than life itself. Sir Wilfrid used these words:

> Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and the universal testimony of history is that unless there is eternal vigilance on the part of a strong and resolute opposition, encroachments upon freedom and abuses in office will creep in, just as surely and just as certainly as weeds and tares will invade and choke the crops of the husbandman if he is not constantly on watch. Nay, more, I think I can invoke also the testimony of the history of British institutions to show that if at any time there is on the part of some section of the opposition a relaxation in vigilance, weeds and tares at once appear in luxurious growth.

These are pertinent words, having regard to the encroachments that have taken place, during the period of the war, upon the rights of parliament:

> Nothing, sir, is more certain than that one illegality will lead to another; that, as a logical consequence, wrong will be followed by wrong.

I have no apologies to offer for the position I intend to take. I have no apology to make for not having received support from the communist party. No member on this side of the house has ever at any time received the official approval of the leader of the Labour Progressive party, nor has any member on this side of the house ever taken the position that the director of the national Liberal federation took when on June 24, 1944, Mr. Tim Buck offered cooperation to the Prime Minister. In offering that cooperation and that assistance, he was answered by Mr. McLean in these words:

> The Liberal party welcomes cooperation from everyone in Canada in putting into effect Liberal principles and policies—

Mr. ROSS (Souris): No matter what the cost to the nation.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER—

—because we are sure that these policies are the only real answer to the problems which face Canada and the whole world and to the problems which will face us in the future.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am glad to note the approval. The cooperation was cooperation during the period of the elections. There was none of that cooperation with communism on this side of the house. I realize too the position of Russia to-day—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We are here, though.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I beg your pardon?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We are on this side.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh yes. There is the policy; the end justifies the means.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): At any cost to the nation.

Mr. CASSELMAN: He spoke out of turn.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is strange, Mr. Speaker, that there should be so many interruptions in connection with a proposition as to which there is such universal agreement.

I was saying that I think I realize the situation in the world to-day. Stalin spoke on February 9; Kalinin spoke on February 4; Molotov spoke on February 4. They set forth the plan; and, according to the royal commissioners, here in Canada were men and women in the civil service who put their loyalty to a foreign ideology above their loyalty to the state. Anyone who runs may read the picture in the world to-day: Great Britain to get out of Greece so that the bases in the Dardanelles will be available; the U.S.S.R. demanding Tripolitania by way of trusteeship; the U.S.S.R. to-day in Iran; the U.S.S.R. asking for bases in Eritrea; the U.S.S.R. asking for the Kars plateau. It is a picture anyone can see; and the empire is not altogether guiltless when we allowed the U.S.S.R. to secure control over the Kurile islands, joint ownership or control of the Manchurian railway, the port of Darien and the port of Port Arthur, under the agreement at Yalta. These things exist; but, these things being recognized, and that spirit of communism spreading all over the world being known, it was passing strange for the Prime Minister to say he did not believe that Marshal Stalin knew anything about what was going on in this country.

I have no sympathy, sir, with those who would undermine their country in time of war or in time of peace. They are entitled to no sympathy, but they are entitled to be tried by law and not by administrative lawlessness. And let me say this. The Minister of Justice says the safety of the state is in danger. Nowhere in the orders in council does it say that, either in October or in February. It says, "it may be inimical" and all through Canada the press has taken the stand that the responsibility must rest with the government to prove to Canada that the destruction of these inalienable rights of British subjects is justified on the ground that there is in existence in this country a situation which would undermine the state and destroy our safety. It is well, too, to remember that as yet no one has explained the appointments made by this government. No one as yet has given an explanation as to why a Doukhobor woman from the constituency of Prince Albert, with a philosophy inimical to our philosophy, should come to Ottawa and find her way into the Department of External Affairs, where she would acquire a knowledge of our secret ciphers.

I might add that never in the long history of the British commonwealth has the "safety of the state" been defined as other than existed during a period of war, rebellion or insurrection. The minister says these are dangerous men and women. The authorities did nothing from September 5, 1945, to February, 1946; then they picked up these dangerous people and kept them incommunicado for a period of time. Later these dangerous people were released on bail in trifling amounts which ordinarily would indicate the commission of no serious offence, and the probability of acquittal. If they were dangerous in January or February, are they not dangerous to-day? If they had to be kept under detention for that period, what has happened since to alter the picture? I say, Mr. Speaker—and it is not doctrinaire or a technicality—to say that these orders in council sweep aside Magna Charta, habeas corpus and the bill of rights. Some say the people of Canada are not interested in that. Sir, I do not believe the minds of liberty-loving Canadians, however much they hate communism, have become so apathetic in six years of domination by the state in a period when the political doctrines of regimentation inculcated by one party and practised by the other have been in effect. I believe the time has come for a declaration of liberties to be made by this parliament. Magna Charta is part of our birthright. Habeas corpus, the bill of rights, the petition of right, all are part of our tradition. The United States has its own bill of rights, and I think out of the events of the last few years a responsibility falls upon parliament

to assure that Canadians, as well as others in the empire and the people of the United States, should have established by their legislature a bill of rights under which freedom of religion, of speech, of association and of speech, freedom from capricious arrest and freedom under the rule of the law, should be made part and parcel of the law of the country.

During the period of the war of necessity parliament became a casualty of the war. We admitted that democratic symbolism and the leisurely processes of democracy had no place having regard to the tempo of modern warfare We voluntarily abrogated the rights of parliament and the rights of the individual, but I ask the Minister of Justice to let us know his answer to this. If during the days of war he did not have the power he has under these orders in council, why was it necessary to apply to individuals in time of peace rules and regulations which were never applied in time of war? Section 21 of the defence of Canada regulations, which has been repealed by order in council, gave power to pick up aliens and enemies of the state during the period of the war. It gave the power of detention, but not the power of examination. Is this democratic symbolism? I defy the government to produce a case where during war, insurrection or rebellion when any British government acted not only to detain but to examine. As I look at what is taking place and what has taken place in recent years, this is what I am afraid of. Parliament abdicated many of its rights during the war, and to-day the government is endeavouring to perpetuate this temporary abdication. We placed our rights in pawn during the war as security for victory. To-day we are asking that those rights be restored to us and that parliament be assured of the prestige to which it is entitled by reason of our democratic development and the heritage that is ours.

This, as I see it, is the trend. From 1939 on, the government has arrogated to itself powers which ordinarily reside with parliament and the people. Indeed, during the period of the war there were the defence of Canada regulations; the present order in council goes much farther than the defence of Canada regulations did.

There has been an attitude on the part of the government denying us information. There was the philosophy of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) that the executive had no responsibility to parliament, the very antithesis of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had so often reiterated in the house.

Mr. CLAXTON: The Minister of Finance did not say that.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: And here is a strange thing: The minister says that on December 6, 1945, he did not remember this order in council of September, 1945 that swept aside Magna Charta and the bill of rights. He forgot it! Well, I accept his denial that he knew at the time of the existence of this order. But, sir, is it not an indication of what power will do to men, what it will do to a former president of the Canadian Bar Association, one who had stood for the safeguarding of the rights of parliament and the individual, that he should forget an order in council which did more to sweep aside the rights of individuals than has any other order in council passed in the history of Canada?

Parliament would never have passed the emergency transitional powers bill had it known about this order. But he forgot about that secret order! I wonder how many other secret orders the Minister of Justice has forgotten. How many other secret orders are there about which we know nothing to-day? I ask that question again, as I did on December 6.

Where is the rule of law? It is flouted by the government. First it is flouted by denial in many statutes and orders in council of recourse to the courts. True, most of those orders in council were connected with military needs. Why is recourse to the courts denied under certain legislation, such as that connected with the income tax and the excess profits tax, and a fundamental principle of justice, that a man may not be a judge in his own case, daily forfeited, to the detriment of business and of individuals across Canada?

Why does this government, which always asserted while in opposition that it is the custodian of the liberty of the individual, and yet denies to that individual the right of recourse to the courts—a principle of British justice since Magna Charta, which states, "To no man will we sell, to no one will we refuse or delay, right or justice."

When, in the history of the British empire, was any man ever denied counsel, except under orders in council passed by this government? Why deny counsel when an individual is brought in for examination? According to the statement read by the minister to-day there was no coercion. And, by the way, it was interesting to note that the Minister of Justice departed from his legal training to the extent of reading *ex parte* statements in a newspaper in order to support the answer he was gviing the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell).

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Will the hon. member allow me to make a correction? I was not

defending or supporting anything. I was indicating to the house the information I got from the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, which I had promised to get at the request of two members of the house.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, imagine the Minister of Justice giving information to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar as to what the commissioner had read in the Montreal *Standard,* and then asking parliament to accept that as an answer!

You say I overdraw the story? What did parliament do a few short months ago in connection with a bill respecting emergency powers? Under the emergency powers bill, on October 5, 1945 the government endeavoured by order in council to get power to deport and to exclude Canadian citizens, or to revoke nationality. Parliament continued to sit until December 18. It would not accept the reactionary principle that a British subject could be deported at the will of the government of the day. Parliament, as represented by hon. members in all parts of the house, took the stand that such intolerance would destroy a nation. Parliament spoke on that occasion in words which could be understood by the government. Parliament pointed out that to deport Canadian citizens was the very antithesis of the principles of democracy, one of the first of which is that minorities are entitled to protection.

What did the government do? It could not get that iniquitous piece of legislation through parliament; so, while parliament sat, on December 15, 1945, the governor in council passed an order in council to do that which parliament would not allow it to do between October 5 and December 15, 1945.

There is the picture, as I see it. I cannot cover the various other infractions and invasions of democratic rights by the executive. I come back to the orders in council themselves, and I ask this: Having regard to the seriousness of the situation, why did the government let that order in council lie dormant from September to February? If it is so dangerous to-day to have individuals connected with the U.S.S.R. in this country undermining our state—and admitting it is—what was the justification for the government's allowing a Russian officer, Major Peter Domishev, to go to Churchill on the Musk Ox expedition, and there to take pictures of our equipment which will be used in the north country in the event of war's ever coming to this land? What is the justification for it? Surely not a fear of difficulties which in the event of refusal might arise between Canada and another nation, because Canada and every other part of the empire is denied the same privilege in that country.

The only justification for these orders-in-council the government offers is that conditions are serious, and that it is done for the safety of the state. Sir, my answer to that is the answer I gave a while ago: detaining and questioning in this fashion has never been resorted to anywhere in this Empire before. I should like to know what would have happened in Great Britain, in the mother of parliaments, if the same condition had arisen. There, according to the Minister of Justice, one of the major wrongdoers, one of the alleged leaders, was not locked up for detention and examination. He was proceeded against by law and legal processes. After he had appeared in court, represented by counsel, he was denied bail, because invariably bail is denied when an individual may not appear for trial, or where it may be considered dangerous to allow him to be at large. Why was not the same practice adopted in this country? What difference was there here from the condition which prevails in Great Britain. I suggest again that I have no sympathy for these people. I know none of them and never have. But are we not travelling along the trail which during the war was used and reused with an utter lack of protest on the part of parliament? This trail is becoming a highway along which the government moves, totally regardless of parliament.

The Minister of Finance said in a speech last fall that parliament's duty was not to scrutinize everything; it was to vote supply. That is the position that the government is coming to. It has taken away the right of the individual to have access to the courts. It has widened the defence of Canada regulations to the point where you say to the individual; Not only will you be detained to protect yourself and protect the country, but while you are detained you shall be examined; Is it not passing strange that these people are detained until such time as they say something which implicates them? They are then granted the right to have counsel; they are then permitted to face their trial. They are granted opportunity of freedom once they confess. When that happens they are withdrawn from the custody of the crown, from this so-called passive internment, and again have the opportunity to be at large.

As I said before, it is the first time in history that this has happened. Again I say that I have no sympathy for communists, but the great danger in the road taken is that if this becomes a precedent it may lead to

caprice and personal animosity being the guide to prosecution of those who have different political views. These orders-in-council provide the government with a means whereby it may translate suspicions into proof by surveillance and the coercion of confinement.

My friend over there says that it works, that the end justifies the means. I have taken the trouble to look up the history of habeas corpus, and the more I have gone into it the more strongly I am convinced that the great and abiding principle of British law all through the ages has been a scrupulous regard for liberty. It was so even in the darkest days. To set aside those rights is to deny the foundation of British liberty. It works. The star chamber worked. It was efficient; it got convictions. There were outstanding judges at the head of the star chamber. But as McKechnie says in his work on the Magna Charta, that writ is the principal bulwark of English liberty, and should the doubtful plea of political necessity lead men to look on its denial with apathy, the most distinguishing characteristic of our constitution will be effaced.

The orders in council provide a short-cut method, and so did the star chamber method. Maitland sums it up by saying that the star chamber probably succeeded, but it was none the less sinister. It too was composed of great jurists, but it became a court of inquiry, not a court of judges administering the law. Public opinion must be mobilized by knowledge against this practice. How apologetic the Minister of Justice was when he dealt with this matter; and I think the same thing can be said of the Prime Minister. Yes, it has been done before; parliament has been criticized before. None was more critical in the days before the war than the right hon. the Prime Minister. It may be said that to take a stand like this is not popular, but I assert that it is a member's responsibility to take a firm stand when he sees freedom being interfered with; when he sees such things as religious freedom being interfered with as it is when these Jehovah's Witnesses are still kept in alternate work; when he sees interference with the freedom of the press as was the case when certain photographers were advised that unless they delivered up their films they would be subject to arrest. When one sees that trend, when one sees bureaucracy not responsible to parliament, then the time has come when members in all parts of this house should rise and say that freedom and liberty are the concepts for which parliament must stand, that they will not permit the adoption by the executive of totalitarian methods; that British methods have worked through the ages and British methods will work to-day.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, first of all, along with many other hon. members who have already spoken, I want to congratulate the two hon. members across the floor who moved and seconded the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Having done that, may I say that while I have taken part in many debates, I begin to feel a little nervous in taking part in this one. Since it has opened the discussion has taken us over a lot of territory. We have been chased by the police, taken into court, put into gaol, let out again on bail, taken over to Russia and also to several different parts of this country. It is therefore not without some diffidence that I rise to address the house.

I intend to speak in support of giving everybody in this country an equal opportunity, which is the first duty of government. I intend to base my submission, first, on a statement made by the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King); second, on a statement of a former prime minister of Great Britain, and, third, on a statement of a business man in the United States. We can never attain the golden age of economic life while we are in the stone age of economic thought. I believe many of us are still in that stone age, and until we get out of it there is not much hope for the common man. Speaking in New York, on December 2, 1942, to the Pilgrims of America, the Prime Minister is reported to have said:

> The only path to prosperity and peace is the path of equality of cooperation and of human brotherhood. The new order must be a world order. It must be governed by a universal rule of law. It must be based on human rights and not on the rights of property, privilege or position. An end must be put to monopoly of power by any country and by any class.

That was reported in the Edmonton *Bulletin* of December 3, 1942. We have heard the Prime Minister tell us that we must have reform before the war is over, otherwise it will be too late. Late in December, 1940, former prime minister Churchill had this to say in London:

> When the war is won, as it surely will be, it must be one of our aims to establish a state of society where the advantages and privileges which hitherto have been enjoyed by only the few shall be far more widely shared by the men and youth of the nation as a whole.

I should like now to quote what a citizen of the United States said, Jesse F. Jones, a wealthy American who was formerly chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He said:

These United States have been good to us. We have made money, we have nice homes, wear good clothes, have fine cars and can afford banquets like this one. We can look back fifty years when most of us started and chart the courses that followed. But we can't look ahead that far and see where we are going.

But there are some things we know about the future. One of them is that the days of making great fortunes are over. That is finished. Another is that the upper third, you and I, have got to have a more public-minded viewpoint. We must realize that the welfare and well-being of the lower third is our problem. We are as much of society as the fellow on the other side of the tracks.

Many of us are wondering whether it is possible to have equality of opportunity until a thorough job of housecleaning is done in all departments of government and all other public institutions, where infiltrations of doctrines detrimental to our democratic way of life are to be found regardless of the label under which they operate.

Having laid that down as a basis I propose to say a few words about the millions of hungry people in other parts of the world. I was glad to hear the Prime Minister make his pronouncement on Sunday night last; and right here, may I say that I followed his injunction and went to church on Sunday, as is my regular practice, and I was wondering whether the Prime Minister used his Sunday morning in preparing his pronouncement of Sunday evening, or whether he went to church himself. His Sunday night speech was very good, and I am sure the farmers all over Canada received it in the proper spirit. I think you will all realize that farmers are necessary people at certain times, particularly when you want something to eat, and when there are taxes to be paid; whether they be exacted directly or indirectly makes no difference.

Speaking of cooperation, the farmers of Canada have had a lot of it in the past in the way of flowery speeches, but this time they demand cooperation in cash, not in credit or in words.

I should like to quote two paragraphs from the speech from the throne with which I propose to deal specifically:

> Of world problems demanding immediate action, the most pressing is the provision of food to those peoples facing acute shortage, and, in some regions, widespread famine. The chance of a peaceful reconstruction of the world depends on food. The shortage at the present time is very great. The problem, moreover, is not only for the next few months, but also for the next few years. Unless the need is met, grave disorders, endangering peace itself, must be anticipated.
>
> The government is seeking by all practicable means to make available for export the maximum supply of foodstuffs. Every encouragement is being given to increasing production. The gravity of the situation demands, on the part of the people of Canada, a united and wholehearted effort.

These words are clear and definite. I do not think anyone can accuse the farmers in any part of Canada of sitting back during the war years and not pulling their full weight in production. I cannot speak particularly for other parts of Canada, but I do know that in western Canada tractors were working night and day at certain seasons of the year on the farm; you could see tractor lights in the fields any night you were driving along the roads. For this the farmers deserve great consideration. The result of these long hours of work, about which we did not complain, after our able-bodied men and women had been sent into the services or into the civil service here or into munitions factories, leaving at home to work the farm men and women long past the age for such work as well as the young men who were physically unfit for the armed services, was that the farmers produced on a scale higher than they had ever reached before. I am not going to give all the credit for this to the policies laid down by the present government. It will be remembered that some years ago the Kaiser used to use the phrase "Meinself—und Gott," and if we take into consideration the bounteous crops provided by Divine Providence during the war years, I think we would be hitting much closer to the mark.

Many of the farmers took the advice of the government; that is, they let it in one ear and out the other because they say that if you want to be a successful farmer you must do exactly the opposite of what the government advocates. In my own case I did not change my farming programme, and I do not intend to do so in the future, because if you are going to be a success on the farm you have to lay down your own programme, make sure it is a sound one, and then stay with it. If you are going to change according to every whim or fancy advocated by people who do not know anything about farming, you are not going to get very far beyond taking a walk down the road and letting somebody else have your farm. I do not think it would be fair to the government to deal with agricultural policy and the fate of agriculture prior to the time this government came into office. Let us take its wheat programme, starting with the 1935-36 crop.

It will be remembered that at that time we had an initial payment on our No. 1 Northern wheat at Fort William of 87½ cents a bushel, and in addition we had participation certificates on which we were supposed to realize cash when the crop was all sold. That

continued for some time without prices getting any better; in fact, the price went down to 80 cents and then 70 cents a bushel, and at one time legislation was introduced to make 60 cents the initial payment on our wheat f.o.b. Fort William. The farmers of Canada did not like that. Perhaps it was done intentionally by the government so that the farmers would be thankful when the price was brought up ten cents a bushel through legislation passed in this house providing for an initial payment of 70 cents a bushel. That lasted until August 1, 1942. During this period, although we were getting a very low price for our wheat, we found that the prices of the things we had to buy were going up and up, and little attempt was made to check those increases. In addition to taking the low price, because nature was good to Canada we were compelled to deliver on a quota basis. The farmers of Canada had no particular objection to that. They knew that a lot of our grain could not be used, and on one or two occasions we were paid some storage on the farms. But to most of us it was a case of buying lumber at highly inflated prices, building granaries and storing the wheat on the farms. Some of the wheat grown in the early years of the war still remains on some farms. On August 1, 1942, we had an increase to 90 cents a bushel. That served to compensate to a very small extent for the low prices which prevailed before that time. In 1943 the price was increased to $1.25, and in 1944 the quota was removed and we were allowed to deliver all the wheat we wanted to. In 1942, as I think we all remember, drastic changes were made in the income tax programme, and as a result farmers and others were compelled to pay income tax on income, in the case of a single man, above $660, and of a married man $1,200. There were some exceptions with which I will not bother at the present time.

In 1944, when quotas were removed, many people were carrying heavy loads of debt and paying thousands of dollars in interest, and they thought to themselves, "Here is my chance to get rid of my grain and pay off my debts." As a result many of them emptied and swept out their grain bins and felt that they were getting well away. Farmers, I may say, have at all times done their best to pay their debts, and on this occasion, having been compelled to pay interest on their debts and hold low-priced grain in high-priced bins, they took advantage of this opening of the quota and the increased price. In 1944 the war was still on, and farmers did not know at that time that they would be chased and compelled to pay income tax. But a short time ago, at the time of the Christmas and New Year holidays, the farmers, at any rate around my part of the country, got some mail which was not very welcome. Letters were sent out containing income tax forms for the year 1944. Many of the farmers are still feeling pretty bad and pretty mad. Some of them stayed up at night trying to figure out their income tax. Thousands of them had not kept any track of their receipts or expenditures, and as a result they spent night after night trying to compute the tax as nearly as they could. In contrast to this, no effort was made by the government to visit the farmers in the depression years and find out what the losses were and try to compensate them or ease their interest rates, cut their debts or do other things of the kind. But after we had reaped, in 1944, one of the heaviest crops Canada ever produced, and in adidtion had delivered surpluses which had been piled up as far back as 1940, the government came along and says in effect, "The war is over, we need money; and if the farmer has no extra money perhaps he will be easier to deal with." So they demanded their pound of flesh.

This is made the worse because farmers realize that in the past there was only one period, namely between 1915 and 1919, when the farmers of this country received their proper share of the national income—that is, about 33 per cent. In the depression years many of the farmers lost their farms and their health as well. During the war years I know of some cases—perhaps there were many—in which the farmer's wife got out and worked putting up hay, harvesting, and doing other farm work, and possibly a year later found herself in hospital undergoing an operation and paying doctor bills. This is not right. Something should be done to make conditions on the farm such that the farmer's wife and daughter will not have to go out and do farm work. But the help was not obtainable and the farmer's wife and daughter got out and did it, and they are still suffering as a result. Those who held on to the farms are still, even to-day, trying to pay off their debts and to meet the load of interest which in many cases runs up to 7 and 8 per cent. Why that is I do not know, because in many cases the amount on which the interest is paid is nothing but a book entry. This should not be allowed.

Farmers also are aware of the losses they have taken on grain in the past. A few years ago, at the time the price of wheat was raised to 90 cents per bushel, I took the trouble to figure out the number of bushels which were marketed between the 1935-36 and 1942-43 crop years, on the basis of the price obtained for it, and also what the farmer should have

received had the grain been sold at what has been called parity price, $1.41 per bushel. I might say that this parity is figured on the basis of farmers receiving 16·6 per cent of the national income, when they were really entitled to double that amount. According to the amount I arrived at, during that eight year period the farmers of Canada sustained on wheat alone a loss of $1,220 million. That sum would pay off a lot of farm debt and provide for homes, better equipment, better machinery and other improvements. But it has gone as a direct contribution to the life of Canada, for which the farmer has absolutely no credit.

Let me go back a few years. I am not accusing the present government with respect to these conditions; I am taking the period 1930-40. I find that the farmers during that period received a yearly average 9·4 per cent of the national income. If you include a few of the good years by taking the period 1926-40, you find that during that time the farmers received 11·3 per cent of the national income. In other words, approximately 33 per cent of the population of Canada had to be content with and get along on 11·3 per cent of the national income. If we take that wonderful year at the depth of the depression—1932—the farmers of Canada received five per cent of the national income. I think it is about time this government did something about it, and about time too that those of us here who represent agriculture and all other national interests got on our feet and made a demand, not a suggestion, that something be done about this matter right away.

In view of present taxation and price inequalities, what is the attitude of the farmer towards greater production? I have tried to point out the conditions under which farmers have worked during past years. All of you know what the present taxation programme is. The married man, including the farmer, is supposed to be allowed an exemption of $1,200. Take for instance the man who gets $1,200 out of his grain and cattle or whatever else he may sell, and in the past has undertaken to raise hogs. Probably the average small farmer will raise about sixty hogs. He takes those sixty hogs and sells them at $25 apiece, and when he comes to settle with the income tax collector he finds that he has to turn over the proceeds of the sale of twenty hogs, or one-third of his production, to satisfy the income tax demand, simply because he has worked many extra hours on production. In many cases he has had his tractor going twenty-four hours a day. And that is the thanks the farmer gets.

One of my neighbours visited me shortly before I came here and said he was worried about his income tax. He is a man I have known for over thirty years, and he has worked all that time for farm machine companies and mortgage companies. In 1944, however, like many others, he took advantage of the quota on wheat and sold all the wheat he had in his bins using practically every cent of the money to pay off mortgages and machine company debts. Now he is faced with the problem of paying income tax on that. I couple of days before I left home he said to me, "Do something about this income tax in Ottawa, because I have to mortgage my land again in order to get enough money to pay the 1944 tax." That is the way in which the tax and price system operates to-day.

Some time ago we had an announcement that our wheat would be sold for export purposes at $1.55. I strongly protested against that. I do not want anyone to get the impression that I am not in favour of Canada giving wheat, at a good price, to Britain and other starving countries, but I do object to the farmers of Canada paying for the gift of the Canadian people. It is the gift of the Canadian people and the expense should certainly be borne by the Canadian people.

We were told that our wheat for export purposes would be sold at $1.55, but to make up for that we were also told that for the next four crop years our wheat would not be sold below $1 a bushel, f.o.b. Fort William. To the farmer in my part of the country that means 75 cents a bushel at the farm, and that is not nearly the price of wheat under present conditions. This again is government policy. Perhaps the government wants to get thanks from other countries; but again, as I said before, if it wants to get the cooperation of the farmer the government must pay in cash and not in credit or in flowery speeches.

It was announced yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the initial payment on this year's crop would be $1.25 a bushel. Under present conditions I am requesting, in fact demanding, of the government that they make that initial price $1.50, with participation certificates. World conditions to-day justify that price, and if there is to be a subsidy then it is the Canadian government's job, or the job of the people of Canada. Do not however continue to have the farmer make these gifts to other countries and bear all the cost himself. We are willing to produce the goods, and it is up to the government and the people of

Canada to pay us for that work. To encourage people to deliver old grain stored on the farm, make those deliveries of old grain income tax free.

With reference to the income tax, I am not for a moment satisfied that the exemption at present is adequate. I am suggesting that it be raised to not less than $2,000, and instead of the present system of computing the tax we should have one on a five-year basis. We have pointed out time after time that farming is such a risky ocupation that a period of one or two or three years is not enough. We should have at least five years on which to base our income tax.

There has been some discussion here and in other parts of the country of an agricultural programme for the coming year. In my opinion it is good business to adopt a sound programme for agriculture and stay with it. There has been some discusison in the past couple of days about summer-fallowing versus putting in every available acre. As a farmer who has made good with the help of Providence, a good wife and family and loyal farm help, I believe in the summerfallow method. We are expected to raise more grain, particularly in the next three or four years, and if we are consistently to raise more grain we should stick to the summer-fallow method. Show me the farmer who consistently sows every acre and I will show you one who will soon be going down the road without any farm on which to live.

As regards the prices of other farm products, I suggest that they all be raised to a level which will bring the farmers a proper share of the national income. After that is done, I suggest that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture as well as the Minister of Trade and Commerce go to church next Sunday and pray fervently for favourable weather, because unless we get favourable weather it makes no difference what policy is put into effect, we shall not get production.

In addition, more labour should be provided, because the farmer has been worked to death in the past six or seven years and it is about time he had some relief in that regard.

Let me read once again the following statement in the speech from the throne:

> The government is seeking by all practicable means to make available for export the maximum supply of foodstuffs. Every encouragement is being given to increasing production.

I emphasize those words, that every encouragement is being given to increasing production.

> The gravity of the situation demands, on the part of the people of Canada, a united and wholehearted effort.

[Mr. Fair.]

As I have already stated, the Prime Minister made his announcement about saving food in Canada and about greater production, and within twelve hours of that time—do not forget this—the wartime prices and trade board ordered the price of gasoline and the price of all kinds of fuel oils in western Canada increased two cents a gallon. Bearing that in mind, listen once more to these words:

> Every encouragement is being given to increasing production.

The government was not satisfied to have the people throughout Canada pay a three-cent war tax on gasoline, but in order in increase production, to induce the farmers of the west to grow more food which could be sent to Europe, they came along with another two-cent increase in the price of gasoline. We are also faced with increasing costs of other things we have to buy.

Recently there have been strikes in the United States and some in Canada. The demand was for more wages and shorter hours. What will be the ultimate result? Greater costs to the consumer; and the farmer, while he is a primary producer, is also one of the heaviest consumers in the country.

I think it is about time the government revoked Mr. Gordon's order of two cents a gallon tax on gasoline. Perhaps the Prime Minister will make a statement to-night, and no later, and also at the same time announce the removal of the three-cent war tax on gasoline. Let them take that five cents a gallon off, and if they want other sources of revenue they can page the Minister of Finance and ask him to deal with his friends, the chartered banks of Canada.

Again, we have a tariff structure which is bleeding the western provinces. If you want production, remove that protection. On many occasions I have given figures here showing that the western provinces were bled to the extent of from $25 to $30 per capita in 1931, while some of the other provinces gained to the extent of $15.15 per capita. Perhaps it is time to remove some of these injustices and do justice to some other parts of the country.

Then I believe the farmers of Canada could do very well with better homes, with electric lights, with bath tubs and washing machines; that they would like better outbuildings, perhaps machine sheds here and there to save their machinery, which at the present time is in very short supply. I do not know whether it is Liberal policy, but I heard a Liberal member say in this house that it is an extravagance for a farmer to have a bathtub. He went on to say that when he wanted a bath he had it in the wash basin. I hope

that is not Liberal policy, because the average farmer, including myself, wants something much better than a wash basin in which to have a bath. We also want to enjoy our radios, cars, water systems, electric light systems and so on, so I hope in the near future the farmers will be given a chance to provide themselves with these things which are long overdue.

I have spoken principally in connection with agriculture, and now I see my time is almost up. I had intended to deal with other subjects, but in the few minutes remaining I think I can say without fear of contradiction that if you have a prosperous agriculture all other classes in Canada are prosperous also. If you have a poverty-stricken agriculture, then every other group suffers. Perhaps I should say a few words about the soldier settlers, who are also in the farming class. On other occasions I have not allowed the debate on the speech from the throne to go by without saying something about them in particular, but since we expect a delegation from the soldier settlers' association to appear before the special committee on veterans' affairs, and since we expect that committee to recommend that they be given clear title to all their land, I am not going to plead for them at the present time.

Coming back for a moment to the question of the income tax, I know something of the sufferings of some civil servants and other workers during the war years. I know some people working in the service here in Ottawa had to send home for money in order to pay their room and board, or else go hungry toward the end of the month until payday came along. So I believe the time is long past when that class should be given relief from the present income tax levies, and I am suggesting that we bring the income tax exemption up to $2,000. There are other means of getting the necessary money, without keeping in the gutter the fellow who is down. Let us find those other means. Many people are pressing for housing which is badly needed, but until these restrictions are lifted and people are given some incentive to do an honest day's work it will not be possible to provide these homes which are so urgently required.

Then when people in industry and people on the farms finish their work; when they reach an age when they may expect to enjoy some well earned leisure, I believe we should have an old age pension for all without the means test. I believe this country can provide and should pay a pension of $50 a month at the age of sixty for both men and women. These people are not going to bury that money in the ground; they are going to spend it. They have earned it during their lifetime, but up to the present it has been stolen from them through poor legislation, legalized by the various governments in different parts of the country, and I believe that should cease. Without making any comparisons, I look back to a few months ago when I disposed of a team of faithful work horses I owned. I did not use them much during the past few years, but I did give them a good pasture in summer, a good barn in winter, and good feed. Then rather than see them suffer I took them out and ended their days. I have a little poem here which seems to pretty well describe the treatment we give many of our old people. It reads:

In heathen tribes, where skulls were thick, did primal passions rage,
They had a system, sure and quick, to cure the blight of age,
If one's native youth had fled, and time had sapped his vim,
They simply popped him on the head, and that was the last of him.
But in this, our enlightened age, we're made of finer stuff,
And so we look with righteous rage on methods so crude and tough,
So when our man grows old and gray, and bent and short of breath,
We simply take his job away, and let him starve to death.

I could go on and speak of old age pensions at greater length; I am going to do so on some other occasion when I have a better opportunity, but in order that some hon. members of the house may see the necessity for total revision of our old age pension set-up and the regulations governing it, which in many cases overrule the legislation itself, I should like to refer to a case which was brought to my attention just a few months ago. It is the case of an Irishman who lived in Scotland for a time and then came to Canada, with his wife. That was eighteen and a half years ago. His wife was the widow of a veteran of the first world war. As the result of both marriages this woman had a family of twelve children. Two of her sons served in the last war; one was wounded and almost passed away, but he is back in Canada and at present is on his own. This man is seventy-two years of age and is crippled with rheumatism. He has a rented farm which for the past two years has not produced enough to pay for the work on the farm. He is not able to work himself. They have one little girl at home for whom they receive $8 per month in family allowance. That is the only support the family has with the exception of $11.75 a week which is earned by the mother, who is fifty-five years of age and who works in a hotel in a nearby town. The father and little girl get along at home

during the week; on Sunday the mother goes home and does the housework, the house cleaning and the washing and so on, and goes back to the hotel Monday morning. This man has applied for old age pension, but because he has not been in Canada the full twenty years his application has been denied. I am not blaming any of the authorities; I am blaming the members of the House of Commons. It is our responsibility. Here we have in our midst a man who is not getting proper nourishment. I am not going into any further details, but this is only one of many cases I could relate.

We have too much food here; we cannot distribute it simply because man-made laws passed twenty years ago stand in the way. I wonder what is the matter with us. Are we all still in the stone age of economic thought? I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, to insist with me that these conditions must be changed so that our bounteous production may be made available to the people of Canada, and to the world after our own wants are supplied. There is a way, by which no man will be made poorer but by which the poor will be made richer. Let us adopt it.

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, at least once each year since coming to parliament in 1940 I have discussed a matter of urgent national importance, namely housing. It would appear, however, that the more frequently I speak the more acute the problem becomes. It is recognized throughout the world that the quality and quantity of houses available for citizens affect most vitally the health and welfare of the people. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, speaking in Detroit on September 9, 1935, on the occasion of her being present at the opening of one of the new housing projects in that city, said:

> This district has been expensive for the city of Detroit. Taxes are 92 per cent delinquent. Sixty-eight per cent of the dwellings have been condemned for human habitation. Records show crime to be six times the average for the city, juvenile delinquecy ten times the average, and tuberculosis seven and one-half times the average.

Then, I should like to refer to another internationally known person, Sir John Boyd Orr. In his recent booklet, "Design for Britain", he states:

> A higher incidence of disease in the slums makes a higher mortality rate. In Welwyn Garden City the rate is 5·9 per thousand. In Manchester slum areas it is 17·3. . . According to this estimate we bury every year 48,000 victims of bad housing.

Then he goes on to say:

> "It cannot be an accident that boys in one-room houses should be 11·7 lb. lighter on an average than boys from four-room houses, and 4·7 inches smaller . . . girls 14 lb. lighter and 5·3 inches shorter." any of the children who survive are in a more or less chronic state of ill health. It is from these slums that a great majority of hospital patients come.

I have argued that in war and peace time it is the responsibility of the federal government to face up to this national problem. I was disturbed by the Prime Minister's observations on Monday. He did not seem to be unduly concerned about the critical housing problem all across Canada. Indeed, he boasted about our satisfactory position as he saw it. Some hon. members on this side of the house questioned his statements, following which he proceeded in all seriousness to say:

> I ask my hon. friends to mention any other country. Will they say that in Great Britain they are in a better position as far as housing is concerned? Will they say that in the United States they are in a better position? Will they say the position is better in Belgium or in Holland; in Australia or New Zealand, South Africa or anywhere else? As a matter of fact when one compares Canada with these other countries in the matter of housing we make a better showing, in relation to our numbers, than any other country at the present time.

I was shocked when I heard the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) comparing housing conditions in this country with those in Great Britain and other countries which have been overrun by war. Certainly the people of Canada have more comfortable shelter than is available to people who have been exposed to warfare for so many long years. But the Prime Minister should not take credit for the fact that we have not been exposed to warfare, and that at the present time we possibly have better shelter for all the Canadian people than would be found in some European countries.

But the government of Canada has never given the sort of leadership the people might have expected. And, so far as his reference to New Zealand was concerned, the Prime Minister was quite wrong. The latest information from that country indicates that more than 17,000 state-owned houses have been built and made available for people in lower income brackets. The population of Canada is about eight times as great as that of New Zealand. If one multiplies by eight the figure I have given, he would get 136,000 as the number which should have been built by public authorities in Canada, had we been doing a job comparable with that of New Zealand since the Labour government took office.

Instead of that, however, I find that in Canada under National Housing we have built about 27,000 and under Wartime Housing about 16,000, or a total of about 43,000. One would need to multiply that figure by three before he would have a performance equal

to that of New Zealand. And there is no comparison between the quality of houses being built in Canada under Wartime Housing, and the permanent houses built in New Zealand.

But hon. members do not have to take my word for the claim that Canada is backward in the field of housing. I would refer them to the Curtis report, published under the supervision of the Prime Minister where, on the very first page, among the findings and recommendations, we read this:

> Finally, Canada has lagged behind the example of European countries, of Great Britain, and of the United States, in providing greater governmental assistance for housing as a matter of welfare and public concern. These substantial reasons put housing into the forefront of domestic post-war plans.

I notice that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) has just entered the chamber. The last time I discussed housing he was kind enough to interrupt me in connection with the situation in Saskatchewan. I have now before me a report prepared by the minister's department, before there was a C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan, in which housing conditions in the rural sections of that province are described. There is mention of that constituency represented for so many years by the Prime Minister. It is indicated that in Saskatchewan 2,711 farm dwellings were examined. Of that number 37·5 per cent were classified as being in poor condition, 56·5 per cent in fair condition and only 6 per cent in good condition. In the face of those percentages I do not see why any member of the government would care to accept credit for housing conditions as they are.

Last evening a number of members of the House of Commons went to the national film board to view some films dealing with housing and community planning. In all, five were shown, two of which were produced in the United States and three in the United Kingdom. It is significant that not one film was produced in Canada. If we have a record of which the Prime Minister is proud, why have we not films showing the people of Canada just what the government has accomplished in the field of housing? Why have we not films available for distribution in the United States, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Sweden and other countries showing the wonderful advances made by the present administration in Canada in the field of solving our housing difficulties.

I must not allow the references made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) to the subject of housing to go unnoticed. I agree with him when he states that housing is the number one national emergency. However, I was not greatly impressed with his suggestions as to how the problem should be solved. He intimated, not that the situation could have been avoided, but, as I gathered from his comments, that had he been Prime Minister of Canada, in some way or another our housing problem would be solved.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: It is understandable that some hon. members sitting behind the leader of the opposition feel that the housing problem could be solved, just like that—simply by marking one's ballot on election day, and by replacing one government with another holding exactly the same views.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Let me remind the house that the leader of the opposition for twenty years was premier of Manitoba. However, he did not say the other day that much had been done during those twenty years to improve the housing situation in that province. From the dome of the legislative buildings in Winnipeg it is possible to see some of the most disgraceful slums in Canada. I am not suggesting that slum conditions there are worse than anywhere else; but I have some pictures which disclose a pretty ugly housing condition in that city. Let the leader of the opposition tell us one thing that was undertaken to solve the housing problem of Manitoba during the term as premier. In Manitoba they have an abundance of cement and lumber, and they have a vigorous climate. They have all the factors that should result in the government on the provincial level facing up to the problem and providing some decent houses. My hon. friend suggests that the situation has grown worse, but I can show the house pictures of houses that have been occupied for some fifty years. They were occupied during the time the leader of the opposition was premier of Manitoba.

I do not wish to spend any more time in criticizing the government for what has been done. I think all hon. members will agree that this government must face up immediately to this problem and demonstrate to our people that we can do in peacetime the sort of thing we did in war time when we broke the bottle-necks that existed, when we established new records of achievement in every field of production.

I think the first thing we must recognize is that we shall have to have some plan. We shall have to work out some technique so that the federal government, the provincial government and the municipal government can participate. We have used the British North

America Act to pass responsibility from one authority to another. The result is that at the moment no level of government is taking the right type of action.

Thousands of our young people fought to save their homes. They have returned, and where are those homes that they fought to save? They cannot be found in Toronto, in Winnipeg, in Ottawa or in any city of Canada. If you do not believe me go to the reading room and check the want ad section of the daily papers from coast to coast. You will find pathetic appeals by ex-service men and their wives who want living quarters. They would be satisfied with anything. Even though rewards are offered, housing is apparently not available. So that the first job is to have the federal authorities take the initiative of bringing the provinces and municipalities together to sit around a conference table and decide on a technique that will result in houses being built. We solved many complex problems during the war, and it should be possible to work out the necessary details in order to set up the administrative machinery and get action at all levels of government.

In the meantime I should like to suggest a programme which I think is feasible, a thirteen point programme. We have had many programmes containing different numbers of points offered, but I think this thirteen point programme in connection with housing should be launched immediately. My first point is that we should stop the unnecessary export of building materials. I followed with interest the statement made yesterday by the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe). He did not seem greatly concerned about the large export of Canadian lumber. I am sure that all Canadians are anxious that some of our lumber should go to rebuild Great Britain and war-torn Europe, but I would remind the house that that is not where the bulk of our lumber is going.

During the Christmas recess I visited California and I saw a great many houses under construction. Some of our finest Canadian lumber was being used. I am most anxious that we retain friendly trading relations with our good neighbour, but with our housing situation so acute I do not think our neighbours to the south would expect us to deny our people necessary shelter while Canadian lumber is being used for luxury building in the United States. I saw a great many houses under construction, but I do not think any of those being built would cost less than $10,000. Perhaps it is no business of ours what type of houses are being built in the United States, but surely it is a matter of concern as to how much of our lumber is being exported and how much we are retaining for ourselves. The *Monetary Times* in a recent number contained a statement by the timber controller, as follows:

> "No change has occurred in the quantities that will be allowed for export," explained Canada's timber controller, D. D. Rosenberry. "The only difference is that producers now may ship that portion of their lumber to the countries of their choice."

In the United States less attention is paid to price ceilings than in Canada or Great Britain, and the result is that higher bidders will take all the lumber we wish to ship and the companies shipping lumber in this country can select the country to which they wish to ship. I notice in the same article that W. J. LeClair, secretary-manager of the Canadian lumbermen's association, says:

> If control were removed—within forty-eight hours we would not have one thousand feet in this country remaining in our possesion—legally and financially speaking.

Surely it should be the concern of this government and our people that sufficient lumber should be retained here to do the job of building decent houses for our people.

My second point is that we should prohibit deferable and non-essential building and stock-pile materials for housing construction.

Third, all building supplies in short supply should be rationed, giving top priority to housing costing under $5,000 per unit. Fourth, we should expand the production of materials to meet an objective of 100,000 housing units in 1946: This would provide employment for at least 250,000 workmen and would cost approximately the same as our aircraft production programme of 1944. I realize the difficulties that would be encountered, but when we consider our performance in the field of shipbuilding, aircraft production, tank production and so on, the building of 100,000 housing units in 1946 should be play compared with the difficult assignment carried out during the war.

Fifth, we should exercise better price control of building supplies and equipment until we make sure that there is enough material for all our people. In the United States congress there is now in committee stage a bill providing for ceilings on both old and new houses. In the original bill there was provision for $600,000,000 in the form of subsidies to keep prices within the reach of people who most urgently require accommodation.

My sixth point is that crown compaines should be set up to break the bottle-necks created by monopoly industry. As the Minister of Reconstruction told us yesterday, lumber

is not the greatest problem. We are short of plumbing supplies, electrical appliances, building boards and other materials. During the war the government of this country found it necessary to establish crown companies when private concerns were unable or unwilling to do the job. The building of houses is a most important job for us now, and certainly some of the crown companies should be reorganized to produce materials in short supply.

My seventh point is that we should ensure the training of workers in the needed building skills. Again we take our pattern from the war years. We trained inexperienced young men and women from farms, towns and villages in welding, rivetting and all the essential jobs in our war industries. We now have a similar challenge, and our inexperienced people should be trained in the arts of house building.

My eighth point deals with the labour problem that would arise. Naturally men in the building trades would be concerned if large numbers were to come into the building trades on a temporary basis. We should enlist the cooperation of the men in the building trades by assuring them that Canada is prepared to embark on a long-term extensive building programme. The Prime Minister referred to New Zealand. I have not forgotten the speech that the Hon. Walter Nash made when he was here during the early months of the war. Mr. Nash outlined the objectives of the Labour government of New Zealand in the field of housing and said it was their goal that every family should have a plot of land on which they could raise flowers and vegetables, that every family should have a separate housing unit and that every individual should have a room where he could close the door and say: "This is my room; this is where my books and papers will be left, and when I return they will be exactly as I left them." Such a programme has never been enunciated or accepted by any government in Canada. We certainly have done very little to see that that sort of ideal should be placed before the Canadian people. But if this government was prepared to say that Canada will use Canadian materials and Canadian working men to carry out such a programme, all the men in the building trades would be assured of full employment on a yearly basis for an indefinite period.

My ninth point is that section 9 of the National Housing Act should be amended, if necessary, to give the provinces and the municipalities the right where desired, to establish limited dividend corporations to engage in housing. It is obvious that the mortgage companies are not dealing with this problem as it should be dealt with, and where provinces or municipalities wish to deal with this emergency problem they certainly should have the right to do so.

My tenth point is that subsidies should be provided to make sure that the difference between what the worker can pay and what is economic rent should be bridged by some authority, and the federal authority is the one to make that gesture. It is recognized that a great number of people in every country do not normally receive a large enough wage or income to provide decent accommodation. I have here a little booklet entitled, "Planning the Canada of To-Morrow", written by Gordon McL. Pitts, president of the architects' association. I find that according to these 1941 statistics 10 per cent of our Canadian workers received an income under $400. If you assume that they could afford for rent 20 per cent of their income, that group should not pay more than $6.50 a month. Then 12 per cent received an income between $400 and $799, which would enable them to pay $7.30 a month in rent; 18 per cent received an income between $800 and $1,199, on which they could pay a rent of $20 a month; and 22 per cent received an income between $1,200 and $1,599, which would enable them to pay $25 a month rent. It also shows that 62 per cent of the population of Canada earned less than $1,600 a year, none of whom could afford to pay more than $25 rent and, as I have already pointed out, 10 per cent earned an income on which they should not be paying more than $6.50 a month rent.

Nathan Strauss, a pioneer in public housing in the United States writes in the "Seven Myths of Housing":

> The public housing programme is founded on the fact that, without government subsidy, decent housing cannot be put within the means of the families that live in . . . slums. This fact, distasteful as it may be to many people, is incontrovertible. History and mathematics both confirm it. To achieve the goal of rehousing those families, the rents charged can be little more than half the rents which must be charged in livable new housing erected by private enterprise.

The federal Government is the only authority financially able to provide these subsidies.

My eleventh point is that Wartime Housing should be continued. In view of the criticisms I have made of Wartime Housing in the past it might seem strange at this stage that I want to see it continued. I frankly admit that Wartime Housing constructed and made available at lower rates better housing than the people who live in these quarters would have had if Wartime Housing had not come into the picture. However, I suggest that Wartime Housing, instead of building temporary houses which will eventually become

slums should build permanent houses. It is unfortunate that Wartime Housing regulations, certainly in western Canada, have insisted that basements be not allowed. But the difference in cost between temporary and permanent housing is so small that I suggest that nothing but permanent houses should be built. In Great Britain, with a very short supply of materials, it has been announced that it is government policy that permanent rather than temporary houses shall be built. This will result in fewer houses being available at the end of 1946 but on the other hand the people who are housed in them will have permanent homes and the materials will not be wasted.

My twelfth point is that the National Housing Act should be amended so that loans might be made up to the full cost of houses. I understand that at the present time it is very difficult in most cities to get houses built at the valuation; that a house which costs $7,000 is valued for lending purposes at, say $5,000. A house costing $5,000 is declared to have a rental value of $4,000, and consequently the prospective owner must advance $1,400 to secure a maximum loan of $3,600. The act should be amended so that the prospective owner should not be required to make such a large initial payment.

My thirteenth and last point under this head is a recommendation that machinery should be established so that loans might be made available to farmers and residents of towns and villages under the National Housing Act. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) will probably reply that there is nothing to stop that now, but one of the returns brought down last year showed that not a single farm dwelling had been constructed in Canada under the National Housing Act.

I come to my next suggestion, which must be part of any over-all solution, namely that the provinces should be taken immediately into the confidence of the federal authority and the responsibility of each worked out, and then I suggest that the provinces should pass legislation defining the metropolitan and regional areas within the province. News items appearing in the Ottawa papers recently regarding disputes between the city of Ottawa and the township of Nepean indicate the problems that arise as we try to acquire land to solve our housing problems. The metropolitan cities in Canada or in any other country are a collection of a number of separate corporations, and if the housing problems of the people living in that area are to be solved there must be a larger unit that will have jurisdiction and authority to purchase land and plan and zone the communities.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

The idea of planning our communities is not a new one. In the days of the Romans the authorities worked out carefully prepared plans for their new communities. When they were establishing a new town they decided where the market should be, where the churches and the residences should be and what form of protection should be provided against a possible enemy. All these details were carefully worked out. But unfortunately in the building of Canada these factors have not been taken into consideration. In the building of our towns in the west, for instance, someone who owned some land and had some pull was able to get a townsite established on his section, and even though there might be good water and a good building site a mile away towns were frequently built on swamps or in the worst possible location. All this sort of thing results from the failure of the authority on the provincial level or on the national level to set up metropolitan and regional areas and plan their development. So that the job to be done by the provinces would be, as I see it, to make sure that they have their metropolitan and rural regional areas planned so that there may be an orderly development of the various communities within the province.

Other responsibilities of the province would be to set up limited dividend corporations and participate in the job of building houses, if necessary. They should allocate the dominion loans to the corporations and guarantee the repayment, and they should also provide for the building of houses in communities which have not been organized or in communities where the local commissions are failing to function.

A final word about the responsibility, on the local level of government, of the local authorities. Here is where the rank and file of the people must participate actively, in seeing that the slums are cleared, that the type of houses built are to conform with modern standards, taking into account our great resources and the type of housing we should like to have for ourselves and for our children. The local municipalities should appoint members to metropolitan or regional commissions who, with local members representing the provincial and federal authorities, would plan their areas, set priorities under the plan, buy, expropriate, hold and lease land, plan neighbourhoods, lease land for public housing, according to their over-all plan, and re-house those moved in slum clearance. It will be necessary, of course, for them to raise their share of the local funds required to carry out their programme.

In conclusion, let me summarize the responsibilities on each level of government.

Ottawa must provide enough building materials, must channel them to low-cost houses, provide funds for a large-scale housing programme, and make them available to provinces for low-cost, low-rent houses.

The provinces must promote the home building programme, co-operate with the dominion and the municipalities, set up metropolitan housing commissions, and help them plan and build neighbourhoods.

The municipalities must follow through on the local level, join the housing commissions to make them work energetically, and stimulate local interest and education for neighbourhood building.

Mr. BONA ARSENAULT (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, during the last session of parliament, a resolution was voted in this chamber, which read in part as follows:

> Resolved, that in the opinion of this house, it is expedient that Canada possess a distinctive national flag and that a joint committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons be appointed to consider and report upon a suitable design for such a flag . . .

The joint committee appointed held two meetings, on November 27 and December 4, 1945.

About fifteen hundred various flag designs were tabled before the members of the committee, who felt unable to formulate a specific recommendation in the short time at their disposal. A similar joint committee will be set up to continue the study of this important question at the present session of parliament.

Therefore the choice of a national flag for our country stands amongst the matters of major importance which will be dealt with by the members of this house in the course of the coming weeks. My intention in bringing this subject forward at this early stage of the session, and purposely before the flag joint committee resumes its work, is to give to this contentious but at the same time vital problem an entirely new approach, an approach which is not based on either English-Canadian or French-Canadian sentiment but merely upon daring logic. At the same time I am endeavouring to bring, in this important national issue, my modest but sincere contribution to national unity.

For many years there has been a growing sentiment in favour of a distinctive national flag in every part of Canada. Although a young nation, Canada finds herself to-day one of the important powers of the world. In the course of the last thirty years our country has performed great achievements from which Canadians derive a glowing national pride, and this translates itself into a distinctive Canadian spirit. This new Canadian spirit grew to unexpected proportions during these last war years, particularly amongst our service men and women. As a result, never before in our history has there been a time when Canadians were prouder of being Canadians. And anywhere in the world where a Canadian may go to-day, he is welcomed, he is greeted, and he is highly respected as soon as he identifies himself as a Canadian.

Certainly the time has come when that Canadian, proud as he is of his own land, should be given a distinctive sign by which he could easily, promptly and fully identify himself at first sight as being a Canadian. The time is now due when this country, our country, should be given a distinctive national flag by which she could distinctly identify herself from other parts of the world, a Canadian flag that would make every Canadian boy and girl live, not for the country his or her ancestors came from, one or two or three hundred years ago, but live for, work for, fight for, and be ready to die for his or her own sacred native land—Canada.

Nothing has contributed more to the rise of sectionalism in this country in the past than the lack of a national flag, in Canada and for Canada. We need a national flag, distinctly Canadian, which will recall to all Canadians that their hearts should be broad enough to love their family, their village, their province, but above all, their Canada, a national flag which will infuse into the hearts and minds of Canadians a sound sentiment of duty and responsibility toward their land, all of their land.

Had we all been true Canadians in the past; had we steadily instilled the principles of Canadianism, without hyphens, without descriptive prefixes; had we "let the dead bury their dead"; had we had a distinctive national flag, then most of the differences which tend to divide us Canadians of different racial extractions, especially in periods of national emergency, would never have arisen.

At this point, may I recall that perhaps no individuals in Canada hold more power in their hands to spread about unity throughout this country than the representatives of the Ottawa press gallery.

Speaking from the experience which I have gathered during the last session of parliament, may I add that in no other place in Canada have I found a more tangible and more sincere spirit in favour of Canadian unity than amongst our good friends of the press gallery. They can rest assured that their constant and valuable efforts in favour of bringing about

a better spirit of understanding in this country are widely recognized and highly appreciated by all true Canadians.

Other apostles of Canadian unity can also be found in the editorial rooms of many of our leading Canadian dailies, weeklies or periodicals as well as in the newsrooms of our broadcasting stations. To indicate to what extent the majority of Canadians of either language are able to agree on matters of principle pertaining to the government of this country, may I give as striking examples the editorials written day after day, and week after week, by two outstanding Canadian journalists. One is English speaking, the other is French speaking. One is Mr. B. K. Sandwell, editor in chief of *Saturday Night* of Toronto, whose editorials are widely welcomed in the province of Quebec as much as they are in other parts of Canada. The other is Mr. Eugene L'Heureux of Quebec city, who for many years contributed regularly to five daily newspapers in the province of Quebec. Mr. L'Heureux' daily editorials reflect the sentiments and the deep thoughts of the majority of the people of the province of Quebec, yet they could be translated and published in newspapers of English expression throughout Canada, and win the approval of most English speaking Canadians, as well as Mr. Sandwell's editorials could be translated into French and published in any newspapers of French expression and be well received by Quebec readers at large. What is the reason? Both are true Canadians, and represent each in his respective sphere the sentiments of all true Canadians of either language.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ARSENAULT: Mr. Speaker, the experience of two or more races working together hand in hand to establish the foundation of a great nation is not new in history. Right at our doorstep, in our good neighbour the United States of America, we have an outstanding example. Perhaps a more striking example is that of Great Britain herself. Look at the history of Great Britain from the year 1066, when William, Duke of Normandy, won the battle of Hastings and established his Norman legions in the British isles, until 1603, when the kingdoms of Scotland and England were united after centuries of strife and war; until 1707, when the legislative union of England and Scotland was completed, and until 1801, when Ireland was admitted into the union.

To-day we in Canada are facing the same problems that Great Britain faced some three hundred years ago, when the flag question was raised in that country. Let us see how the problem was solved in the British isles to the satisfaction of the different elements which composed the United Kingdom at that time. Let us trace the experience of the British people in solving a similar problem in similar circumstances under similar conditions; and then let us ask ourselves what our national flag should be in order to symbolize Canada and at the same time help bring about unity in this country.

A flag is a symbol, which stands for the principles for which a nation stands, just as the cross, for instance, stands for Christianity. Symbols stand close to men and interpret great ideas to them. They enable the imagination to maintain a grasp on vast abstractions such as the ideas of religion, of nationality, of country, of unity. In all ages and at all times, it has been so. The deeper we go into history, the more evidence we find that man, whatever his condition, his culture, his country, has universally displayed this innate instinct of glorifying some national symbol; but before the time of the crusades we cannot find evidence of any flag that could be described at national. It was not earlier than 1277 that the cross of St. George was definitely produced by Edward I as the national symbol of England. As to Scotland, it is agreed that the Scots had adopted the cross of St. Andrew as their national emblem at an earlier period, though we find the first evidence of this in 1365, when they planned to invade England assisted by a large contingent of French.

In 1603 the two kingdoms of England and Scotland were united under the crown of James VI of Scotland, who became James I of England. The approval of the two nations to tie their fate together did not immediately lead to unity between the peoples of the two countries. National differences ran high. It is quite interesting to note that the total population of both England and Scotland at that time did not quite equal the population of Ontario and Quebec to-day. The problems of unity between the two races were of the same nature as the problems of Canadian unity we have to face to-day. The question of a flag for the new British nation was handled with all the wisdom and far-reaching national sense that we Canadians ought to display in dealing with the same problem to-day.

How was this question settled in Great Britain 340 years ago? Did James I of Scotland try to impose the Scottish cross of St. Andrew upon the English people as a com-

promise? No; both the Scots and the English met half way. The year 1606 saw the birth of the first union jack, made by combining the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew in one field. It was not called Great Britain's flag; it was called the king's flag. Then by a proclamation issued by King James on April 12, 1606, it was ordered that England and Scotland were to retain their respective national flags. Twenty-eight years later, on May 5, 1635, King Charles I issued a proclamation giving further instructions as to the use of the flags, as follows:

> We . . . do hereby straitly prohibite and forbid that none of our subjects, of any of our nations and kingdoms, shall from henceforth presume to carry the union flagge in the maintop, or other part of any of their ships . . . upon paine of our high displeasure, but that the same union flagge bee still reserved as an ornament proper for our owne ships and ships in our immediate service and pay, and none other.
>
> And likewise our further will and pleasure is, that all the other ships of our subjects of England or South Britain bearing flags, shall from henceforth carry the red crosse, commonly called St. George's cross, as of olde time hath been used; and also that all the other ships of our subjects of Scotland or North Britain shall from henceforth carry the white cross, commonly called St. Andrew's crosse.

From 1634 until the death of Charles I in 1649 it was only on a few special occasions, and as a distinct favour, that merchant ships of either England or Scotland were granted permission to use the union jack. The execution of Charles I on January 30, 1649, for a time dissolved the union between England and Scotland. Under those circumstances the union jack was dropped, each country retaining its national flag. In 1654 Scotland was reunited to England and the cross of St. Andrew was reintroduced into the British flag on May 1, 1660.

I assume these facts are sufficient evidence that in Great Britain the flag problem was not solved merely by introducing a single flag by an act of parliament. As we have seen, each of the countries which entered the union retained its own national flag, and at the same time considered the union jack as the king's flag, the king's colours which they were permitted to fly under certain conditions, regulated by the king in council.

Now, without intending to trace the origin and development of the red ensign from the days of Cromwell, may I point out that 1707, when the legislative union of England and Scotland was completed, the use of the red ensign on all ships was officially authorized by Queen Anne. From 1707 until 1801 the red ensign was regarded as the only legal ensign of Great Britain. It was the red ensign, for instance, which in 1759 was flown by Wolfe's battleships cruising on the St. Lawrence river a few weeks prior to the historic battle of the Plains of Abraham where two great races fought on a common battlefield which was to become their common land.

A painting by Francis Swaine in 1760 can be seen in the Royal Museum of Ontario. It shows one of Wolfe's ships, HMS *Vanguard* anchored near Percé Rock, off the coast of Gaspe, flying the red ensign. By order in council of July 9, 1864, the red ensign was made the exclusive property of the British mercantile marine. In 1892, as the Canadian merchant marine was using the same plain red ensign as was used by the merchant marine of Great Britain and as Canadian ships at sea were unable to be identified from those of Great Britain, the lords commissioners of the admiralty issued a warrant permitting the coat of arms of Canada to be inserted in the red ensign; and this new combined red ensign was by this empowered to be used on board vessels registered in the Dominion of Canada.

Finally, in 1924 the red ensign, with the Canadian coat of arms, was authorized to be flown over all premises owned or occupied by the Canadian government abroad. That is, in short, the history of the red ensign as we see it on the Peace Tower to-day. It is not a Canadian flag. It is not a land flag. It is not even a flag; it is an ensign. Further, it is a naval ensign, the naval ensign of all British ships at sea, with the exception that it bears the Canadian coat of arms. It is British, not Canadian, and it is three steps down from the union jack.

With the coat of arms of Canada it is also the authorized ensign of the Canadian merchant marine. Therefore I suggest that it is not distinctive, and that it cannot be accepted as a distinctive national flag of Canada. Besides that, the adoption of it as our national flag would result in confusion and, in addition, it would be anti-heraldic, and illogical to fly it ashore.

An outstanding citizen from Victoria, British Columbia, Mr. Robert D. MacLachlan, in a pamphlet entitled, "What is All This Talk about a Canadian Flag?" had this to say about the 1924 order in council authorizing that the red ensign be flown on Canadian government premises abroad:

> It was however the flag of a colony. The position of the jack on the flag (upper quarter next to the flag staff) denoted the sovereignty of the British parliament over the Canadian parliament which was represented on the flag by the Canadian coat of arms on the fly—a position denoting inferiority.
>
> In 1924 Canada was legally a colony of Great Britain so the flag was then correct and in accordance with heraldic law.

From a letter sent out to the members of the Senate and the House of Commons in October last by the Toronto assembly No. 107 of the Native Sons of Canada, I quote briefly:

In a national flag if more than one emblem is displayed the upper lefthand corner next to the staff is reserved for the emblem of the dominant state, and the lower righthand corner on the fly is reserved for the vassal or subservient state.

A national flag speaks of the authority of the parliament of the country it represents. The union jack speaks of the authority of the parliament of the United Kingdom, and its inclusion in the place of honour in a Canadian flag means that Canada is a dependency of the United Kingdom.

May I quote now again, briefly, from an editorial published in the well known Toronto weekly, *Saturday Night*, on October 27, 1945, entitled, "Nation and Flag":

Surely the opponents of the official recognition of a Canadian flag must see, if they will look at the matter with their brains and not with their feelings, that it is fundamentally absurd for nation A, which is so distinct from nation B, that it can be at peace when nation B is at war and at war when B is at peace to insist that its flag and the flag of B are and must ever remain identical.

A national flag is a symbol of sovereignty. The sovereignty of Canada is vested in the Canadian people, as the sovereignty of the United Kingdom is vested in the people of the kingdom. They are not the same sovereignty. They do not need the same flag.

If there are any Canadians who should be entitled to have something to say about the choice of a national flag in Canada, I assume that this house will agree with me that they are those gallant, courageous and brave young service men and women who in this last war year after year—and they were long years—thousands of miles away from their native land were doing the fighting.

In the December 10, 1945 issue of the Canadian army forces newspaper *The Maple Leaf* published in London, England, I read that service men speak out loudly for a truly Canadian flag. May I quote briefly:

Reported erroneously in a Canadian dispatch as having been approved by the king as the national flag of Canada, but later found to be only one of a thousand designs submitted, the controversial banner incorporated a union jack in the upper lefthand corner, a sprig of three maple leaves in the centre of a white field and three golden fleur-de-lis on a blue circle in the upper righthand corner. That the matter of Canada's flag is close to the heart of Canadians overseas is shown by the fact that more letters were received on this subject in the past two days than on any other subject or controversy over an ordinary two-week period.

Here is a short quotation from an editorial published in *The Maple Leaf* on this subject entitled, "Ottawa Papers Please Copy":

[Mr. Arsenault.]

Who has a better right to voice their opinion on the proposed all-Canadian flag than the men and women of Canada's fighting forces now being demobilized?

Elsewhere on this page are excerpts from letters written by all ranks of servicemen and women of the navy, army and R.C.A.F. Almost of one accord they express a well-round "No" to the proposed flag, the sketch of which appeared in the December 6 issue of *The Maple Leaf*. We know that the story of this particular flag is not official, but it has served to uproot a flood of opinion that cannot be ignored.

A recent Gallup poll resulted in sixty-eight per cent of the people in Canada wanting an entirely distinctive flag. And now the voice of Canadians in the United Kingdom is being heard in no uncertain terms. We believe that their ideas should carry as much weight as Canadians at home. To the committee at home in whose hands lies the final selection, we say . . . please note.

In this convincing manner the editor of *The Maple Leaf* supports the opinion of his correspondents on the flag issue. And I sincerely hope that every member of the house will carefully note the opinion expressed by our servicemen and women on the choice of the national flag, such as outlined in *The Maple Leaf*. With them I repeat:

Who has a better right to voice an opinion on the proposed all-Candian flag than the men and women of Canada's fighting forces now being demobilized?

And I will add: Who knows better than they the meaning of sacrifice for country?

At this point I wish to make a clear distinction between a national flag, an official flag and an authorized flag or ensign. Canada has an authorized ensign and an official flag. Canada has as yet no national flag. Canada has had an authorized ensign since 1892. That is the red ensign with the Canadian coat of arms in the fly which was authorized for use by merchant vessels registered in Canada. That was confirmed by the Canadian Shipping Act of 1934.

Canada has had an official flag since 1911. The union jack was officially declared to be the proper flag to be flown on land in Canada. I cannot think of any reason, historical, constitutional or otherwise why the union jack and the red ensign should not be retained in their particular places to fulfil their particular functions, one as our king's flag and the symbol of our membership in the British commonwealth of nations, the other as the ensign of our merchant ships, with perhaps a maple leaf in the lower righthand corner instead of the coat of arms of Canada.

All nations of the world at all times have used different flags for different tactical purposes. Those flags have been described as national, official or authorized flags or ensigns. Speaking before the joint committee on December 4, 1945, the Secretary of State (Mr.

Martin) declared that Great Britain at present uses over one hundred different designs of national, official or authorized flags or ensigns. Those who go to Montreal once in a while can see in the Windsor station over twenty-one designs of British flags. Prior to the last war France was using at least seven different flags which were entirely different from one another. Besides the tricolour there was the Tripoli merchant flag, the Algiers flag, the Tunis flag, the French Cochin-China flag, the kingdom of Siam ensign and the Madagascar flag.

To-day the United States of America are using at least six different flag designs. There are the stars and stripes, the President's flag, the United States union jack, the United States yacht ensign, the United States revenue flag and the Hawaiian flag. Although Hawaii is a possession of the United States, their flag has nothing at all of the stars and stripes in its design. Another example, is the island of Malta which is a British possession. They also have a national flag which has absolutely nothing in common with the union jack. As we all recall, that flag is the Maltese red cross on a white field. There are scores of other examples that could be given all along the line.

As do other leading countries of the world, Canada may use different designs of flags, either national, official or authorized, for different tactical purposes. Canadians could at this time, on behalf of unity, take advantage of these exceptional circumstances and the great interest aroused by the choice of a national flag to settle once and for all, not only this matter of the choice of a national flag for Canada but the whole question of our Canadian flag and ensigns. This should be settled by an act of this parliament of a free nation.

Since Canada is a member of the British commonwealth, united to her sister nations under the constitutional authority of the same king, I cannot very well see why anyone in this country could reasonably object to the full-sized union jack being officially recognized by this parliament as the official symbol of our partnership in the commonwealth, the finest example in history of mutual friendship between nations and one of the strongest means of maintaining peace in the world in these trying days.

Too much is involved to try to put forward any sort of narrow nationalism in the face of the distressful conditions that we find in the world to-day. Not only should we help to maintain the British commonwealth of nations, we should have a commonwealth of all the nations of the world based on the same principles of mutual friendship and collaboration. The union jack is here to stay, to stay as long as Canada is ready to share her obligations and the benefits of her privileges as part of the British commonwealth of nations. There is a great principle involved in this issue with far-reaching consequences which cannot be overlooked by anyone. As a French-speaking representative in this house from the province of Quebec may I say that Quebec will be the last province of Canada to pull down the union jack. Our religion, our language, our civil rights were guaranteed and granted to us French-speaking Canadians under the union jack. As the right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) stated in the house on November 13, 1945:

> It is under the union jack that the institutions of this Canadian nation have grown and developed and have brought us to the point where now, and for a good many years now, the dominion is and has been an autonomous state subject in no phase of its domestic or its external affairs to any other authority than this Canadian parliament.

I notice that my time is just about up, but with the unanimous consent of the house I should like to finish stating my conclusions. They will take only a few more minutes. The province of Quebec also remembers, as much as any other part of Canada, those uncertain and crucial days of 1940 and 1941 when there occurred the collapse of France and of all organized armed resistance on the European continent, when the United States had not had Pearl Harbor and when Soviet Russia had not yet entered the war. Quebec realizes that we French-speaking Canadians or English-speaking Canadians would all be slaves of Germany to-day had it not been for the three crosses of Saint George, Saint Andrew and Saint Patrick which were joined together and lifted proudly by Great Britain along with the dominions against the enemies of mankind.

As evidence of this contention and without any discriminating intentions, may I say that while the red ensign, the authorized flag of our merchant navy, is flown on these parliament buildings, the union jack, the full-sized union jack still unfolds itself to the breeze on parliament hill of Quebec only a few acres away from the very spot where 187 years ago two chivalrous and gallant soldiers, Wolfe and Montcalm, sealed the fate of this country.

Canada's constitutional position to-day with respect to Great Britain is similar to the position of Scotland with respect to England from 1603 to 1707. For over one hundred years the two kingdoms of Scotland and England were united under one king but had separate parliaments. For over one hundred years, from 1603, the year of the union of the two kingdoms under one king, until 1707, the year of

the legislative union of the two countries, each of these nations had their national flag but both nations used the union jack at the same time as the king's flag, the flag of their union under the same king.

To-day Canada is constitutionally an equal of Great Britain. Each country has a separate parliament but both countries are united under the same king. Each country has the same symbol of allegiance to the king, the union jack. Canada has an official flag, the union jack. Canada has an authorized ensign for her merchant marine, the red ensign. Canada now needs a national flag such as both England and Scotland had prior to the legislative union of the two countries. Therefore, I propose, as the only possible satisfactory and final settlement of the flag issue in Canada, the following, which will undoubtedly win the almost unanimous support of all true Canadians of whatever racial extraction or language:

1. That this parliament of a free, autonomous and independent nation reconfirms the union jack as Canada's king's flag and as the official symbol of our country's partnership in the British commonwealth of nations.

2. That this parliament maintains the red ensign in the functions it has filled ever since 1892 as the naval ensign of Canada's merchant marine, with possibly the coat of arms being replaced by the maple leaf.

3. That this parliament gives to the Canadian nation a national flag, which will not be an English-Canadian flag, or a French-Canadian flag, or an English and French colonial flag, but an all-Canadian national flag.

Speaking in this house on November 13, 1945, the right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) declared:

> The purpose for which it is suggested there should be a distinctive national flag is to have a symbol that all Canadians can look upon as distinctively their own, not because they want to discard the union jack, but because the union jack is not distinctively their own and because they feel that their nation has now reached the stature in the family of nations that requires it to have something which can be regarded as its own.

On February 14, 1938, when the flag questiontion came up in this house, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) made the following statement:

> The use of the union jack on anything that is distinctively Canadian in the United States does not help to emphasize the individuality of this country or its distinct nationality; it helps to submerge them together.

The hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), speaking in this house on the same subject on November 8, 1945, said:

> We in Canada have shared the union jack, and we shall always honour it as the symbol of much that is best and most precious in our heritage; but we have had nothing that has been peculiarly and indisputably our own, that would symbolize Canada, all of Canada and everyone in Canada. There should be something that all can see and look to with pride, as the symbol of this great nation of ours, to which affection and loyalty can attach, and which can become the sign of the unity and purpose that will make Canada great.

One final quotation. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), speaking in this house on November 8, 1945, said:

> I wish to see Canada with a distinctive flag, and in my opinion the red ensign with a coat of arms on it, which I would rather say nothing about, is not a distinctive flag. . . . The flag of the British commonwealth is the union jack, and we respect it, but I am pleased indeed to know that my hon. friends to the right are prepared to recognize that the time has come when Canada should have a flag of her own.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is a free nation, just as politically free from Great Britain as Great Britain is free from her, and certainly more economically independent from the British isles than she is from us. Therefore a national flag for Canada must not constitute the symbol of what Canada was when she stood as a colony under the supreme authority and jurisdiction of the imperial parliament, but of what she is to-day, an independent nation, a respected power amongst the nations of the world.

Like most countries Canada has a symbol which is recognized the world over as the expression of Canadian nationality. That emblem is the maple leaf. On this one thing we find the Canadian people almost unanimous, that the maple leaf must be given the position of honour in the proposed national flag if it is to be an all-Canadian flag.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless the hon. member has the unanimous consent of the house to proceed I must ask him to resume his seat as his time has expired.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak as a private member of the house and as a member of the opposition. I have consistently supported certain principles ever since I came into the house.

First I wish to congratulate the government upon writing off the $400,000,000 owed by Britain to Canada under the commonwealth air training plan, and next I congratulate the government upon advancing a loan to Britain to facilitate the exchange of exports and imports between our two countries.

I should like to say to the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Arsenault) and to the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) that had it not been for the glorious young Canadians and young men from the other dominions who stood by Britain's side when she had to go it alone at Dunkirk and afterwards at Dieppe, we might have experienced the awful horrors of war on our own Canadian soil, the concentration camps, the whip, the gestapo police, the loud speaker and savagery—and the carting away of thousands of the people of Quebec, Ontario, and the maritimes as thousands were carted away from countries ravaged by the German war machine. Now is the time for cool heads, clear thinking, and plain speaking. There is a great deal of kindness in this House of Commons. I found that out years ago when I first entered the house, but the time has come to pay tribute where it is due, to Britain for saving our shores from invasion.

Speaking of the glorious part that France played in the war of 1914-18 and of the tribulations which that country suffered and her triumphs I would remind the house that Mr. Churchill said that France will always be a great nation and ally of Britain, and we all hope that it will be restored very shortly.

I wish to congratulate the government on the appointment of that great soldier, Lord Alexander, to be governor general of this country. In the session of 1943-44, in a debate on external affairs, I proposed to the Prime Minister that after a great war we should follow what was the custom in that great land to the south of us where, following the war between the north and the south, great soldiers were elected to be president of that great country, and that similarly we should appoint a great soldier to be governor general of Canada, and in that debate I proposed that either Lieutenant-General Montgomery or Lieutenant-General Alexander be appointed the next governor general of this country. I hope there will not be any departure from that principle of a great Briton being appointed, which has been observed since confederation. Appointments from the old land act as a system of checks and balances. It is a system which harmonizes parties and eliminates party strife, and the various great men who have occupied the office have done a great deal for the welfare of our empire and of mankind.

I have referred in this house from time to time to the principles which I continue to support. As you know, Mr. Speaker, Christianity is part of the law of England, and by the Constitutional Act of 1791 it became the law of Canada. Certain principles should be supported in these debates. These are some economic truths which should be an aid: To uphold the Christian religion and resist all attacks on it. Adequate security against external aggression and safety for our seaborne trade. An armed Britain forever aided by Canada. The maintenance of internal law and order, that all men may reap what they have sown. Impartial justice administered by a judiciary free from any interference or pressure on the part of the executive, and I want to compliment the member for West Calgary (Mr. Smith) on his able address last night in the liberty of the subject. Sound finance and strict supervision of our national income and expenditure. Continuous and long-sighted development of our empire trade, without which Great Britain and her dominions will perish. The promotion of all measures which will improve the health, happiness, welfare and social conditions of the people of this country as a whole. Support of private enterprise and initiative as against state trading and the nationalization of industries. Go not with the multitude to do wrong. Always tell the truth to the people. You can ask a sacrifice of the people without fear, but to offer a bribe is dangerous. While it is not the empire's business to be the policeman of the world, it is equally not our job to be its governess. Trust the people and they will trust you.

I say to the government of the day, do not be afraid to tell the people that you have made a mistake. The Canadian people do not expect its leaders to be gods. Lastly, never legislate against human nature.

There are four cardinal principles which we in this country have forgotten, although I believe they are intimately connected with our greatest domestic problems of the present time. They are as follows: parliamentary reform, constitutional reform, cabinet reform and law reform. Twenty years ago they got law reform in England. In this matter we are twenty years behind the times. Long overdue is the consolidation of our statutes, which I have urged for a number of years, as also has the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) since he came to the house. The code was written in 1907. As the debates have shown, our laws need overhauling.

A day or two ago there was introduced into the legislature of Ontario a budget which forecasts a deficit of $21 million, and which is another evidence of the need of a new charter for the provinces. When all is said and done, such conditions were beyond the

scope of the imagination of the fathers of confederation. The provinces were created, one might say, for political and not economic purposes. As I have said before, they are only a duplication of the municipal system. But if their powers and rights and privileges under section 92 of the British North America Act are taken from them by this parliament, the time must come for writing a new charter. They are here now to stay and have a function and a duty to perform in confederation, and it is not right to take their revenues away from them and then expect them to meet post-war conditions. I look upon the province of Ontario as a forgotten child of confederation. Some years ago, together with my friend Mr. McCrea, of Sherbrooke, then a very much respected government member, I asked a question which was the subject of joint returns, which showed that forty-three per cent of the cash taxes of this country are paid by Ontario, and about forty-one per cent by Quebec, so that eighty-three per cent of the cash taxes of this country are contributed by the two industrial provinces. I have always been in favour of the principle for confederation, the old Cornish battle-cry, "Each for all and all for each." I believe that principle is yet sound. I never heard before 1939 the argument that the province of Ontario is living off the west; I am sure it is not right, either in the economic sense, the historical sense, or any financial sense The time has now come when something should be done on this subject and the government must find a solution of the problem in the coming dominion-provincial conference. Ontario needs active help and at once to meet her functions.

I should like to say a word in reply to those who raised the question of providing food for Britain. It is proposed that we should have a much greater food production. I remember that in the session of 1938, three months before Munich, and again in the spring of 1939, when the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture were before the house, and I saw the war coming, and when the British Medical Association were meeting in London, I proposed that this country should establish underground food reservoirs to store our wheat, food and canned goods in the old country. At that time Canada had a preference for wheat in the mother country. Yet there were those on the prairies who contended that theirs was a free trade industry, that it was a north and south industry instead of an east and west industry to Britain and her allies. That was proven to be a fallacy. At the meeting of the British Medical Association it was shown that hard wheat could be stored scientifically and kept good for ten years over there, and not the Canadian wheat bootlegged the way it used to be along the harbours of the seaboard on the United States side. Had such war food reservoirs been established and wheat stored there, consider what the position would have been in the spring of 1940 and in 1941 when, during the great battle of the Atlantic, the mother country had only two and half weeks' supply of food. We abrogated the British preference foolishly on wheat by the United States treaty of 1938 and threw away our preference. I mention this to indicate what might have been done in view of the war, at a time when, I believe, we had half a billion bushels of wheat available a year, instead of paying an acre bonus not to sow it at all.

On this matter of food production I doubt whether the government has gone far enough. It is all very well to talk about summerfallowing and that sort of thing; the grain could be sown now and shipped next fall to the markets in Europe, where suffering is so intense. If we go into the production of coarse grains and turn them into pork it will be some time before the product will be obtained. I believe that my leader, the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Bracken), was quite right in calling the government's attention to that particular point.

I support this loan to Britain because it is founded upon a sound basis, namely on the exchange of goods and services in the form of exports and imports. It is not like the United States loan, which is simply an exchange of goods for gold or for debt. Why was that debt of Britain incurred with our great ally to the south? It was incurred to save the shores of America from invasion, and we must not forget that very little in the way of cash will be obtained from the new American loan. Moreover, when we remember that the loan is tied up with the Bretton Woods agreement, the success of which is very doubtful, tied up with the abolition or curtailment of preferences and with other conditions, I believe that the Canadian government has made a good exchange in the loan of $1,250 million. I should like to see the loan to the mother country from the United States withdrawn. Canada has the services that are needed. She has wheat, flour, manufactured goods of all sorts, canned goods and all the rest of it, and I see no reason why the other dominions, Australia and New Zealand, could not take up the balance of the loan of four billions, if we increased our loan, so as to give the mother country a chance to recover. It would help to pay the debt which, after all, America as a

whole owes to the mother country for protecting our shores, because there is no doubt in the world that the mother country has saved from invasion not only the shores of Canada, but New York, Boston, and Savannah, Georgia, where the Bretton Woods people met to-day.

I have said before, and I repeat, that the United States government always speaks with two voices, the congressional voice and the voice of the President. Do not forget that the American government is not the American congress. I doubt whether congress will agree to the loan until next fall and then only on certain conditions that Britain will not be able to accept the loan.

I was in Cleveland the other day, in Buffalo and in some other cities in the United States and I found out what former members of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation had been doing. Upton Close and others who think like him were before and for a year or two on the payroll of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation at one time, and I remember calling the attention of the government to the fact that the C.B.C. were hiring aliens here to spread news unfavourable to this country and the empire and the cause of the allies. As a matter of fact, at that time the C.B.C. was one of the most mischievous institutions in Canada. It was sending out information which it had no right to disseminate. What did Upton Close say in Cleveland the other day? There appeared in the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* advertisements of his views for meetings, in which he said that the British empire is on crutches and is nearly at the end of its day. Similar views have been expressed by others. I have here reports of speeches made in the old country commenting on all this, but I will not take the time now to quote from them. I wish to protest against the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation being used in this mischievous way at a time when the mother country has suffered so severely. We find twenty-six thousand church and school buildings destroyed over there, while not a farmhouse, not a barn has been pulled down, as a result of the war, either in Canada or in the United States.

Surely we can pay tribute to the mother country for what it has done and not cavil about a measly loan. As a matter of fact, some of the best businessmen in the country, Liberals too, have pointed out that the loan to Britain is a splendid business proposition and should be extended. I believe it could be increased to two and a half billions over two years, and the other two billions could be taken up by New Zealand and Australia, many of whose wonderful products have been displayed from time to time at our exhibitions here.

The Canadian people are long suffering, but there is a limit to their patience. That limit has been reached. As a result of mistakes made in the war and in the reconstruction period so far, they are losing their confidence in all governments. They believe that there has been overgovernment and overtaxation in Canada, and they are losing their confidence not only in the administration but in members of parliament as well. They are becoming critical of the work that is being done in the nation's various legislatures. The worst of it is that the public are not really acquainted with the facts in any situation that confronts them. They cannot get the truth and the whole truth concerning any problem that faces the governments of Canada. No; they have been blindfolded. They have not been given the real, actual facts. We have had a control system in this country throughout the war—we still have it—which has virtually made the work of the House of Commons unnecessary. We might as well have gone home and locked up the House of Commons, for in part the nation's affairs in the war have been handed over to boards over the head of parliament, over the law courts of the country, without any public regulation whatsoever.

There is now too much soothing syrup being poured over the radio by controls and bureaucrats. There is too much of that sort of thing being dished up and served for the purpose of making Canadians happy. There is no sacrifice that Canadians will not willingly make in this time of peace and reconversion, just as there was no sacrifice during the war which they were unwilling to make. But the people should be given the facts. There is a great deal of waste in Canada to-day. I have seen in our cities and towns in various parts of the country garbage collectors picking up half loaves of bread and all that sort of thing. There is too great a waste of food and something should be done about it, and I am glad to see the government starting a conversion and saving campaign.

I do not mind saying that in my opinion the government is taking a step in the right direction, but it should have taken that step long ago. I repeat, the people of Canada want to know the truth about the conduct of public business, and not necessarily the official truth. The fact is that we did not get the official truth about the spy business. We have always had spies in this country. I have seen them in Ottawa attending sport contests and regattas before the last war—Ribbentrop, Von Papen and the like. In this

house I complained at one time about one embassy in Ottawa which represented the puppet government of Premier Darlan, and another French Premier Laval, who was executed a comparatively short time ago. I asked the government in this house a question about that particular puppet Petain—Vichy government of France in Canada, but I got no satisfactory answer. They had a big house here. I often saw many people going into it though I was never invited myself. I asked, was an inspection made at a dark time of the war? Was that house ever closed up? In an order for a return I asked whether there had been any inspection of it. We had submarines coming up the St. Lawrence and there was a debate in this house, behind closed doors, on the subject. I do not know what happened because I did not attend the private meetings, but I do know that the Petain embassy in question was allowed to stay open, and the heads of it are still in Canada. You need not talk about spy business. Spies are located everywhere in this country, and other countries during and after every war. In fact, they know more than some of us do in this house.

We have seen in the city of Ottawa a large basic industry doing more to solve the unemployment problem than any other agency, the business known as the embassy cure for unemployment. They have gone on the high seas, below seas and up in the air. In fact, I saw the deputy leader of the C.C.F., the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), the last day I was in the house, sitting beside the Minister of Soldiers Welfare (Mr. Mackenzie). It was at the last session, but unfortunately I had to go home at the time. It was about the 7th of December. I said to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), "You had better be careful about the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. You had better give him a bodyguard when he goes to the UNO, because I understand he flew as far as Moscow, and he might have been kidnapped." I say that Ottawa is full of these ambassadors of foreign countries; here at the opening of parliament there were forty-six of them and their deputies in the house. I do not know what they are going to do in the hot weather here if they all wear uniforms, swords, epaulettes and steel spurs; but I do say we are making ourselves ridiculous with all these Canadian embassies scattered all over the world. What do these men do? Well, the Canadian envoys make speeches all over the seven seas, and it is costing a great deal of money to maintain these embassies abroad.

That is something I should like to see the Conservative party deal with. I am a Conservative, and have never been anything else. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) said I was the only "true blue" left. I have always been a progressive Conservative; but with all the principles I have supported from the time I was on the Toronto city council, I do not think I need call myself a Progressive Conservative. Let the Conservative party stand firm on the ground that the state exists for the individual, not the individual for the state; that state interference with the full liberty of the subject is an evil thing *per se*, the encroachments of which should be most searchingly scrutinized and resisted; that no government department, except where it enjoys a monopoly, can conduct business at a profit; that the prosperity of the nation rests on the enterprise and ability of individuals in free association to conduct their affairs with a minimum of regulation and interference; that capital and labour are partners and not enemies, indispensable to one another; that bureaucracy is the enemy of both and will ruin them morally and financially if they do not restrict its inordinate increase; and, finally, that what the Conservatives seek is the welfare of the whole community, and no sectional or class advantage.

In the debate last year, on September 11, 1945, I referred to the insistent demand all over the country that there should be some declaration of policy by the government in regard to its various control bodies, but I find that little or nothing has been done. At the present time all kinds of bodies are spending money like water, over the head of parliament. As I said in this house on September 11, 1945:

> Every principle for which the British nation struggled in the old land since the 17th century has been surrendered to the political caucuses. Parliament itself, which came into being to ensure that taxes shall be voted only by those who have to pay them, has become the institution through which those who do not pay them impose them on others.
>
> I want to emphasize to the committee that powers of legislation older even than the right of taxpayers to determine the national expenditure have been surrendered, and if we are to continue this sort of thing the power of parliament will be gone forever. Whole spheres of activity, involving the livelihood of every man, woman and child in this country, have been removed from the jurisdiction of the law and of parliament and reserved for the determination of tribunals, irresponsible, irremovable, governed by no control and subject to no appeal. . . .
>
> I come from a very large taxpaying city. The working class have to pay a 12 per cent sales tax, and the burden of taxation is very heavy upon them and upon business firms in the district. Some small business men have been put out of business altogether.

Let us stop feeding inflation by these huge expenditures. In Washington they propose to reduce expenditures by at least fifty per cent,

while we are increasing them by leaps and bounds. We should call a halt to this sort of thing. The trouble is that we are only holding a postmortem when we come to this house. I was glad to see the new auditor general's report, because three or four years ago I had a letter from Mr. Sellar, who at one time was secretary to a very good finance minister, the late Mr. Robb. I was complaining that he had not the powers of the former auditor general, John MacDougall, who would raise questions in the back of the auditor general's report, pointing out to parliament the errors made in the name of the state. I am glad to see there has been an improvement in the last auditor general's report. We all know what happens to an individual or to a nation which goes on borrowing and does not keep its finances within bounds. It becomes bankrupt. When you continue to spend more than you make and keep on borrowing money to make up the difference, you know the result. You know, too, that a big chunk out of every dollar a working man earns and spends is used to pay taxes. There is a sales tax on almost everything he buys, so that everyone should look at the way the government is spending our dollars. In my opinion the government should begin now to live within its means. During the war of necessity we spent huge sums of money; yet now, with the war over, the government proposes to spend much more than in any pre-war year. Most thoughtful people believe that government expenditures are now far greater than they need be. They believe that the government. like a family, should live within its means that it should not spend more than it takes in and that it should not keep going deeper into debt; yet that is exactly what is happening to-day. Our government is spending millions more than it takes in, and it continues to borrow or add taxes to make up the difference. That is the sort of money handling that causes inflation. Economy in government means money in your pocketbook. If the Canadian people will act to reduce government spending and take steps to increase production, inflation will be stopped; and this is the only way in which it can be stopped. I urge this house to cut the cost of government, to eliminate all waste, all unnecessary services and postpone all expenditures than can be put off until our war bills are paid. Mr. Truman has adopted that policy, and I urge the government to start living at a level that we can afford to maintain. We shall soon see the result in the cost of everything we have to buy, food, clothing and everything else. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) had a good example the other day of what is happening. You cannot buy a shirt here, yet he saw dozens of them in the windows in Jamaica. I suppose they were sent there in exchange for some of that wonderful rum; I suppose that would be considered an exchange of goods and services.

I wish to ask this question of this House of Commons, because I see a large number of returned soldiers here to-night as members of the house. What is to be the future position of the soldiers who are returning home to Canada? The trials and troubles and evils which brought about the second war are still with us; certainly at least the economic ones are: lack of housing; lack of employment; the return to old jobs; hospitalization for themselves and their families, and so on. Look at this housing situation. It brings to mind the situation at Bethlehem, where the Son of Man had to find housing in a manger. We seem to have made no improvement at all in our housing policy since that time. This matter has come before the house in season and out of season, yet nothing has been done about it. I will tell you what is the difficulty in connection with housing. In 1935 the Bennett government at least did one thing; it appointed a committee to deal with this matter. There was a good deal of debate on a motion of mine, but that committee was appointed; it brought in a report, and the present government which came in in 1936-37, lent 89 millions of dollars for the construction of houses. I objected to the creation of a great housing department, and at that time labour and building materials were also scarce; yet under that policy the whole constituency of York West, the constituency of York South, the constituency of York East, and the northern portions of the constituency represented by the hon. member for Eglinton were built up by loans through the banks at three per cent by private enterprise. Thousands of houses were built there. Why cannot it be done now? And yet we see all these controls, so much so that our soldiers cannot get into the houses they bought on an agreement for sale, because of this infernal control system. I was in a number of houses the other day, and I know the tenants under controls were making a profit out of them. Down in one basement one could operate a building business in a residential district. Then, there was a little bit of an attic in another house about twice the size of the top of this desk with cooking stoves. That is what happens under this rent control system and irksome controls. Remove them.

I suggest that some of these housing controllers in Ottawa who sit in the swivel chair—

that is the way the hon. friend from Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) describes them—should go up and see some of those houses in our Canadian cities. Let them go and see what is going on. Why do they not have inspectors? Let them go to those homes and find out why returned soldiers cannot go into the houses they have bought on sale agreements and check up the abuse of the control system and huge profits made by some tenants.

Why do they not remove these controls on labour and materials? They can build dozens of theatres in Toronto—dozens of moving-picture theatres. Yes, they can get lumber and building supplies for all that kind of thing. They can get plasterers, bricklayers and all the tradesmen they want for theatres. But they cannot get enough lumber and materials to build ordinar houses.

The mayor of Toronto has been complaining to Ottawa about this as have representatives from other municipalities. I am not referring to only one city, because I receive letters from all parts of Canada complaining about the same thing, the evils of rent control.

The time has now come to get at this housing problem, and do something about it. In 1938 the whole world suffered from social disorder in those countries that allowed it. Difficulties arose because of ham-stringing state control in some countries where social acts had led to great change. Let us see the cause and effect of all this. In 1938 half the world lived isolated behind controlled currency rates with no human intercourse beyond the confines of their own countries. There were state controls at home. Six years of the second world war broke down aggressive tyranny in Europe and Asia. Yet it is a fact that more of the whole world is living under state direction than when the war began. To-day two-thirds of the world are suffering from state isolation and restriction of the individual.

Some countries not touched by the war are affected by the isolation of their neighbours, with no human intercourse as yet. At the same time numerous bureaucratic officials are given visas and foreign currency to spend.

Then, a committee was appointed to look into the coal situation, and to bring about a national fuel supply. Away back in March, 1923, I first proposed a national coal supply so that all our coal might be mined under the British flag, including the maritimes, Alberta and Wales. Eventually this government adopted that suggestion, and large amounts of coal are being moved from the maritimes to the head of the lakes. The difficulty is to a great extent one of transportation. We have very heavy winters, and in view of that the time has come when something should be done to assure a steady coal supply, and not the coke now sold as coal from the United States.

We know that by a process of lease-lend British bases were given up from Newfoundland to British Guiana and at other points for the use of fifty old United States warships, on a lease of bases. Half of those warships were useless. Many of them had to be taken to dry dock during the battle of the Atlantic. Yet all those are charged against Britain. Why should those bases not be charged up to lend-lease? A lease of ninety-nine years, practically freehold, should be charged up to lend-lease; that is where it belongs, and the ninety-nine year lease cancelled. I say that because of those fifty old ships only a very few had any value. Britain's battle of the Atlantic saved millions of people in America from axis invasion.

Something should be done about this. The freedom of the air and of the seas is vital to the British empire, more vital to it than to any other country or group, for the defence of the British empire to a high degree depends upon the unmolested transport of goods and passengers from one quarter to another.

The British empire is indeed the only political unit whose existence depends entirely on air and sea-borne traffic. Its over-dependence on foreign trade increases its need for command of the air and of the seas in certain areas and of the force to maintain that command. The United States could dispense with foreign trade to a great extent, without any great sacrifice or vital threat to its existence. China and Soviet Russia are similarly placed. But the British empire, western Europe, South and Central America are dependent upon foreign trade, and therefore on freedom of the air and of the seas.

I object to all this wild talk about internationalism. And what about the giving up of British bases on the seven seas? Russia was not in the war for two years. As a matter of fact, Russia had a trade agreement with Germany. The United States was not in the war for two and a half years. Where would we have been had we to share all British bases in the seven seas at Aden, Gibraltar, the Cape, Hong Kong and Singapore? We would have had to remain neutral, too. Did you ever hear tell of such a thing? Have we heard of such a thing as giving up British bases to foreign countries? The war would have been won by Germany. Give foreign countries all the raw materials we can give. But sovereignty?—no. That is one of the matters I have discussed before.

In conclusion, I wish to say a word about our old ally, Russia. Let us not forget that

she was an able ally of ours. We must remember what she did in this war. As Mr. Churchill said when he spoke at Fulton and Richmond, and again in New York, the hope of the world is that Great Britain, the United States and Russia may work together and cooperate for the good of civilization and of the world in general in peace as they did so well in war. If we can carry on in that way, it would be far better than any league of nations.

Speaking last year, I referred to the league of nations. The only league of nations which was ever successful was the British empire. If we want to have internationalism, then let us start right there.

Russia believes that she is free to do as she likes in eastern Europe. She is not playing the game with her other allies. But I would ask hon. members not to forget that during the closing years of the first world war the Russian people were in the grip of a national revolution. The result was a humiliating surrender by the Russian forces to Germany at Brest-Litovsk, a surrender which would have permanently enslaved Russia to Germany if the United States, the British empire and France had not continued the war in spite of Russia's defection from the anti-German coalition.

At the present time she is not playing the game. But it is only a battle of nerves. I do not believe there will be another war. Russia wants security on her own terms in countries she has captured and invaded, and more room to reach the sea. She will not be happy until she gets it, and she intends to hold all she has obtained and reach out for more.

It will be recalled that on December 10, 1945, there was a meeting in Moscow between Mr. Bevin, Mr. Byrnes and the Russian officials. I believe they agreed to give Russia what she wanted in Japan; yes, five times more than she lost there in war forty years ago. Those two honourable secretaries agreed to support the puppet governments of Roumania and Bulgaria. All this was agreed without the dominions knowing anything about it.

Then, further, they agreed to everything that was done at Yalta. Who was present? It was Russia, the United States and Great Britain. They practically settled the peace of the world and the peace of Europe, even before the coming peace conference. It cannot be changed at that conference.

Then, what was done at Moscow? What did Mr. Bevin and Mr. Byrnes do? They went to work and left out France altogether, and instead of the big 5 went back to 3 again —France should have the Ruhr valley; she should have the Rhine, because twice in our generation she has been invaded. Yet, as I have said, they agreed to recognize the Soviet puppet governments in Bulgaria and Roumania. They consented to exclude France from the treaty making in eastern Europe.

As Mr. Churchill has said, they did all this to aid Russia and to remove suspicion. True, Mr. Bevin did object to the eastern situation and the Dardanelles; but that had no effect at all, because Russia is bound to have authority and to give effect to her ideology. Communism will be revived by Russia in those invaded countries; there is no doubt about it. She is going to hang on to every foot of territory in Europe acquired with her army and navy. Mr. Churchill referred, when speaking in New York the other day, to the UNO or "you know who". We are at the parting of the ways. We may believe in miracles, but I think that Mr. Churchill deserves a great deal of credit for having placed the cards on the table and telling the people the whole truth and nothing but the truth of the aims of Russia. If we had had that kind of talk before this war, there would not have been a second war.

Mr. L. PHILIPPE PICARD (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to follow the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) in his trip around the speech from the throne, but there is one item in his remarks with which I differ particularly and I feel I must say a few words about it. The hon. member criticized and tried to ridicule our ambassadors and our diplomatic service. Petty criticism of that nature made by hon. members, just as that made a year or two ago by a newspaper correspondent of the expenses of our ambassadors, is a great disservice to the country. Canada is a great country emerging on the international scene and she must have a competent diplomatic service.

I saw the evolution of our diplomatic service during the years I was in contact with its members when on many occasions I accompanied the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe to imperial or international conferences. I think we have as good a staff of men as or in some cases even better than, the big powers. We should make life in the service more comfortable and free from worry and criticism. We should pay them more generously from the rank of third secretary up to that of ambassador. I hold no brief to speak for the personnel of the Department of External Affairs, but I think it is only fair to say the good I think of them especially when they have been doing such a good job.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is more responsible than anybody else for the

organization and expansion of and impetus given to our diplomatic service. This is but one of his many achievements in the international field. He can be justly proud of the men he has gathered around him to help shape our foreign policy, to carry on the work of the department and to represent our country abroad.

I should like to say a word or two of special tribute to the people with whom I was associated on the delegation to the preparatory commission of the united nations, especially those who were sent from the House of Commons, my good friends, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Winkler). I think the best possible spirit was shown by that delegation. If any of us had political prejudices they did not show up. We made a good family together because we did not feel we were representing any party but that we represented the government and, above all, the people of Canada. I think it is only fair I should say that all those delegates as well as the experts from the Department of External Affairs deserve the congratulations of the house.

As I said a moment ago, we have in external affairs a body of men who are highly trained, who are hard working, but who are strangely unpaid. This is not said in criticism of the Prime Minister or his deputy minister, but I do want to offer a word of advice to the press and to the house that better service will be rendered to the country if the government is encouraged to lift the standard of pay of our diplomats. During the early stages of their careers when these men have to spend many years in acquiring knowledge they are greatly underpaid when compared with the returns that could be obtained in business. A young man in business may have some value, but certainly he has not the cultural achievements possessed by our officials in external affairs.

I intended to devote all my time to-night to a question that is foremost in the mind of everyone, the ways and means of building a solid foundation for a lasting peace. I do not intend to pose as an expert in international affairs, but a study of these matters was part of my earlier training, already a good number of years away, and they have been more particularly in my mind since the Prime Minister paid me the honour of asking me to be a delegate representing Canada at the meeting of the preparatory commission of the united nations in London. I wish again to thank the Prime Minister for the confidence he has shown in me and for the opportunity he gave me to come in contact with the diplomats and statesmen of the world and to study at close range and, may I say, under the appropriate surroundings the problems that may affect the reorganization of the world and the equilibrium necessary for peaceful intercourse between nations.

Canada, less than any other nation, cannot afford to remain aloof from international affairs, nor can we feel a disinterest in the shaping of world policies. It has been said during the last six months that should there be another war Canada stands the danger of being in its path, of being to a certain extent the battleground for the opposing forces. Any student of world affairs will understand the possibility of this event which would have been unthinkable a few years ago.

Entirely opposite conclusions have been drawn from that fact. Some offer the argument for our tying our fate exclusively with that of Great Britain, while others argue that we should remain untangled. A prominent historian in Montreal lately claimed that we are now in that position because:

> We have tied our military systems and our destiny to Anglo-Saxon imperialism.

I think that last view is denied by a mere look at a map. Due to the rise of our two neighbours to first place among the nations of the world we happen to be geographically in a strategic location. That has nothing to do with our commonwealth ties and can in no way justify our remaining indifferent to the fate of Britain or neglecting our friendly connections with the United States. The other view is also false because it is not so much our British connections that will help us in our predicament as the power of our neighbours to the south. We must be practical enough to realize that.

However, one way or the other the prospects do not look too good for the furniture, as the man said whose house lay in the path of a tornado.

I am mentioning here just one selfish reason why Canada of all nations must not be disinterested in the outcome of the game now being played by the big powers in order to conceal the real appetites and the real struggles that lie at the base of all the present unrest.

Above this national motive there is one that goes deeper. That is the realization that our world has to become one world or stop being a world. Therefore all states must cooperate for the betterment of international relations by the removal of sources of discord, whether they originate from overambition on the part of some states, from fear for security on the part of others, from reluctance to grant to others the privileges

which one enjoys or from economic reasons or rather a lack of balance in the economies of nations.

Some will say that peace will be assured when the causes of war are removed. This may sound evident, and yet it is not a definite and broad enough solution because by the very nature of man and human institutions causes of conflict are ever present and ever resurging and can never be permanently removed. We have the evidence of it in the relations between individuals, but if social intercourse has been regulated among individuals so can it be regulated among nations. The more disturbing causes of discord can be removed by agreements and compromises, and the innumerable points of contention between smaller states or between groups within states can be ironed out by this process; yet that alone could not bring about conditions of lasting peace.

There are only two ways open to humanity at the present time to avoid chaos or extermination, and they are correlative and both essential.

The first is the establishment of world institutions for the preservation of peace supported by the will and determination of peoples who realize what would be their fate in the event of another conflict; who are ready to make the necessary sacrifices and concessions to bring about more justice and equity in the world and who are determined to submit to the higher authority of the assembled nations. It is not necessary to meditate long on events of the past or to be a psychologist to know that this is a formidable enterprise.

How can you couple world democratic institutions to the realities of power politics? If your world authority is based on parliamentary institutions, how will you determine your units of representation? If you accept as a basis the rules of the former league of nations or of the actual organization of the united nations you give in your assembly one vote to each sovereign state, and there you are forced by the realities of power politics to create a higher body, which was the council of the league and which is now the security council, which has authority for the maintenance of peace and the use of force against delinquents and on which the big powers reserve the right of veto; that is, the right to prevent their being punished, within the framework of the organization in case of delinquency on their part.

About this veto, it might be interesting to note an incident that happened during the last meeting of the security council. Upon one occasion Russia invoked the right of veto on an appeal by Syria and Lebanon. A vote ensued. Some delegate questioned the right of Russia to exercise the right of veto. On that vote France and Britain, against whom in fact the right of veto was used, voted to sustain that Russia had the right to use the veto. The big five powers were united in insisting on their respective rights to use the veto if necessary in their own interests.

Why are we forced to have a council? Because that unit of representation in the assembly is undemocratic and does not take into account the potentialities of states for the waging of war. It is undemocratic in this way, for example, that the United States, which is the first power of the world, with a population of 135 million, has one vote, while Latin-America, with a population not half that of the United States and not one-tenth its military, economic and financial strength, has twenty votes. Syria and Luxemburg with very small populations have the same vote on the assembly as the United States. The result of this system is that proportionately the vote influenced by one citizen of Syria could affect 135 citizens of the United States. On the other hand, if you have representation by population, you will have China and India able to impose their will on the world.

No matter how you devise your unit of representation, it is fraught with danger. Unless human nature could be changed there will always remain the possibility that the most powerful will have the more to say in the running of the world. Yet does that mean that no attempt is to be made at having world institutions for the preservation of peace? On the contrary, it shows the necessity of having an organization devoted to the settlement of international disputes and equipped to regulate relations among nations.

I share the view expressed by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) yesterday that, despite the cataclysm it has gone through, humanity is not yet ready for a world parliament, and it would be inadvisable at this moment to press for its organization; but, on the other hand, I also share the views of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that it is the ideal to aim at, no matter how far it may seem out of our reach.

However, we must have world institutions, and I think the ones that resulted from the conference of San Francisco, from the work of the executive committee and of the preparatory commission, are such as we may be encouraged and be assured that we have as workable instruments as may now be forged with which to work for the maintenance of peace.

We know enough of these institutions to make it unnecessary for me to enter here into details of their functions and powers. I might be permitted, however, before I come to speak of what I consider the second way open to ensure the maintenance of peace, to give a few impressions I got while at the preparatory commission.

I have returned convinced that the delegates assembled in London were aware of the importance of making a success of the new organization and that they were all anxious to cooperate in the framing of institutions within which all nations may work to preserve their security and ensure better conditions for the world to live in.

I am familiar, of course, only with the work of the preparatory commission as I was not present at the meetings of the assembly, and it is true that we were still in the elaboration stages, but that period was all the more important because then were drafted the regulations and were devised the means to put into effect the statutes enacted at San Francisco. It was constantly evident that any differences between delegates were motivated by a desire of each, according to his concepts, to ensure the security of his country and to prevent the possibility of peace being endangered by other nations. There were no sombre motives behind the objection of any country to the wording of a specific rule, but the eagerness to make sure that it would not work contrary to its purpose.

It would be wrong to assume, as certain people have insinuated, that the Soviet Union was aiming at rendering UNO inoperative when it pressed for certain amendments or objected to others. I am still convinced that it was as keen as the United Kingdom and the United States as well as Canada and any other nation to work out an instrument by which to render possible the putting into practice of the principles of the united nations charter.

The differences that exist between the Big Three and more especially between Britain and the Soviet Union, and that came into the open during the first session of the assembly and the security council, are an entirely different matter, and I will touch upon them later in my remarks. They go far deeper than the setting up of the machinery needed for the establishment of a medium of intercourse among nations.

Somebody wrote in the press at the end of the first session:

> UNO has deceived the hopes of humanity aspiring for a just and lasting peace; the result of this first experience is that union among the great powers has been compromised in London.

[Mr. Picard.]

I think this statement is neither fair nor accurate. If there is a lack of union amongst the great powers, it cannot be attributed to the faults or deficiencies of UNO. It results from their lack of confidence in one another for the solution of problems which concern their vast conflicting interests.

I think on the contrary that there now exist well organized institutions which offer the best means devised to date to force the airing in the open of problems that may affect the peace of the world, whether these problems are presented in their true light or disguised in order to influence public opinion in other nations.

UNO constitutes the most advanced medium of regulating international relations ever agreed upon by the nations of the world. It is far from perfect, but we must give it our wholehearted support because it is one of our only hopes of succeeding to avoid conflict and therefore chaos.

Before I pass to the other part of my remarks, I should like to congratulate the Prime Minister on the decision which he took before San Francisco to include in delegations members of all parties. It is essential that Canada's foreign policies shall have some sort of continuity. If unanimous agreement cannot be arrived at in each party, at least some people of culture and ability and a sense of responsibility can be made aware of what is going on and can transmit to their political friends the motives and the reasons for certain decisions being arrived at. I think we may at all times, without violation of our convictions, develop a national point of view whereby Canada, like the United States and many other nations, will be able to present a united front in foreign or international affairs. One sees now in England at the foreign office a staff of men, directed by Mr. Bevin, consisting of people of varying convictions on political and social matters. I believe that Mr. Bevin has brought to the British foreign office, through his vitality, his energy, his vast intelligence, new life and new "pep" to an institution which was venerable but which, I will not say was in need of, but would welcome new blood and new life, which he surely has the personality to provide. The British delegation was of one party only, the government party. The United States had with their delegation a prominent republican lawyer who, though he has never been in politics, is an important influence in his party. I think that was a really wonderful departure, and one which will ensure harmony if the practice is maintained.

UNO, Mr. Speaker, represents the legal way, the nearest approach to the ideal way of establishing conditions conducive to a lasting peace, but it will be made workable and its success possible only if the second way to ensure the maintenance of peace in the world is resorted to.

No matter how well have been devised the organizations whose aim it is to preserve peace, peace will be secure only if and when the nations who have the potentialities to wage war are determined not to wage war. Peace, and I do not mean by that the settlement of all contentious or litigious questions between small nations, but peace that is the absence of war and the establishment of decent relations among peoples, will be possible when the big powers have ironed out their difficulties and not before. Let us not fool ourselves; the real difficulties are not those that are brought into the open. Britain and the United States are not offended at Russia's prolonged stay in Iran because it is a violation of the sovereign rights of a small country, nor is the anxiety of the Soviets for Greek democracy the reason of their protest to the council over British occupation in Greece, and the same applies to Indonesia or Syria and Lebanon. The game is a game for positions on the chessboard of Europe, and the pawns are the strategic points each one is anxious to acquire control of or not to lose the effective control of.

It is evident that the Bevin-Vishinsky duel, however it may have appeared in press reports, was not a personal fight. Both talked for mighty empires, which are, respectively, Russia the second and Britain the third power of the world, whose interests are conflicting on many points of the globe.

Ideologically the British socialists would seem to be related to the Russian communists in this, that both derive their collectivist theories from Karl Marx and Engels. However, everywhere throughout the world to-day the proponents of these two theories of social administration are strongly opposed to one another. British socialists have constantly resisted the infiltration in their ranks of communist sympathizers. Attlee, Bevin, Morrison, and before them Ramsay MacDonald and Arthur Henderson, have always opposed communism, and even more state capitalism, which would seem to be the system now in force in the Soviet Union.

This antagonism has nothing to do, however, with the present conflict. It results, according to me, from the fear and the lack of confidence in one another of two states eager to assure their security, one of which tries to capitalize on its victory to realize century-old dreams, while the other tries to prevent that in order to maintain unchallenged century-old privileges.

Let us consider objectively the situation of the three big powers.

Britain has, over a period of nearly three hundred years, built the most powerful empire since the Roman empire; it has been through its mastery of the seas the only world power up to the beginning of this war. Its security was guaranteed, first by its fleet but also by the maintenance of a divided continental Europe where no state could absolutely dominate the others. During the course of the last 150 years this security has been menaced by the Napoleonic adventure, by the German ascendancy, initiated by Bismarck and culminating in 1914 by the imperialist ambitions of Wilhelm II and finally by the nazi onslaught. On these three occasions England mobilized all its energies and succeeded in preventing invasion and, through coalition with other states, in vanquishing her enemies.

The alliance with Russia and Prussia brought about the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo; the Franco-British alliance, aided by the United States, Italy and Japan, won the first great war; the concerted efforts of Britain, the United States and Russia, assisted by all the united nations, have finally overpowered fascism and nazism.

After avoiding all these dangers, Britain succeeded, after each war except this one, in re-establishing in Europe conditions such that no state could by itself be a menace to world security for a time to come.

The establishment of coalitions or blocs of nations, in order to bring about a balance of power among the states of the continent, has been the best guarantee of Britain's security.

To-day, on the day following an Homeric fight from which she emerges much weaker and poorer, Britain sees on the continent a power stronger than herself, whose potentialities, despite its terrific losses, are not to bring quiet to the minds of British leaders.

During the course of the war, Britain accepted agreements intended to give Russia guarantees of security for the future which she judged indispensable. She accepted the Russian claims on the Baltic states and the settlement of the Polish problem. She recognized that the Russian zone of influence should include Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Bulgaria. All this was probably done with reluctance and fear, but it had to be done. This fear no doubt grew when Yugoslavia and Albania came within the Russian sphere and when the Soviet ambitions began to resemble very closely those of Tzarist Russia.

The naval power of Britain, while guarding the safety of its communication lines, was the cause of its supremacy in the world and partly accounts for its wealth. She faces today a Russia getting more powerful. While she had always relied on the balance of power in Europe, she now foresees the Soviet Union dominating continental politics and approaching the North sea; she takes note of Russia's ambitions in the Mediterranean and the middle east and realizes that she may soon have a knife in her throat. This is why she appears determined to resist with energy any future Soviet expansion.

As to the Soviet Union, let us also consider her problem objectively. Twice during the last 150 years Russia had some of her provinces invaded and owed her salvation not only to her obstinate resistance but to the help received from maritime powers. Her security depends, above all, on her western frontiers. Russia has obtained and wants to maintain a sphere of influence in the states adjoining those frontiers.

Whatever may be the objections one has to communistic doctrines, one cannot deny that her past experiences justify Russia in ensuring that she has friendly neighbours. I cannot agree with the imposition by force of any form of government in a country, but these neighbouring countries were at one time or another during the war Russia's enemies, and as a winner she uses her rights to further her security and protect her borders.

The British seem to think that Russia's claim goes farther now than a mere anxiety or eagerness for security. There is evidently for a victorious state the temptation to live its dreams. Russia lacks outlets on warm waters. Her only ports free of ice year around are Murmansk on the Arctic ocean and Vladivostock on the sea of Japan.

The control of the Dardanelles by Turkey, the control of the eastern Mediterranean and of the Red sea by Britain, as well as the zone of British influence in Greece and Turkey paralyze Russia and prevent her from having, in all security, any access to the Mediterranean.

However, the Soviet Union has now by its influence in Yugoslavia and Albania a word to say on the Adriatic, and it might take away from the British, or render unsafe, the use of the natural harbour of Kotor on the Dalmatian coast.

The Americans appear less directly concerned with the European imbroglio, but Russian power is not to reassure them. However, unless unforeseen events are precipitated, there are few points where Russian and American interests are directly in conflict at the present time. But let us not forget that the United States have also considerable oil interests in the middle east and that their interests are tied up to a point with those of Britain, and it is highly improbable that they may remain neutral if war breaks out between Britain and Russia.

I may say, though, that Churchill's speech in Fulton, according to me has done more harm to the cause of British friendship in the United States than may be realized here. I was in New York at the time and came in contact with many people sympathetic to Britain who strongly objected to Churchill's speech. The general opinion on the street was: "Why should our sons die for the safeguard of British imperialism". And yet there is friendship for Britain in the United States. That speech was not timely or helpful. However, it is evident that, in the event of war, if the United States did not join Britain it would face Russia the next day.

Soviet Russia dominating all Europe, succeeding to Great Britain in the control of the Mediterranean and the middle east and part of Asia, would be a terrific menace to the United States. The United States cannot remain aloof from the differences that crop up between Britain and the Soviets.

I cannot agree with the hon. member for Peel that Bevin and Vishinsky spoke clearly and put their cards on the table. If they did, they were double-sided cards and only one side showed. There may have been strong talk in the council and blunt answers, but I do not consider this an improvement over the polished language of old diplomacy. Calling anybody a liar is not considered acceptable in good company. I cannot find it better, far from it, when said around the green tables of diplomatic conferences.

When I say that they did not speak clearly I mean that they have spoken for the gallery. They have enunciated great principles and have built a case to influence world public opinion, but they have not shown their real game. They have spoken of the defence of minorities and of their respect for democratic principles, but they have not spoken of oil, or of tin and rubber, or of naval bases or of lines of communications.

I say and repeat that the present fights in the united nations organization are fights for position and that the real problems are debated in the secret reunions of the foreign secretaries or the discussions of their experts, and the real fight centres around the terms of the peace treaties that are being drafted.

The treaty with Italy is, according to me, one of the bones of contention, not as to what will be abstracted from Italy but as to how the partition will be done. The Italian colonies and the Dodecanese islands offer probably the most difficulty.

The region of Trieste-Fiume is disputed by Italy and Yugoslavia. I believe that Britain favours as a solution the establishment of an international free port in Trieste, in the manner of the Hanseatic ports of the middle ages, so that it may serve all central Europe. The Russians must insist on giving most of the region to Yugoslavia, their friend, or, in the event of a free zone being established in Trieste, will ask for one in Salonika, and the British will oppose it.

Italian North Africa offers more problems; the Soviets want a base in Tripolitania; they also want one in Erythrea on the Red sea, as well as one of the islands of the eastern Mediterranean. The most that Britain might be ready to concede is to internationalize Tripoli, like Tangier.

Then, there are the Dardanelles. The Russians since the days of Peter the Great have aimed to get control of them. Mr. Churchill the other day, in New York, was ever so scandalized at the idea that the Soviets want a fortress to control the straits. He thinks it is enough to give Russia assurance that the Dardanelles will be free in war as in peace, under an international authority, and assimilates the Dardanelles to the Rhine and the Danube. The Soviets assimilate the straits to three others, two of which, Gibraltar and Suez, are controlled by Britain, while the third, Panama, is controlled by the United States. Would the United States and Britain be ready to internationalize effectively these three gateways of the world? I doubt it. I am not saying this because I sympathize with communistic views, nor because I want to defend Russia, far from it, but because I want to be objective.

In conclusion, I may say the ideal way to ensure the maintenance of peace would be through a world parliament, and failing this we have in the united nations organization a workable instrument.

Second, peace will be secure if the Big Three agree to talk plainly and compose their differences and have enough confidence in one another to accept compromises and adjust world privileges to the new relative status of power amongst themselves.

In common language, the question for the big powers is, do we share the spoils equitably and then, when our positions are strong and secure, do we become virtuous and live under international law as the reformed gangster often does in national life, or do we start fighting amongst ourselves as to who gets what?

Allow me to conclude on a more idealistic note by quoting the words of Nicholas Politis, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece and one of the world's most famous international jurists, written in 1924:

> We must now realize that the era of compulsory justice in international affairs has started. After so many centuries of crises that at times divided them and at times united them, modern nations have definitely adopted the ideal of justice that, since so long ago, an enlightened humanity has strived without avail to attain. Slowly, timidly, they are bringing it about. The first hurdles have been cleared, another has just been undertaken.
>
> The ultimate aim is still far away. There lies ahead a long road strewn with obstacles. Incessant efforts will be needed before the work can be completed.

Hon. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the address in reply to the speech from the throne I am breaking a rule of twenty-five years standing in my own political life. I do so because I fear that the matter I desire to discuss this evening may not be discussed later in the session, and also because I wish to take advantage of the kindly intimation by the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) that he felt it was a salutary thing if his actions in matters extraordinary, such as those we shall discuss to-night, should be criticized in the House of Commons, perhaps in the view that should other occasions arise under similar circumstances the man charged with the responsibility of putting into effect legislation, procedure and methods similar to those which have been put into effect in these circumstances, might hesitate to some extent before doing so.

I am fully aware that what I shall say to-night will not be popular either in this house or, where it means the most, at home. I shall be charged on the one hand with biting the hand that fed me, and on the other hand with being the reddest of red communist. I do not think I need say to this house or to those who in all probability will follow me and accuse me of being a friend of the communists, that by education, by tradition and by the religion to which I belong I have opposed nazism, fascism and communism; and it is because I fear that there is a tinge of some of these isms in that which I propose to criticize to-night that I rise in my place on this occasion.

Following along the lines of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and the lines of the excellent discourse by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith), I pro-

pose to divide the matter which is being discussed into two parts, the international and the internal. Internationally I have the fullest confidence in our present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie King). I believe he will handle this matter without sabre-rattling, without war-mongering, with dignity and in the best interests of Canada. With regard to the Canadian element let me say this. I yield to no man in my hatred and contempt for those who may be found guilty of this the most heinous in the whole category of crimes. As the hon. member for Calgary West said, it is only by accident that they are not being accused of treason. They are being accused of something else; if they are found guilty will be found guilty of the lowest form of criminality, of having betrayed the secrets of their country to a foreign power; and the people of Canada will expect swift and exemplary justice to be meted out to them, as they are entitled to the greatest and swiftest measure of justice that our criminal code and out statutes provide.

I should like now to say a word with respect to the legislation itself. May I digress here to say that I freely acquit the Minister of Justice of any desire to mislead when he told the house there were no secret orders in council. I have known the Minister of Justice for twenty-five years. I have admired him as a citizen; I have admired him as a lawyer, as a man of honesty and integrity. I admired him fifteen or twenty years ago when, I think as president of the Canadian Bar Association, a citizen in no way involved in politics, he went out of his way, in an address which was often quoted in this house, to defend the liberties of the subject and to stand up for a constitutional form of government in this country.

Let us see what has happened in the way of legislation; but first perhaps I had better read the magna charta. The most important and most famous article in the magna charta is this:

> No freeman shall be arrested, imprisoned, dispossessed, outlawed, banished, or hurt in his person or property, nor will we—

Meaning the king.

> —in person or through our officers lay hands upon him save by the lawful judgment of his peers, or the law of the land. . . . We will to no one sell, deny or delay right or justice.

Let me place alongside of that the order in council, P.C. 6444 of October 6, 1945:

> 1. The acting Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice, if satisfied that with a view to preventing any particular person from communicating secret and confidential information to an agent of a foreign power or otherwise acting in any manner prejudicial to the public safety or the safety of the state it is necessary so to do, may make an order that any such person be interrogated and/or detained in such place and under such conditions as he may from time to time determine.
>
> 2. Any person shall, while detained by virtue of an order made under this order, be deemed in legal custody.

Those are the two documents, the magna charta and this order in council, which I think it is relevant we should compare. In his address on March 19, to be found on page 89 of *Hansard,* the Minister of Justice himself said:

> I told them—

I think he meant the counsel for the commission.

> —that if the order were one that was going to be made, then it would not be in that form; that I did not think in peace time it was proper that any member of the executive should have the kind of powers the order expressed; that I thought no one should be detained, even for interrogation, without there being some form of intervention of the judicial authority; that we would act only as if that were the provision, and that there would have to be a recomemndation from some organ of the judicial authority to make me feel that I should exercise those powers.

Later on, in the course of the same address the minister repeated that he acted with a great deal of reluctance and hesitancy. I have here also the report of the committee on civil liberties, of the Canadian Bar Association. I am not going to read it all, but may I read this:

> The affirmation of that right—

That is to say, the right of personal freedom.

> —has evolved some standard principles which have acquired almost sacred significance in the mind of the citizen:
>
> (1) The right not to be detained at the mere arbitrary will of the crown, or any government, or administrative authority;
>
> (2) The right not to be arrested, unless under the authority of a magistrate's warrant, issued on a complaint duly executed, and based on the ordinary law;
>
> (3) The right, when under suspicion, or arrest, or sentence, not to be coerced to give any information or evidence against oneself, or to testify in one's own case.

Those are the principles laid down by the committee on civil liberties of the Canadian Bar Association.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What date?

Mr. POWER: It is to be found in the minutes of proceedings of the 27th annual meeting of the Canadian Bar Association held at Toronto on August 30 and 31 and September 1, 1944.

I should like to quote one more authority, which states:

Now let us come to another point, which I wish particularly to stress. I refer to the right set out in magna charta that no man shall be dispossessed of his rights without the lawful judgment of his peers under the law of the land; not the law as made by the governor in council, not the law as made by some unnamed and as yet unexisting body, but the law of the land as known to everyone. It is an essential principle of liberty and freedom that the law of the land should be known, that it should be so known that every man as he runs may read. The law should not be something which is to make its appearance in the *Canada Gazette* after some board or governor in council, not parliament, has passed a regulation; it is something that should appear in the statutes of the country.

That is the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, *Hansard,* April 19, 1934, at page 2342. And with those authoritative statements I rest my case against what would appear to be a revocation of magna charta, after 731 years of existence.

The point which I wish to make and which I consider important is that of the precedent which has been created in these cases. I am not sure about Great Britain. I am not even sure of the precedents created under the defence of Canada regulations made during the war. But I feel assured that no time in peace-time Canada have we ever had any such legislation as is contained in the order in council, parts of which I have just read.

The two hon. gentlemen who have spoken for the government in this debate, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, are men of high reputation for integrity, for broad humanity, for tolerance, for liberal-mindedness and for a great regard for the personal liberty of their fellow citizens. As will appear from what the Minister of Justice has said, they have acted with deliberation, with hesitancy and, possibly, with a great deal of reluctance. No doubt they feel that they can exercise those extraordinary powers which were conferred upon them by the order in council with discretion and with the least possible injury to their fellow men.

But may I point out that neither of these men has any guarantee of immortality. Neither is there any guarantee in our political life that the political wheel of fortune may not some day turn. And the numbers brought up on that political wheel of fortune may not always be the numbers of men in whom this country has the same faith and confidence as it has in the men who are now at the helm of affairs.

The hon. friend for Calgary West spoke about the book, "It Can't Happen Here." I think he was about to continue some discussion about that book when his attention was drawn to another point. Perhaps he was about to point out that in most totalitarian countries, or at least in the two of which we know the most, Germany and Russia, the majority of the people do not rule, or at least, did not rule. The majority of the people in Germany, we are told, were not nazis; and it has been repeated time and again here that the majority of the people in Russia do not belong to the communist party.

Nevertheless the men at the head of that party are the men who are in charge of those countries. They are in charge of the administration of justice; they are in charge of executive power. And it would appear to be from these men and from the kind of government they have that we obtain some idea of the methods which appear to have been followed in this case.

"It Can't Happen Here", but it requires no great stretch of the imagination to paint what, to some, may be an extreme case, when misguided, intolerant, wilful and fanatical men might be at the head of affairs in this country, men who might confuse the security of the state with their own political security, men who might believe that their political opponents are plotting against the security of the state because, forsooth, they are only opposing those measures which are being proposed by the heads of the state.

There have been harsh words spoken in the house and country about bankers, trust companies, cartels and monopolies. It might very well be that, through a turn of the wheel of fortune, the opponents of those who participate in monopolies and cartels might some day be in power and might believe firmly and conscientiously that the general security of the state, because of cartels with foreign nations, is seriously endangered.

Some of those very people who to-day applaud what is going on might find that they cheered to-day but they wept to-morrow. It is not without the recollection of hon. members—certainly not more than fifteen or twenty years ago—that a great American running as candidate for President of the United States was defeated because millions of his fellow citizens believed wrongly and wickedly, but perhaps sincerely, that his love of his country was vitiated by his allegiance to another country and to another ideology. Religious intolerance can bring people a long way. If religious intolerance ever came to the places of power and authority in this country I would not care to think of what might happen to those who opposed it. Precedents are dangerous things, and I regret far more than I can say that a precedent has been created in this case. These men could rely on the procedure and the approval by parliament, as

parliament will approve, of the legislation and of the procedure which has been followed in this case.

I should like to have the time and perhaps the capacity to analyse something of the public attitude arising out of this event. I admit freely that in the popular mind the government is doing absolutely the right thing. I do not controvert or deny that for one moment; I only regret it. I feel that fifty years ago when we were closer to the great struggles which had taken place for human liberty or freedom it would have been more difficult for a government to proceed as this government has proceeded in this case. I wonder if the modern love of speed, efficiency, the cult of success in business, in politics, yes and in sport; the idea of winning at all costs; I wonder if that has not been so thoroughly impregnated into the thinking of our people that they are perhaps apt to forget what some of us believe to be eternal principles in their desire to see something done and done quickly.

There is the idea that we must fight fire with fire, that if these men had been in Russia perhaps it is more than likely that they would have been taken out and shot, and they should be here. We have fought a victorious war after four years. We have talked glibly of the new order which was to follow it, and it almost appears to me as though we the victors had taken on the manners and customs of the vanquished.

As to the accused themselves, I think I said I have no sympathy whatsoever for them, and I have not. But when I read the report of the members of the commission that some of these men, in admitting their guilt in giving the secrets of their country away, pleaded that they had another loyalty, a loyalty presumably, if not to another nation at least to another ideology, I wondered whether all of us are not to some extent responsible, not for these accused but for the fact that there are discordant loyalties in this country.

My hon. friend, the leader for the Social Credit party (Mr. Low), touched on the point when he said, or when I took him to say, that before we go too deeply into international affairs we should first try to become a nation on our own, we should first try to develop a nationality of our own. I am perhaps one of those who smiled in a bit of derision at what was considered to be somewhat tawdry patriotism when reference was made to 100 per cent Americans. Perhaps it would have been good for us if we had tried to develop more 100 per cent Canadians. Some great Irishman has said that if he were permitted to write the songs of a people he would not care who wrote their laws.

During the course of the war I had occasion to attend a large number of concerts, singsongs and so on in the camps of the various armed services. What songs did we hear? We heard "Annie Laurie", the "Rose of Tralee", "There'll always be an England". Did we ever hear any song about Canada? Have we ever tried to develop a Canadian spirit which would make those people stand abashed at the very thought of betraying their country? Our educational institutions are at fault. We are at fault in this house for developing loyalties, whether they be to other lands or whether they be to certain sections of our land.

Mr. POULIOT: Who forbade your bands playing "O Canada"?

Mr. POWER: Not me.

Mr. POULIOT: One of your men.

Mr. POWER: That may be, and I shall be quite willing to answer my hon. friend at some other time.

Mr. POULIOT: I shall have an opportunity to do that too.

Mr. POWER: We have not developed as we should have developed a Canadian spirit. We have not developed it in our schools or in our colleges. Until such time as we do we cannot expect and we cannot hope to have in this country the right kind of loyalty to our institutions and to our nation. When every man in this country has a loyalty to the country as boundless as are the acres of this country, when he is as much at home in Halifax as he is in Vancouver, in Quebec as he is in Toronto, when we have no such thing as sectionalism, then I believe it will be more difficult for wilful men to betray their country.

I should like to speak of one more aspect of this discussion. I wish to refer to it from the point of view of liberalism, that is liberalism in the broadest sense, in the sense in which every political leader of this house has at some time or another and probably still is a believer in liberal thought and liberal principles rather than in the narrow sense of those who sit only on one side of the house; in the sense in which the hon. member for Calgary West is a liberal. I refer to liberalism which is defined as being a struggle for liberty, personal, civil, political, physical, social, economic, domestic, national and international. It is a struggle for the rights of the people against privilege and privileged interests and classes. The great victories of liberalism during the past century have been along the

lines of constitutional reform. The Liberal party believes in individual liberty and in the rights of the citizen.

Amongst all the leaders of liberalism in this country there has never been any greater than the present leader, the Prime Minister of this country. I know he shares my views of liberalism for from long association with him I know his views on these matters. I know with what hesitancy and reluctance he must have acquiesced in what has gone on. I had hoped that he would have ignored that hesitancy and reluctance and would, when pressed, have refused to allow such legislation to be placed in the records of the people of Canada. He has taken a position with which I cannot agree. I respect his decision, as I hope he will respect my view.

As for me, brought up in an atmosphere wherein a framed photograph of magna charta was on almost every wall, accompanied with a warrant for the execution of Charles I, and steeped through my reading in the traditions of the martyrs of liberty and freedom, I cannot wish to turn back the pages of history seven hundred years and repeal magna charta. I cannot by my silence appear to approve even tacitly what I believe to have been a great mistake on the part of the government. If this is to be the funeral of liberalism I do not desire to be even an honorary pall-bearer at the funeral, and I do not wish by not taking part in this debate to give silent approval to the procedure which has taken place.

Mr. PIERRE GAUTHIER (Portneuf) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, following the example of many honourable members who have spoken since the opening of this debate, I wish, with your permission, to congratulate the honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau) and the honourable member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Winters) who have respectively moved and seconded the address. They have discharged a duty which was certainly not onerous and their task was pleasant to fulfil. As was evidenced by the compliments they have received, their performance has been found satisfactory by nearly all the members of this house.

When I see you, Mr. Speaker, occupying the chair of the one we are agreed to call first commoner, you can readily imagine what memories are brought back to my mind and to my heart. You surely can guess that I see you as a young schoolboy, striving industriously to develop your character in the class-room, in the recreation and study rooms of that old institution, venerable among all, the Quebec seminary.

It is because I was once a classmate of yours. I was not surprised to hear you call out, at the very beginning and with the greatest ease in the world: "Order", because even in those days, you used to shout your terrible cry of "Silence, gentlemen", with as much vehemence. You have simply adopted a different term.

We then found ourselves members of the Quebec Legislative Assembly, where we won our political spurs and where we had the pleasure and the privilege of sitting with a man whose fine sense of propriety we valued very highly. A few years later, we were sitting on the floor of the House of Commons, still followers of the same party. Then I left for a short trip and returned just in time to see you occupy the Speaker's chair. Although I don't envy your position, knowing the various duties it entails. I was highly pleased by your elevation to that high position, and I am still very glad of it. Among the members of the Legislative Assembly with whom we were sitting at that time, some have passed from the provincial to the federal arena, to the House of Commons, like yourself, the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. McDonald) and myself, and to the Senate, the Hon. Senators David, Bouchard and Nicol. Although we may at first have found it hard to become accustomed to this change—after being used to the spirit of good fellowship of the Legislative Assembly—we are now getting used to the atmosphere of the House of Commons. And now, thanks to the kind cooperation of all hon. members of this house, whatever may be the language we use, we are inclined to find the atmosphere of the House of Commons nearly as pleasant as that of the Legislative Assembly, but I am not as yet so sure of that.

I do not see the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier).

Mr. DECHENE: He is not at his desk, but he is in the house.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I see him now and I take the liberty of telling him briefly what the electors of the county of Portneuf expect of him at the present time.

In 1938, I believe, a certain sum had been voted for the erection of a post-office building at Donnacona; plans were drawn and he would have but to say the word for the construction of this post-office to be started next summer. The amount involved is not very high and I have no doubt that the minister's consent will be given with the kindness he usually

displays when granting our electors a favor. Besides, almost at the mouth of the Portneuf River, which is navigable up to a certain point, certain protection works would be needed to prevent closing the highway which runs from Portneuf Station to Portneuf Village, uniting those two parishes. These small requests could be granted at little cost to the government and I cannot see how the hon. the minister can turn down the member for Portneuf.

Since the beginning of the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, I have listened most carefully to speeches made in regard to the important problem with which the government was faced, namely the very contentious matter of the discovery of a spy ring in Canada.

There is one thing that I have particularly noticed. Not a single member of this house has any sympathy for these hirelings of the Moscow embassy or for the communist doctrine. Although no one has any sympathy for them, in the matter of technicalities, details and particulars, criticism has been levelled at the Right Hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) and at the Right Hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). No one has any sympathy for those spies but some feel that they have been treated too harshly.

Mr. DECHENE: It might please them if we were to decorate those people.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): However, I know that some have been arrested and released on bail, and, after all, they were spies. In England, bail was refused to Dr. May. In Canada, things are different. As I am not a lawyer, I cannot discuss matters of technicalities but I know that when a man goes into the woods or the jungle, if he possesses the instinct of self-preservation, he will have brought with him some weapon to defend himself and when a wild animal springs at him to devour him, he does not argue, he does not plead for mercy, he asks no permission but he simply shoots it to save his own life. Is it what we are doing in Canada? This is what Canada is doing.

I cannot sympathize with spies. It may be argued that they have not yet been declared guilty. That is possible. But I will not believe that the Mounted Police, of whom so much good has been said in this house, have recommended such a decision to the Right Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) unless they had proofs. That is preposterous. I repeat, we are now dealing with communists. Unfortunately, some of our leaders and politicians often lose sight of that fact. Many members of this house forget to take up the communist problem as it should be approached. We must not lose sight of the fact that the ultimate aim of communism is universal ideological revolution. Whether Stalin or others are at the helm of the Russian state, they are communists who hanker for the advent of universal revolution. They know how to go about it.

Indeed, this is not the first time I treat this subject, Mr. Speaker. Here is what I said, ten years ago:

> Providence has countenanced the existence of classes differing on the intellectual, financial and social levels. It is wishful thinking to believe that all minds are equal, all intellects similarly brilliant, all qualities universally distributed and apparent to the same degree in every individual.

I was referring to the levelling of classes, a principle very dear to Karl Marx.

> It is those who tried to bring mankind to believe that the contrary could be true who have become the promoters of the socialist doctrine, which is the first gateway to the great communist structure.

I said that ten years ago.

> Class struggles have been their first activities. The first international was founded during the first years of the second half of the 19th century, on the occasion of a world fair held in London. Heralded by Karl Marx's appeal—Workers from all countries of the world, unite!—socialist and communistic agitation began.
>
> To achieve its objective, the neo-messianic school to which Heine and Marx belonged strove to substitute materialism for the religious ideals of a whole race.

That is of the whole Jewish race.

> And that was done as far as possible in the silence of cells where the communistic poison flowed freely.

Ever since those days, communism has kept up its propaganda. To-day, that propaganda is better, stronger and is carried on more insidiously, and the members of that party are more important. They must undoubtedly know the truth of the words of a great Spanish prelate: "Give the unfortunate an illusion; supply hotheads with a pretext, and you will have a revolution." And upon such ground the communist ideology is active, be it in Ottawa, in the whole of Canada, or elsewhere. I must therefore protest when members, after saying that they have no sympathy for communist spies, dwell on technicalities and finally claim that the rights of individuals have been in-

fringed, that the citizens' liberty has been curtailed. It is inconceivable! There cannot be two weights or two measures. I also said:

The years slipped by, and then came the third international which slew the czars and is trying to upset the political economy of the whole world. Their hard work is never done by their armed forces but by cells concealed under various designations which display feverish activity and an astoundingly perfected organization.

In this matter of espionage, we have seen how well they work. Thanks to one of their own, we have been warned of their intrigues and we have found out how much they had learned of our secrets relating to purely Canadian inventions. That is how they work. I wonder why we should display such unwarranted tactfulness, why we should put off action and bewail the harsh methods adopted in dealing with spies. That is my personal opinion, Mr. Speaker; I do not expect everyone to agree with me, but that is the conclusion I have reached after reading and study, after living through two wars and an intervening period which was torn by eighteen conflicts and during which the theories of advanced socialism and communism have gained a great deal of ground. Some people say that communism is not as bad as is claimed. Let us see what a communist has to say. His name is Berdiaeff. I quote from the book entitled "The Man of 1936 in Soviet Russia", by Helen Iswosky.

Berdiaeff has clearly shown, writes the author, in a recent work, the essential difference which characterizes the Marxist concept of liberty . . .

Listen to this; I quote:

To achieve liberty, he says, for a communist, means to achieve strength in a collective social movement, and transform life collectively . . . We must achieve strength and transform life in a given manner, having a fixed conception of truth and a fixed doctrine. This liberty is subject to the dictatorship of a given ideology, which cannot be changed one iota. The communistic freedom does not grant any liberty to those who refuse to accept the only doctrine, the only creed that can win salvation and deprives its enemies of all human rights.

Now listen to Boukharine. He is quoted by the same author. I ask every Christian in the house to listen to what Boukharine has to say:

It is ridiculous, says Boukharine, to think of God in the same way as devout old women. It is not man that has been created in God's image, but it is God that is created to man's image; we have no need of Him . . . Since man has fully achieved his worth, a human society, happy and creative, constitutes for us an aim in itself and does not need consecration from divine idols.

This is a communist speaking. And we should stand unafraid, in this country, of such ideas, of this ideology, whose agents are at work in our midst, trying to steal our secrets? And why should they steal them? Not to hide them somewhere else, but so that others may use them in the event of another war.

Mr. Speaker, a man by the name of Churchill recenty made in the United States a speech that was strongly criticized by Generalissimo Stalin and was even criticized across the border. Before the Second World War, Churchill had told us how strong was the nazi-fascist ideology; he had also warned the world of the magnitude of communist ideology. Over there, no one heeded his word; however, untiring in his efforts, he now sounds a further warning.

I am not criticizing his speech; I am glad he made it and I hope Canada will wake up and that the democracies, the true democracies, not those that are governed by dictators, but the real democracies, those that have gone through the great test of the war just ended, will eventually join together to achieve a second victory, a real one this time, the hardest but the most important, the victory of ideology.

A country may be vanquished in the field, but its ideologies stand forever. It is thus that nazism still subsists in Argentina and Germany, fascism is still retrenched in Spain and, as every one knows it has not been extirpated from Italy. This is evidenced by the fact that Giannini has just formed a new party, called the "total man" party by the British, the "parti de l'homme complet", by the French, and the "uomo guadun que" party by the Italians. In no more than two weeks, he has recruited over 200,000 supporters. This is proof that ideologies are never eradicated.

A while ago, a speaker stated that fire must be fought with fire. I say that to put a fire out, it must be smothered by a sufficient quantity of water. I do not concur in the communist ideology. Some may think that I am still frightened—to borrow the words of the former member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen)—at the thought of the communist bogey; not at all, it is a question of principle for me; we must at all costs avoid an imminent danger. Are we going to beat about the bush and stop at technicalities when we are dealing with espionage, on the pretense that spies might have been treated too harshly. I am of those who want the government to exercise due vigilance and who demand that these spies be punished if they are found guilty of this crime.

I am closing, Mr. Speaker. A short while ago, I heard the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) say that Canada, unlike other countries, lacked impressive songs to

stir the patriotism of its people. I do not know any songs in English, but I am familiar with very many in the French language. I will mention only a few, such as "O Canada, mon pays, mes amours" (O Canada, my beloved native land), known and sung by all little French Canadians; they live in the Province of Quebec, which, for them, stands as the whole of Canada, but they may be heard as far as the Pacific Ocean. Among other songs, "O Carillon" keeps forever vivid in our minds the glorious memory of our past; "Vive la Canadienne," which has just been mentioned by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Marquis). These are songs that keep our patriotism alive and if there are no such songs in English, there is only one thing to do, namely, find a good English version of "O Canada"; it is the most beautiful and most patriotic song that can be found to reconcile the ideals of all the races that make up this country.

I am through, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to read for the benefit of all members the prayer that is said in the assembly of one of the United States, but I will do so some other time, as it is late and I do not want to delay the adjournment of the house.

I thank the honourable members for their attention. Again, may I say that I spoke for myself and that once convinced of the justice of a cause, I do not easily change my mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is the privilege of the hon. member to adjourn the debate if he so wishes.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): No, I have just about concluded my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

On motion of Mr. MacInnis the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, March 22, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

DEFENCE AND DEMOBILIZATION

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER EXPENDITURES AND DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS WAR ASSETS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a select committee be appointed to examine the expenditure defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament for national defence and demobilization, and for other services directly connected with the war, including the disposal of surplus war assets, and to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of the policy, decided by the government may be effected therein, and that notwithstanding standing order 65 the committee shall consist of twenty-five members, namely: Messrs. Benidickson, Black (Cumberland), Bradette, Cleaver, Cote (Verdun), Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval), Golding, Homuth, Isnor, Jackman, Knowles, Lalonde, Macdonnell, Marier, Marquis, McGregor, McIlraith, McLure, Michaud, Probe, Reid, Shaw, Smith (Calgary West), Stewart (Winnipeg North), Winkler, with power to send for persons, papers and records; to examine witnesses, and to report from time to time to the house.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I believe hon. members are anxious to have the select and standing committees set up as soon as possible. Last year there was some complaint that we were lax in having some of the committees constituted at an early date, in particular the select committee on expenditures.

If I thought there would be any debate on this motion I would not press it at this time. I should imagine however the house would be glad to have the committee set up at once. If that is so, I should be pleased to have the house proceed with my motion.

The motion offered this year is in exactly the same terms as the motion passed at the last session. The personnel of the committee is, I understand, the same.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Speaker, we are agreeable to having this committee set up, and to proceeding without debate.

Mr. COLDWELL: I should like to say the same thing.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask one question: I communicated to the whips the fact that there is one change we should like to make. Apparently my communication was not received in time. The suggestion is that the name of Mr. McCullough (Assiniboia) be substituted for mine. If the change is made now it will obviate the necessity of having it made later.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps hon. members would permit the motion to carry, following which a motion could be made to substitute one name for another.

Motion agreed to.

[*Later:*]

The house having reverted to motions:

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved:

That the motion to set up a select committee to examine the expenditure defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament for national defence and demobilization be amended by substituting the name of Mr. McCullough (Assiniboia) for that of Mr. Knowles.

Mr. BRACKEN: I assume there will be no objection on the part of the government to substituting other names if there is a desire to make a change.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No. During the session changes are made of certain names on most of the committees. The intention is to follow the same practice.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Speaker, I object to the appointment of this committee for the reasons that I gave last session. The time has gone by for a committee of this house—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the motion to appoint the committee has been adopted. The motion before the house is merely to provide for a change in the personnel and is not debatable.

Motion agreed to.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CHURCH: I wish to say that I object to the system which has been adopted of appointing committees after the expenditures have been made. It is nothing but a post-mortem—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion to appoint the committee has already been adopted by the house. We are now on orders of the day, and if the hon. member wants to put a question, it is his privilege to do so.

PENSIONS AND REESTABLISHMENT

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT OR SUPPLEMENTING OF EXISTING LEGISLATION

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): moved:

That a select committee be appointed: 1. To consider all legislation passed since the commencement of the war with the German reich relating to the pensions, treatment, and reestablishment of former members of His Majesty's armed forces and of other persons who have otherwise engaged in pursuits closely related to war;

2. To prepare and bring in one or more bills to clarify, amend or supplement the above legislation;

With power to send for persons, papers, and records; to print its proceedings, and to report from time to time to the house;

That the provisions of section 1, standing order 65, be waived in respect to this committee.

And that the said committee shall consist of the following members: Messrs. Abbott, Adamson, Archibald, Ashby, Baker, Belzile, Benidickson, Bentley, Blair, Blanchette, Bridges, Brooks, Bruce, Claxton, Cleaver, Cockeram, Croll, Cruickshank, Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval), Dorion, Drope, Emmerson, Fulton, Gauthier (Portneuf), Gibson (Hamilton West), Gillis, Green, Halle, Harkness, Harris (Grey-Bruce), Herridge, Isnor, Jutras, Kidd, Langlois, Lapointe, Lennard, Marshall, Mackenzie, Macdonald (Halifax), MacNaught, Merritt, Mitchell, Moore, Mutch, Pearkes, Power, Probe, Quelch, Ross (Souris), Sinclair (Vancouver North), Skey, Tremblay, Tucker, Viau, White (Hastings-Peterborough), Whitman, Winkler, Winters, Wright.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the cooperation of the house in following the same procedure as has been followed with regard to the previous motion. This is practically the same wording that we had in the resolution of a year ago, and the personnel of the committee is the same with the exception of one or two changes which have been made by agreement.

It is intended to continue the excellent work which was done a year ago by the committee on veterans affairs. The committee will review if necessary the three measures that were passed by this house and deal with the Pensions Act, the Veterans Land Act, and the act dealing with fire fighters and supervisors that was before the veterans affairs committee a year ago. It will deal with any new suggestions that were made to the committee, such as amendments to the Soldier Settlement Act, and it will deal also with civilian personnel who are protected now by orders in council but who are not protected by statute. These and other matters which will come before the special committee on veterans affairs will I think have the general support not only of the members of the committee which functioned so excellently a year ago, but of the house generally.

Mr. BROOKS: I understand from the minister that the terms of reference are exactly the same as last year and that this committee is to consist of sixty members as the committee did last year. I stated last year that I thought it would be well to have all returned men on this committee, and I am still of that opinion. However, I am not pressing the point.

I am pleased indeed that the committee is being set up and will start to operate soon. I know that last year members of the committee found it difficult to attend the meetings while carrying out their duties in the house. We were working long hours, sometimes morning and afternoon, and toward the latter part of the session we had to sit while the house was sitting, which I think all members will agree is not a good thing.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I should like to ask one question. Will the fact that this com-

mittee is sitting preclude any discussion in the house, say on matters having to do with the Veterans Land Act?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Last year the Veterans Land Act was amended in the special committee and it went through this house. There were certain members, the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) being one, who asked that their rights be preserved if they had any further suggestions to make.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is not my point. Are we to be precluded from discussing these matters when the committee is sitting? Questions pertaining to the Veterans Land Act may come up in the house. It is near the spring of the year, and these matters are urgent. Will the fact that the committee is sitting prevent discussion under some relevant item under consideration in the house?

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is a matter of the rules of the house. I do not know the nature of the discussion my hon. friend is referring to, but I shall be very glad to discuss it with him at any time.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I think the minister knows the procedure and whether or not we shall be prevented from discussing these matters while the committee is sitting. There are some urgent matters having to do with war assets and the like. I have a whole volume of material from settlers, and I want to know if I am to be debarred from taking these up under some particular estimate just because the committee is sitting.

Mr. MACKENZIE: So far as I am concerned there is no desire whatever to debar the hon. member from referring to the things he has in mind.

Motion agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT

NOVA SCOTIA—CAUSEWAY ACROSS STRAIT OF CANSO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the widespread unemployment situation in Nova Scotia can the minister give the house a statement on what progress is being made with regard to the proposed causeway across the strait of Canso? If that project can be expedited it would greatly relieve unemployment in that province.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): The hon. gentleman was good enough to send me notice of his question. I am unable to give him a complete report at this stage. When the estimates of the Department of Transport were under consideration last year I told the hon. member that there were four proposals which had been put forth by the engineers of the department. The acceptance of the different proposals will depend upon soundings or borings to be taken in the gut of Canso. Some of those borings have been taken, but not all. Because of weather conditions it has been impossible to complete the soundings, but as soon as the weather clears, perhaps early in May, it will be possible to complete them and we can then come to a conclusion as to which of the alternative suggestions should be adopted.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

ALLOWANCES TO UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. R. KNIGHT (Saskatoon City): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, of which I am afraid I gave him short notice. Has the government received complaints about the insufficiency of allowances to student veterans attending university, and what action, if any, has been taken in that regard?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): The parliamentary committee of 1945 recommended that consideration be given by the governor in council to increasing the rates set forth in parts 2 and 3 of the schedule of rates to the post discharge reestablishment order. The government gave consideration to the question of inadequacy of allowances to student veterans attending university, and it was found that only four students of some 25,000, have withdrawn for financial reasons. The matter is receiving consideration.

VETERANS LAND ACT—REGULATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF QUALIFICATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. G. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Will he consider an immediate change in the regulations governing the Veterans Land Act which compel joint approval by the board of the veteran and his wife before issuance of a certificate of qualification under the Veterans Land Act, and discarding the present regulations which prevent a veteran with an overseas wife from taking advantage of the act without hardship and long delay?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on a point

of order, I must say that I did not receive notice of the question. In any case it must stand as a notice.

P.E.I. CAR FERRY

INQUIRY AS TO PROGRESS OF CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): I wish to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Transport. Is he prepared at this time to make a statement regarding the construction progress of the S.S. *Abegweit,* the new steamer for the Borden-Tormentine ferry?

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): I am informed by the contractors that, provided the subcontracts are maintained according to schedule and the machinery is delivered on time, it is expected that the *Abegweit* will be ready for delivery about the 30th of September.

Mr. McLURE: Thank you.

MAPS

OMISSION OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FROM MAP OF CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): Is the Minister of Trade and Commerce aware of the fact that a branch of his department published a map of Canada on which the province of Prince Edward Island is not even shown?

Mr SPEAKER: Order. It is the practice that when an hon. member puts a question, it is not to give information to the house, but to seek information from a minister.

Mr. McLURE: I asked a question.

PRIVILEGE—MR. CHURCH

REFERENCE TO REMARKS IN DEBATE ON MARCH 21

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, to refer to remarks made last night, as reported, at page 163 of *Hansard,* by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Picard), who followed me in the debate on the address. It is seldom that I rise to a question of privilege, but the hon. member misquoted me last night. My reference was only to creating at a time like this more embassies and envoys all over the seven seas and dividing Britain's foreign policy when we all should act together. I never referred to the very fine staff of the Department of External Affairs, or to the head of it, the Prime Minister, who has so many talents. My references were confined to the sending of envoys abroad at a time like this to countries where we already have commercial agencies. I object to the hon. member attributing to me words I never used. I have never objected at any time to visits of members of parliament abroad, because I believe that that is money well spent.

WHEAT

SPREADING OF PAYMENTS FOR DELIVERIES—INCOME TAX

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, in my absence from the house yesterday, I understand that the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) asked a question regarding the spreading of wheat payments in connection with income tax. I never intended to suggest when speaking on the subject that this announcement would be made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think it would be made by the Minister of National Revenue or the Minister of Finance. In any event, as the question involves government policy, it cannot be answered at the moment.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

The house resumed from Thursday, March 21, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fernand Viau for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne usually outlines the policy of the government for the session. When I heard the speech read by His Excellency at the opening of parliament my reaction was a hope that the people of Canada were not looking for very much this year, because if they were, and if there is not something more in the government's programme than there is in the speech, they certainly will be disappointed. In the speech last year it was mentioned that we were building a new world. As we did not finish that job last year I thought there might be something in the speech this year to indicate that we might be going on with that job. But there is nothing of the kind in the speech. There is no reference to the brave new world. As a matter of fact the speech gives every indication of being the work of tired men who are looking backward to the old world rather than forward to a new one.

I represent a working class constituency. I have a fairly long association with organized labour and other working class movements, so I wish to say something about the aspirations and the fears of the working people, not only of my own constituency but of Canada, as I see and understand them.

Perhaps the greatest fear to-day among the workers is that of unemployment, the fear that we may be slipping back to the days and the conditions prior to 1939—and I have a fairly good idea that other people besides the workers have this same fear.

When the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) replied to the criticism of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) last Monday on unemployment, he brushed that criticism aside by asking this question: Though employment is not all that we would wish it to be, where is there a country better off than Canada?

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacINNIS: My hon. friend says "hear, hear." Then the Prime Minister went on to compare conditions in Canada with those in the United Kingdom, Belgium, Holland and other parts of Europe. Such sophistry is begging the question, because conditions in Canada are not comparable with conditions in the United Kingdom or in the countries of Europe. The war destroyed the economy of almost the whole of Europe; and in the United Kingdom, if the country's economy was not destroyed by war, the whole economy was converted to war purposes. But in Canada the same war made this country greater and richer and more able to provide for the people than ever it was before. So it is sheer nonsense to compare conditions in Canada at the present time with conditions in almost any other part of the world. Perhaps the only comparable country is the republic to the south of us. The fact of the matter is that at the present time we have unemployment on a large scale. I would urge the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and other members of the cabinet not to be too offhand about it, because the 263,000 who were unemployed at the date of the last report, and the others who do not know how soon they also may be unemployed, are not offhanded about it. Perhaps of itself 263,000 is not an alarming number; but it is alarming in view of the world's need and Canada's need of goods.

I am aware of the fact that unemployment is not yet acute, that there is no mass suffering such as we had in the thirties. The reason of course is that we have made some provision against it. There are the unemployment insurance benefits; there are also the savings made during the war when work was plentiful, and service pay, and the like. But these resources, however large they may be, are limited, and are a mere stop-gap. What is causing the workers worry to-day is not so much the present unemployment, although it is bad enough, but the fact that no plan is being prepared to obviate the conditions which brought about such disastrous results in the thirties. There are no plans for public welfare, and the position of the average worker is as it always has been—the harder he works the sooner he is looking for another job. Until we get away from that, and the worker has assurance of continuity of income, there will always be that worry.

The only reference in the speech from the throne to unemployment is typical of the old thinking in the new world upon which we are entering. I read from *Hansard*, page 1:

> The maintenance of a high level of employment and national income is a fundamental aim of government policy. Employment and income alike are bound up with the restoration and expansion of world trade. To the productive employment of vast numbers of Canadians, export markets are essential.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is old stuff. It was dinned into our ears all during the depression. I appreciate as much as anyone does the value of export trade, but export trade will not put an end to unemployment and distress in this country; it will make for unemployment unless we are prepared to make trade a two-way affair. That is, unless we are prepared to accept imports in the full measure of our exports and to distribute to our people the national income so created, foreign trade will not help us very much. I believe we shall have to approach full employment, the elimination of unemployment, in a time of peace in somewhat the same way as we proceeded during the war. We put an end to unemployment during the war, not by trying to find work or to make work for people, but by producing the needs of war. Now, with peace here, there are peace-time needs, and if we put our people to work to satisfy the needs of peace, to provide the things which our people need in their everyday life, not only shall we find work for everyone, but there will be more jobs than workers, as there were during the war.

There are other measures to which I wish to refer, but before I do so I want to say that I believe that labour in Canada deserves the appreciation of the government and of the people for the freedom from industrial strife enjoyed by this country since the end of hostilities. The smoothness with which

production and services were carried on at a time when wages were falling and prices rising has been of tremendous advantage to this country. In that respect the situation here has been quite different from what it has been on the other side of the border. But organized labour will demand wage increases, and will demand them because they have become necessary. Now that the war is over and there is more civilian production, labour is entitled to a higher, not a lower, standard of living. High wages are also necessary because high wages will help to prevent another depression. In our capitalist economy depressions always come about when there is an over-supply of goods for which there is a need, but those who have the need have not the price to buy. Therefore, higher wages will help to prevent another depression.

During the war there was a ceiling on wages. I agree that it was necessary to stabilize wages, although I have always maintained in this house and outside that to the extent that a stable price structure was maintained, to that extent the burden was borne by the low-paid wage and salary earner. I suggest that the government should not wait for strikes and disputes before there is an increase in wages. The government should make it quite clear that it is in favour of increases in wages at the present time.

There will also be a demand for shorter hours. The two national labour bodies, the trades and labour congress and the Canadian congress of labour, have gone on record in favour of a forty-hour week without reduction in pay. This will mean, if it does come about, that where there is a forty-four hour week and it is reduced to forty, a ten per cent wage increase will be required, and if it is forty-eight hours reduced to forty, the necessary wage increase will be twenty per cent. There are many industries in Canada in which the work week is much higher than forty-eight hours and even fifty-six hours a week.

While we are discussing shorter hours we should not lose sight of the world's tremendous needs for production. I suggest to the Minister of Labour and the government that they should take into consideration the calling of a conference of representatives of organized labour, organized employers and the government to discuss the best means of attaining full production and full employment. Such conferences have taken place in the United Kingdom, and I believe they have been productive of much good.

I am suggesting such a conference because I believe that full production at this time is exceedingly important. I notice that the Minister of Labour in a recent speech at Renfrew said:

> We must use the same characteristic good sense which we used when our backs were to the wall, and then the Canadian people will be able to overcome any difficulties which we may face.

I agree with the minister that, united, we can overcome any of our difficulties in Canada, and I suppose almost everyone will agree with him in that. But I should be astonished if the minister finds the same attitude towards that sort of cooperation to-day as he found during the war. Indeed, the whole cry for the removal of controls is to get away from working together and back to the old system of everyone for himself and the devil take the hindmost.

Mr. MITCHELL: It has been suggested by the two labour congresses.

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes. That was the motive behind this demand for the removal of controls, and we still hear it. They want a restoration of freedom. I am wondering what freedom —freedom to do the other fellow before he does you? It is because we have no common objective and because we want to get back to the principles of free enterprise that we are told by these lovers of freedom that we must get rid of the bureaucrats. The people who suggest this are unconscious of the fact that the bureaucrats, if there are any, came into being to protect the community from irresponsible private bureaucrats.

An hon. MEMBER: Pirates.

Mr. MacINNIS: "Pirates" is right. The question of the removal of wage control and price control has been receiving considerable attention, particularly the matter of wage control, by organized labour. Personally I cannot at the moment see that any advantage could accrue to labour by the removal of wage control.

Mr. MITCHELL: I agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am sure the minister does. As regards labour, the supply to-day is greater than the demand, while other commodities are in the opposite position, the demand being greater than the supply. If we removed all the controls, prices would skyrocket and it would be very difficult to get wage increases at all. I do not see, therefore, that there is any hope in that direction. I believe, however, that labour should be allowed to negotiate for fairly substantial increases, not only because of the increased

cost of living but also because of the increased amount of consumers' goods that are coming into the market. For these reasons, the low-paid workers particularly should be allowed to negotiate for substantial increases in wages.

Several hon. members have urged that the income tax exemptions should be raised to $2,000. Of course this matter is not dealt with in the speech from the throne; it falls more naturally under the budget, but it has been mentioned. I am in favour of raising the exemption on the income tax to $2,000, but I would much rather see this house take some action to ensure that every family received an income of $2,000. It is not of much use to have the exemption raised on an income one does not receive.

I shall give the house some examples of workers' wages in Canada in 1941 when the wages were frozen. In a sample of incomes gathered by the bureau of statistics from the 1941 census returns, it was found that 83·9 per cent of the wage earners of Canada received an income of less than $1,500. These people are not going to benefit very much from the exemption suggested, particularly on that part of the income which is over $1,500 or even $1,000. They will not benefit from the exemption because they do not receive the income. When you examine the various categories you find that wage earners receiving less than $500 a year numbered 1,028,800, or 35·9 per cent of the total wage earners in the country at that time. If these figures do not convince the members of this house that something should be done and done quickly to increase wages, I do not know what will convince them.

Another report to which hon. members may have seen, the Marsh report of 1941, gives the number of heads of families in certain income brackets. City workers, heads of families, earning from $500 to $1,000 a year, numbered 219,000 in 1941. Rural workers, heads of families, earning from $500 to $1,000 numbered 80,000. City workers, heads of families, earning $500 or less numbered 114,900. Rural workers, heads of families, earning $500 or less numbered 103,100. The year 1941 was a prosperous one. It was the year in which wages were frozen or stabilized, and in relation to the cost of living at this time wages are not much better, if any.

The government says that it considers it a fundamental principle to maintain a high national income. A high national income cannot be maintained unless there is a high individual income. The two must go together.

I wish to make one other observation in connection with this $2,000 exemption from income tax. When the increase in the indemnity of hon. members was before us in the previous session I pointed out that as members of parliament we had not done anything to increase the standard of living of the people of this country. I could quote figures —I have them here—to show that the amount of money being paid in wages has been continually falling since that time. Now that we have increased our own indemnities we are in duty bound not only to raise the exemption on income tax up to $2,000, but to see, as far as it lies with us, that every family receive an income of $2,000.

I should like to say a word in connection with a national labour code. The idea is not a new one to the group with which I am associated. We advocated it in our first manifesto in 1933, and we are still satisfied that it is a good thing. It is not only a good thing but an essential in harmonizing and stabilizing labour relations across the country. I am aware of the many difficulties, but I believe that P.C. 1003, faulty as it is, was a step in the right direction, that we should take advantage of its acceptance during war time, and that the government should do everything possible, even to the extent of an amendment of the British North America Act if agreement can be had to that end, to bring about conditions under which a national labour code will be part of the laws of Canada. In my opinion a labour code should set down minimum standards above which the provinces would be free to go, if they wished, but not free to go below.

I listened with much interest to the speech of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) on Monday of this week. It was a long speech, but in my opinion the most striking feature of it was that he spoke on both sides of almost every point he raised. He reminded me of the Roman god Janus who, I believe, was supposed to be the porter of heaven and the guardian deity of the gates. And, because of that, as a gate has two sides, he is usually shown with two heads.

The leader of the opposition referred to the fact—and it is a fact—that the housing situation in Canada is a festering sore on the body politic, and a national emergency. Then he went on to say—

> During the war we met the national emergency courageously and forthrightly. Surely we shall not be less resolute in peace.

One or two pages further on in his speech he is reported in this way:

> I do not urge the government to engage in rash efforts of decontrol, but I do urge the government to prepare and make public, now that the war is over, a planned programme to relax wage controls on low-wage people and to free the productive processes of the country from the effects of those laws against production, which

were made necessary in war, but which in time of peace discouraged what is most essential to the production of needed goods.

Well, I should not be a bit surprised if the government, without being over-rash, did come forward with a planned programme to relax controls, but I am fairly sure they will not have a planned programme for anything else.

The point I wish to make is this, we dealt with the national emergency courageously and forthrightly in war time, not by leaving things to people to do or not to do as they pleased, but by meeting the needs of war with all the power of the Canadian government and resources of the Canadian people. There is no other way in which we can deal with the housing emergency—no other than by meeting it with the whole power and resources of the Canadian people.

Referring to Canada's loan of $1,250 million to Great Britain, the hon. gentleman said, as reported at page 30:

From the point of view of the selfish interests of Canada, the loan is amply justified.

But on page 31 I find this:

But we might as well understand what we are doing . . . What this loan in fact means is that for five years the Canadian taxpayer will pay interest on it which, even at 2½ per cent, will be $30 million a year, and at the same rate on the extension of the 1942 interest-free loan he will pay $14 million.

I submit that if the loan is a good thing, and I agree that it is, it was proper that it should have been made. It is a good thing for Canada economically. I am convinced it it a good thing for the world and for Canada politically, and if we need to bring in humane considerations, I would say it is a good thing from the humane point of view. If we want to get a picture of the difference between what war did to Canada and what it did to Great Britain and Europe, we see it in the fact that this country can now lend $1,250 million to Great Britain, and that Great Britain needs such a loan. Nothing could show more clearly what the British people sacrificed in the war. I am in favour of going as far as possible to carry out our share of the war's costs, and I am convinced that anything we can do to help Britain now is a part of it.

A little further on the leader of the opposition referred to cartels and the control these institutions were gathering to themselves over production and other factors in our economy. I agree that cartels are gaining control of the economy of this country; but I do not agree that the government can eliminate the danger or menace of cartels by completely eliminating controls, and leaving everything to free enterprise. The purpose of every competitive organization, or every organization that is supposed to be competitive, is to eliminate competition in its own line. I imagine no living organism of any kind likes competition, because competition makes living more difficult.

Let me read from the press release issued at the time the report on cartels was made public. It will give the house an idea of what cartels are doing to our economy and to our freedom; and then let anyone tell me how we are going to overcome this power by lessening the controls we now have over the economy of the country. The press release, under the heading "Economic effects of cartels", states:

The report discloses that in the two decades between world war I and world war II restrictive trade agreements of private interests flourished and spread; and that in so doing they (a) limited production and impeded the most efficient use of world resources; (b) raised or maintained certain consumer prices; (c) restricted the import and export of certain commodities; (d) restricted the use to which certain commodities might be put; (e) nullified external trade policies in certain respects; (f) resisted technological advances in certain fields; (g) created patent pools or monopolies covering wide fields of endeavour; (h) assisted the formation of private industrial empires which tended to supplant governments in the determination of certain national commercial policies.

In view of that statement by this Canadian commission which investigated cartels, how can anyone in this house or anywhere else say that the salvation of the people of Canada lies in giving free enterprise more control and more opportunity to do this sort of thing?

At the beginning of his address the leader of the opposition made this amazing statement.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Lalonde): The hon. member has exhausted his time.

Mr. MacINNIS: I have only a little more to say, if the house will permit me.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Lalonde): With unanimous consent the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. MacINNIS: He said, as reported on page 27 of *Hansard*:

In these days it is the duty of the modern state so to organize its economy that every individual able to work and desiring to work shall have an income from his efforts commensurate with his contribution and adequate for a reasonable standard of living.

I think we would all agree with that, but again I do not see how the state is going to do that. If the government is to assume the responsibilities suggested by the leader of the opposition, then the government must

have the necessary power and control over the economy of the country to enable them to do so. I do not think it can carry out its responsibilities if it leaves the control in the hands of others. I suggest it is not fair to assert, on the one hand, that the government is responsible for the economic welfare of the individual, and to urge in the next breath that in connection with the economy of the country the productive forces be handed over to private individuals to operate them for their own profit. That is what my hon. friends to my right are advocating. I do not think even the leader of the opposition can ride two horses going in different directions.

The party with which I am associated agrees that the government has a responsibility for the social welfare of the people. At the same time we assert that the government can discharge that responsibility only when the productive forces of the country are used solely for the benefit of the people. This means planning; this means control. But it also means freedom—freedom from fear, freedom from want, and the assurance that the harder we work, the more secure we will be; not, as it is to-day, the realization that the harder we work the sooner we will be looking for another job.

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that during this debate the function of the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne has not been sufficiently recognized. That debate can serve a most useful function, a variety of functions, in fact. One good function which it can serve is to enable the house to elicit information from the government with reference to its programme for the session and its plans for administration which too often is not found in the speech from the throne.

In the speech from the throne which was read a week ago there are some very vague and general statements and there is a sad lack of a clearly defined legislative programme for the session. If this debate does serve the purpose of eliciting from the government some real information about the programme that it proposes to submit to parliament it will have served a very useful function indeed.

In no respect is the need of information greater than with respect to the plans for housing. As a matter of fact, the only information that the public or the members of this house have received with respect to the government's housing plans for some time now has been bits and pieces which from time to time appear in the press. It is true that the speech from the throne does give a paragraph to housing, but that statement is significantly lacking in information. It is high time that the crumbs of information which have been given to the house and the people were supplemented by some more systematic approach through parliamentary channels.

I think the time has come, in fact it came long ago, when there should be appointed by this house a standing committee on social security matters. One of the primary tasks of that committee should be to go into the proposals that have been offered with reference to housing and to obtain the information which is necessary and which the public has not been receiving. That committee should consider in detail the numerous proposals which have been made from time to time.

If one is to judge by the remarks of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in following the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), constructive speeches are not wanted by the government in this debate. I think you will go a long way in searching the records of the debates of this house before you will find on the part of any leader of the opposition a more constructive contribution than that made by my leader. I am bound to say that so far as the Prime Minister's reply was concerned the detailed and constructive observations of the leader of the opposition remain unanswered.

There are five things said in the speech from the throne with reference to housing. The first one is an amazing statement, a monstrous understatement—it is stated that the demand exceeds the supply. A most laconic statement! That is all the government has to say to the people of Canada, many thousands of whom are living to-day under conditions that at any other time would have been considered simply unthinkable. Summing up that situation the government says "Oh, well, the demand exceeds the supply."

Second, we are told that a large number of houses has been constructed since V-E day, but at this stage we still have not been told how many houses have been constructed since V-E day. Apparently the government does not know because it is not a matter of government record. They tell us that, even in the face of the lavish promises that they made to secure election in June last.

Third, we are told that some special efforts are being made to expand the supply of building materials—I shall have something to say about that later.

Fourth, it is said that the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has been established. That is something that we really did know. I think it should be said in passing that Mr. Mansur, president of the Central

Mortgage and Housing Corporation, has this advantage in starting his duties. He can look back on the previous administration of the National Housing Act and be assured that whatever he does his administration cannot be more ineffective than the administration of the act before he assumed responsibility.

Then we are told that steps are being taken at once to have some form of coordination in the activities of the government in the field of housing, placing them all under one minister. I had a good deal to say on that subject during the fall session of the house and I do not intend to repeat what I said. Coordination of the efforts of the government is long overdue. Where else in the world will you find a situation so pressingly urgent as the housing situation in Canada being handled by a government on the basis of dividing the responsibilities and power among three ministers. An anomaly like that could exist nowhere else.

Evidently, if one is to follow the speech from the throne, no legislation in the field of housing is contemplated this year by the government. In any event we have not been told of any as yet.

May I offer to the hon. members who respectively moved and seconded the address my sincere compliments. In the main they confined themselves to the non-controversial features of the speech from the throne. I offer this observation in passing: Neither of them said anything on the subject of housing. It is in no carping sense that I draw attention to that fact because I think there is a reason for it. Perhaps my respected friend, the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau), had in mind the description of housing conditions in his own riding which was contained in a telegram sent to the Prime Minister of Canada on October 24, 1945, by the mayor of St. Boniface. This reads:

> Family of five and family of three on the street. Controller here refuses to take action to provide necessary accommodation unless city requests buildings to be taken over at city's expense. City not in financial position to assume responsibility—weather at present severe—snowing. Immediate relief for these families must be found otherwise small children and mothers will have health impaired—general unrest in whole community. Feel unless immediate steps taken by your department to authorize your emergency controller to commandeer building and order alterations to be made to care for these emergency cases tragedy may happen and public get out of control. Returned soldiers and families very hostile regarding lack of accommodation.
>
> George C. MacLean, mayor.

I have referred to the constructive contribution made to this debate by my leader. There are two speeches to which I shall draw the attention of the house, that of the Prime Minister and that of the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe). My leader referred to housing conditions, and I think his language was very temperate when he referred to those conditions as a disgrace. They are a blot on the escutcheon of the Dominion of Canada. I suggest with all respect to these two hon. gentlemen that their contributions to the debate on the subject of housing were marked by smugness, complacency, boastfulness and an attempt to treat the whole subject in a trivial way. What we did not find in their speeches was realism. There was no courageous facing up to the problem which housing presents in Canada in its full dimensions or any indication that there would be a gearing of a great national effort to meet it. I am sorry that the Minister of Reconstruction is not in the house at the moment. I should like to say, as I have told him personally, and I believe in this I speak for all members, that we are delighted that he has returned from his vacation looking so much improved in health following the long-deferred vacation that he took between sessions, and we all hope that he will enjoy good health from it. At least his vacation has had a tonic effect upon his spirits, for if ever a man was full of optimism it was certainly the Minister of Reconstruction when he spoke in this debate two days ago. He saw everything through rose-coloured glasses, and in listening to his speech and to that of the Prime Minister two days earlier I began to wonder if I was really living in the same country as they, because the descriptions that they gave of conditions as they seemed to find them were so utterly different from the actual conditions that I have seen that I had to pinch myself to see if I was really sitting here in this month of March in the Dominion of Canada. Their descriptions were of a very different kind of Canada from what I have seen in recent months.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let us have a frank approach to and a clear appreciation of the immensity of this housing problem, and then let us view it in the light of the government's policy to meet it. The government has not met the housing problem. It has not taken adequate measures to cope with it. I wish that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Reconstruction would come to some of the places I have seen where men and women and their families, many of them veterans who have given long years of service to their country in this war, are living in hovels, garrets or cellar basements—not just one case but in thousands.

How big is this housing problem, Mr. Speaker? It is an immense problem. It has

reached enormous proportions. Mr. Storms, general manager of Housing Enterprises Limited, said in a published statement on March 14 last that there are 375,000 families in Canada who are involuntarily doubled up because of the housing shortage. Imagine—375,000 families! That means almost 2,000,000 people. He went on to say that the situation was daily becoming worse with the arrival of soldiers and their dependents from overseas. It is a problem that mounts with every boatload of soldiers coming back from overseas. In the city of Toronto the authorities, who are doing their best to cope with local conditions, estimate that one-half of the discharged ex-servicemen want housing, and the problem is growing daily. The department of welfare of the city of Toronto keeps a record of the families who apply to them for housing accommodation, and in the last three months the number of unfilled applications on hand has increased by eighteen per cent. It has gone up every week. The need is constantly growing. The situation is going to continue to grow worse if we can expect nothing more from the government than has been indicated hitherto in this debate. It would be cruel to mislead the people of Canada into thinking that with the kind of programme the government has indicated conditions can improve.

It is a bitterly cruel fact that those who are bearing the brunt of the housing shortage in Canada to-day are our veterans. After long years of separation from their wives and families, tens of thousands of them have come back to find themselves either still separated from their families or having to double up under intolerable conditions. The readjustment period will be difficult enough for many of these men without their having to face all that may be involved in domestic conditions in the present intolerable situation. As Mr. Storms pointed out, the problem is going to become increasingly acute with the arrival from overseas of the soldiers and the dependents of those who have married overseas. The hon. member who seconded the address (Mr. Winters) had this to say as reported at page 19 of *Hansard*:

> We do not overlook the fact that many of our soldiers are bringing war brides and families with them to Canada, and we wish to assure them of a welcome in this country.

But it will be a very sad welcome indeed that many thousands of these wives are going to receive in Canada in having to submit to the doubling up which will be necessary if they are to have a roof over their heads. There will be more of them living in cellars and garrets.

[Mr. Fleming.]

We have had intolerable conditions in other respects as well. I have already referred to the unequal burden borne by the veterans, and I should like to make mention also of the very unequal share of the burden that is being borne by people with families. Unless the government in framing its housing plans for the future takes into account the claims of people with families and puts them first after the claims of the ex-service personnel we are going to leave a crying social need unsolved.

There are other problems, too. I have personal knowledge of two cases in Montreal which were brought to my attention, and which are only typical of many others, showing the methods being practised to evade the rent control regulations. In one case the rent paid was the rent fixed by the rental authority, but the sum of $500 was exacted from the tenant for the purchase of the key. In another case an apartment had been rented furnished, but the prospective tenant was compelled to buy the furniture at an utterly exorbitant price. Astute minds have been directed to devising methods of defeating the rent control regulations.

The effect has been very unhappy indeed on the reestablishment of veterans. One reason why so many of the ex-service men have not yet found employment is that they have been kept so busy trying to find housing accommodation they have not had time or opportunity or perhaps the will to look about for needed employment. That condition is common all over Canada, and particularly in the large cities. It is retarding recovery on the employment side, the reconversion side. You will find it acute in mining communities and in logging communities. There is a great need of proper housing accommodation adjacent to the big camps in many great logging areas in this country, not only in the east but in the west, in British Columbia, on Vancouver island and elsewhere.

The suggestion has been made by someone: Oh, let the surplus people in the cities go to the farms. But so long as we have these glowingly optimistic statements from the Minister of Reconstruction about the great opportunities of employment and high wages which will be available in industry you will not find many people going back from the large cities to the rural areas from which many of them came. Conditions are so bad that in some cities there has been interference with the law; but it is a great tribute to the law-abiding character of our people that under conditions of great stress there has been so little lawlessness over present housing condi-

tions. In some communities, however, there has been interference with sheriffs to prevent evictions of ex-service personnel. The government must take account of this situation.

What have been the activities of the government in this field? Well, we had a statement given to the press by the Minister of Reconstruction—hon. members will find it in the Ottawa *Journal* of February 11—which is a pretty fair sample of what happens when you get three ministers in the same administration competing for power in connection with housing matters or any others. This was the not unboastful statement which fell from the minister on that occasion; he was speaking about what the government is doing, and he said:

> Wartime Housing is the only department of government that is doing anything to get these houses built.

The only department! Well, I will accept his confession as applied to the other departments of government.

What is this great record of Wartime Housing Limited of which the Minister of Reconstruction boasts? I will give the house one experience. It is the experience that the city of Toronto had with contracts for 603 houses to be built in adjacent communities. These were to be semi-permanent houses. Unfortunately, Wartime Housing Limited decided that, of the 7,000 houses that it laid down in its 1945 programme, 6,200 were to be built without cellars, and only 800 with cellars. Under these conditions the city of Toronto had to take these houses without cellars; and what is the result? The first sod was turned on July 4, 1945, and a very optimistic statement—of course statements which come from the government or its minions are always optimistic—came from the representative of Wartime Housing Limited on that occasion. He said that 200 would be ready by the fall and 300 by Christmas. The first house was occupied on December 18, and to-day, ten months after the turning of the first sod, only 183 are completed. A fine record indeed! Wartime Housing Limited is still going on, wherever distracted municipalities apply for help, exacting harsh terms. They are still demanding a free gift of the best sites from the municipalities; they are still demanding subsidies in the form of donations of land and low taxes. In the city of Toronto the taxes they are prepared to pay do not amount to a quarter of what those properties would have to bear if they were owned by private persons. This is the kind of terms which Wartime Housing Limited is exacting.

That is not all. For instance, Toronto has expended already in appropriations, for the purpose of assisting housing, $2 million. The responsibility in this matter rests on the dominion. But here is a sample where one municipality—and I believe it stands pre-eminent in respect of the load it has had to carry, a load which the dominion government has left it to carry—has spent over $2 million in meeting not only the demands of Wartime Housing Limited for the provision of services in these 600 houses outside the city, but others as well. Wartime Housing is still going on disturbing the normal channels of distribution by its high-handed requisitioning methods.

What is the situation in respect of building materials? We have a glowing account in the throne speech of what is to be done to provide building materials, and we have this remarkable statement of the Minister of Reconstruction as quoted in the Ottawa *Journal* of February 11:

> We have beaten the shortage of brick, and lumber is now coming on the market in good quantities for houses.

Hon. members will remember, too, that he said in the house on the 20th of this month that perhaps lumber was the least of our problems and that, generally speaking, the situation was well in hand. I do not know what the Minister of Reconstruction means when he says that the problem of brick has been beaten, and that lumber is coming on the market in large quantities. It just does not fit the facts as the supply houses in the country know them. It does not fit the facts as they exist in Toronto and the other big cities of Canada. Talk about beating the situation in brick! One of the building materials which is in most critically short supply is brick; if there is another in the same category it is lumber; and it is not good enough to have these glowingly optimistic statements from the Minister of Reconstruction when they cannot be supported by facts. They just do not fit the facts as we members of the House of Commons know them in our respective constituencies. Not only do these shortages exist in acute form to-day; they will be felt for another two years unless a massive effort is put forth in this field. Yet in October last—I think it was the 25th—a very optimistic statement was made with regard to the production of building materials, on that occasion, by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). There seems to be something contagiously optimistic among members of the government; when they come to this question they are always optimistic, regardless of the facts. I will not take time to review the glowing statement made on that occasion. But the house will recall this, that

although the Minister of Reconstruction painted such an optimistic and rosy picture to us two days ago, nevertheless it is not six weeks ago that he appointed a fact-finding committee, drawn from the Canadian construction association, to ascertain the underlying causes of the shortage. The fact is that there are shortages and that these shortages will continue unless, as I say, a massive effort is put forward.

When we are approaching this problem let us realize that there must be a tremendous amount of work done to expand the capacity of the building and construction industry in Canada. Mr. H. C. Nicholls, the retiring president of the Canadian construction association, stated on January 14 of this year that the capacity of the building industry of Canada to-day is 30,000 houses per annum.

An hon. MEMBER: It was 40,000.

Mr. FLEMING: It was 30,000, according to the statement of the retiring president of the Canadian construction association; that is, the housebuilding capacity of the building industry. On that occasion representatives of the plumbing supply industry in Canada stated that that was far too optimistic an estimate, that twenty to twenty-five thousand was the maximum that their trade could possibly supply at the present time.

Mr. McILRAITH: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. FLEMING: If we are to expect larger figures of construction—

Mr. McILRAITH: Would the hon. member—

Mr. FLEMING: —it can only be on the basis of their building houses without putting plumbing in them.

Mr. McILRAITH: Would the hon. member permit a question on that?

Mr. FLEMING: I will give the hon gentleman the same answer that the minister gave in the house two days ago: when a number of members wished to ask him questions he said "No, no, no." I am sorry; I should like to answer questions, but I have not the time.

An hon. MEMBER: Deal with facts.

Mr. FLEMING: That is what I am doing.

An hon. MEMBER: That is open to doubt.

Mr. FLEMING: That is a very generous statement on the part of the hon. member. We recall where it comes from.

A word about these controls: let us have a picture of this control situation. Hon. members will recall that controls are a form of machinery set up in war-time to meet a war-time situation, to ration scarcity, and in some cases to create scarcity to prevent the expenditure of the funds of people on certain things and also to draw off labour from certain industries into war industries. That applied as much to the industries engaged in the production of building materials as to any others. The controls took such forms as these wage ceilings. There were low wage ceilings in industries engaged in the production of building materials. Price ceilings, fixed with reference to 1941 prices, were low, and it will be recalled that the restrictions went into great detail; they were very minute. Then the burden of taxation fell very heavily on industries engaged in the production of building materials. They had been depressed industries before the war and their standard profits were low. Consequently they have little or no benefit from whatever expansion in production is hoped for now. As a matter of fact, when the Minister of Reconstruction stated in this chamber last fall that the construction industries were making more money than before, he did not go on to tell us that the Minister of Finance is taking most of it away in the form of excess profits taxes.

The controls also take the form of zoning the marketing of lumber in particular areas and the application of quotas as between domestic and export markets, as well as the former multitude of permits and the multiplicity of controls, together with the vast army of controllers. That is the picture which to an unhappy extent faces industries engaged in the production of building materials in Canada. Unless there is a complete change of attitude, these industries will not be encouraged to go on and expand. If we have any hope of overcoming the housing situation to-day we must start with the expansion of production in building materials, and we shall not do that until we change our approach.

Consider the picture of controls in Canada. If the government is to maintain the same type of machinery and the same attitude it has held so far, then we shall not have an expansion in output of building materials in Canada. In the United States they believe that in order to obtain proper output of building materials they must expedite production. The time has come in Canada when we must have an expediter of production. We must put the emphasis there instead of on the rationing of scarcity.

Here is the situation which I believe most people who are in touch with this question find to-day. The manufacturer is still hobbled by a number of the restrictions I have referred to, and when the Minister of Recon-

struction says, "Oh, well, picture the danger of interfering with price ceilings," he ought to go farther and inform the house that at the present time his own administration is considering the easing of these ceilings on the manufactured price of these building materials. How will they do it? They will pass the burden on to the retailer. They will juggle the ceiling prices and take it out on the retailer.

In the field of distribution, zoning restrictions are still in force. What has been the effect of some of these restrictions? In the field of export, I suggest, the house should be given something more in the way of what I might call corrective information. The Minister of Reconstruction, in his glowing account two days ago, said that there had been a great response to his request for a stimulation of exports. There certainly has been in the field of exports so far as the producers of lumber are concerned, for the good reason that there is such a handsome differential between the price fixed for exports and the domestic price under ceilings. The result has been that the best lumber has been going outside Canada.

The minister can talk about his export quotas and about holding them down, but the export quotas were not fixed on a dollar basis. They were fixed on a footage basis, and the best lumber has been going to the export market, while what the trade calls the "guts and feathers" has been left to the domestic market. The situation in that regard has been such that producers to-day can realize more—I am speaking of the big differential—for rough green clears in the export trade than for manufactured kiln-dried uppers shipped to the domestic market.

There is a big black market in Canada in connection with building materials. The Minister of Reconstruction admitted it two days ago, when he said that was one reason they did away with building controls three months ago. Black markets, he said, were developing, and they are still here. There has been an undoubted attempt on the part of certain persons to get around the ceilings. The timber controller in Toronto made a statement in Toronto this week as reported in the *Globe and Mail* of March 20. He said:

> Illegal bonuses, such as $100 for opening a car door, or $200 for delivery before a certain hour, have been taken by lumber black marketers in Canada as part of above-ceiling-price transactions, Timber Controller D. D. Rosenberry acknowledged yesterday.
>
> "We all know all their dodges—or we think we do—and we are going after them," he told the Ontario Retail Lumber Dealers' Association. "Maybe we haven't started soon enough . . ."

I think it will generally be agreed that they did not start soon enough. Then he made this statement, as quoted at the end of the newspaper item, and I offer it as a panacea for solving the problem of black markets:

> "The best method of all for stopping any black marketing," he said, "is to get so much lumber on the market the few pirates will not be able to sell theirs."

In the second place, black marketing has taken the form of selling in the wholesale trade at retail prices, calling big shipments retail, and the retail merchant, of course, is the man who is suffering—the retail merchant as well as the purchaser.

In the third place, common grades of lumber have been sold as select.

In the fourth place, we all know that in the labour market, because it was not possible for many contractors engaged in building—some of them even on government enterprises—to attract labour into their service, they have been hiring men as contractors without reference to existing wage ceilings.

Let us sum up the black market situation. If we are to have restrictions and controls, then we should have them strictly enforced.

In addition, there are vast quantities of building materials in Canada to-day held out of the market. Why? Because of the uncertainty as to what the government will do. They are hoping for higher prices.

There must be on the part of the government an enunciation now of a much clearer policy with reference to the demobilization of controls than there has been in anything that has been stated so far, because, if this is not done, these vast quantities of building materials will continue to be held off the market. It must be made clear to those who are holding these quantities off the market that they will be caught with them some time, and that can be done only if the government enunciates a longer term policy with a clearer objective than anything given us heretofore.

In the face of these facts, the leading contribution by our C.C.F. friends to the solution of the country's problem is to put more shackles on the builders and those engaged in the production of building materials.

There is another form of restriction worthy of mention. I have referred to the freezing of tenants in occupation. I mentioned this at the last session, when I called the attention of the Minister of Finance to the situation, and he promised that the matter would be given consideration, but no action has been taken. When the freezing order came into effect it was made to apply not only to existing tenancies but to those thereafter created. The result was that people would not take

a chance on getting undesirable tenants into their houses, and they have not offered to rent accommodation to those who are sorely in need of it.

Let me give opinions on this subject from representatives of veterans' organizations as well as representatives of labour. In the Toronto reconstruction council on January 19 we have statements like this:

> Major Edwin Meredith of the Canadian Corps Association, advanced the suggestion because he said he was seriously alarmed about the housing situation in general and the problem of veterans' families in particular.

This has reacted against veterans, and it is for that reason that I make this plea. I quote further:

> "There would be many thousands of additional rooms made available if some assurance were given," contended Russel Harvey of the Toronto district labour council. "The greatest fear of home-owners is that they won't be able to get rid of objectionable tenants if they rent rooms that are now vacant."

Mr. Harvey is a prominent labour leader in Toronto, and a member of the Ontario labour relations board.

I do hope the government will give consideration to that suggestion.

The last form of restriction to which I have time to refer is this. At the present time veterans who are home-owners must give three months' notice to their tenants if they want to resume possession of the home they occupied at the date of enlistment. They are not in a position to qualify to give that notice until they are discharged. That ought to be changed. It means that a veteran coming out of uniform has to wait for three months before he can get into the house that he owns. Surely to goodness it should be permitted to veterans to give that notice in advance of discharge. It cannot be that much hardship to the tenant, because the tenant knows that his landlord is a man in the armed forces.

We do not ask the impossible of the government, but we want a frank facing up to this situation. In large measure we lay the responsibility for this problem at the doorstep of the government. We say (1) that the government made reckless promises to win votes, and those promises have not been fulfilled; (2) we accuse them of lack of foresight and preparation. They surely could have seen the situation which was developing. We accuse them (3) of dilly-dallying and wasting valuable time when energy and drive were needed. The start should have been made long ago. We accuse them (4) of lack of frankness with the public, glossing over the serious dimensions of the housing crisis and the utter inadequacy of their measures to meet it; (5) lack of a clear-cut policy to meet a clear-cut objective, even to the extent of confusion as between departments of government; (6) discouraging private builders in a variety of ways; (7) high-handed methods of requisitioning building materials whereby a fair distribution thereof has been prevented; (8) a wage policy which has deterred production of building materials and the construction of houses. The low wage ceiling will have to be eased. We accuse them (9) of a taxation policy which has discouraged the worker, the producer, the processor and the builder, and has restricted production; and last but by no means least, (10) a war-time man-power policy which wasted our human resources and our ability to produce.

The responsibility is that of the government. We do not ask something superhuman or impossible of them, but we do say that they have not measured up to their responsibilities. They have fallen far short of them. This is a federal responsibility. The government has taken all the necessary power unto itself. It is the same old story. When it comes to taking credit for something good they are ready to take it, but what about responsibility when things do not look so good? Well, that is a little different. We have had a fine illustration of that in this debate and in the debates of the fall session in connection with labour conditions. There we had an illustration of the difference between credit and responsibility. When the Ford strike was on we had a labour crisis in this country. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) rose in his place in this house and said that it was a provincial responsibility. But to-day—

Mr. MITCHELL: I never did anything of the kind.

Mr FLEMING: Well, it is to be found in *Hansard*. The Minister of Labour said that it was the responsibility of the government of Ontario. Then a solution was brought about by joint action of the two governments, and to-day the Prime Minister boasts about the condition of labour relations in Canada, but to whom does he give the credit? To the Minister of Labour. Of course, when it comes to credit there is no doubt about the government being right in the field.

The matter of employment has a direct relationship to housing. It was estimated in the Curtis report that the construction of 25,000 houses would provide 150,000 jobs per year. The responsibility of initiating policies

to bring about conditions of high employment rests on the dominion; therefore they have a direct responsibility in the matter of housing. In the matter of social security —and this is a problem of social security— the responsibility certainly rests on the dominion to assist.

May I detain the house while I try to sum up what I conceive to be the needs of the situation. In the first place, there must be a frank recognition on the part of the government and of parliament that a national emergency exists. Let there be no playing politics with that. There is a national emergency in the field of housing. My leader and others have pointed that out. The President of the United States has recognized the same thing in his country. Why cannot we recognize it in ours? I speak now of the government and of parliament. When it comes to the safety of the state being involved there is no hesitation on the part of the government to take measures even to override the rule of law. Why cannot we have strong action by legal means in this field of housing? I have spoken of the need of easing wage ceilings. I have referred to the need of easing the burden of high taxation on wage-earners and the need of easing the burden of taxation on those who are engaged in production. We agree in all parts of the house that there must be complete concentration on the building of homes even if other forms of construction have to be sacrificed. In the construction of homes first preference must be given to veterans.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Golding): Order. The hon. member's time is now exhausted. Unless he has the consent of the house he cannot continue.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Continue.

Mr. FLEMING: I thank the house for its great courtesy. I promise hon. members I shall be brief. After the provision for the need of houses second place must be given to the needs of the construction industry itself, because there will have to be a big expansion of plant engaged in the production of building materials if the colossal need is to be met.

In the next place there must be a big plan. When President Truman gave instructions to Mr. Wilson Wyatt, his housing administrator, now housing expediter, to draft a plan for the United States he gave him only one instruction and it was this, "Make no little plans." That must be our approach in this country. We must go forward with a big plan. Half measures will not do; the problem is too colossal. I have not yet been able to find the 1946 programme of the government in the field of construction. If it has a 1946 programme or objective it still remains a profound secret so far as this house is concerned. We must have a goal. We shall flounder if we have not a goal. Housing Enterprises Limited has announced that its objective in 1946 is the construction of 6,000 housing units in various Canadian centres. That is rental housing. That is a drop in the bucket. Let us not delude ourselves that this will be low-rent housing. It cannot be. The cost of construction to-day is such that Housing Enterprises Limited cannot build low-rent housing as that term is properly understood. They will probably be medium-rental houses.

Let us have a proper understanding of what is involved. I am not going to go over the promises that the government and its supporters made in the last election campaign. The house will remember the promises of the 600,000 to 1,000,000 houses. Let us see the big plan. We have not heard about it in parliament. Let us have the big bold plan they advertised in the campaign. Where is it? We in this house would like to see the government's big bold plan.

The Prime Minister did not give the United States very high marks for what they are doing in the field of construction. The United States has set its objective. It was approved by the President. The original objective of 500,000 houses for 1946 has been raised to 1,200,000 houses on which construction is to be commenced before the end of this year. That will be increased before the end of 1947 to 2,700,000 houses and apartments. There is a real objective. Relatively, our need for housing in this country is greater because our climate is more severe. We must plan on a big scale.

In the next place, we must realize that the problem of housing, in certain aspects, will be with us for a long time. Of course all hon. members want to concentrate upon the emergency aspect of the problem because it is of such collosal proportions. But we must keep in mind, too, the long-range problem; and what we do to-day in an effort to cope with the emergency aspects must be related to our long-range objective.

We must not lose sight of the need in the low-rent housing field, a field which is not met by the National Housing Act as it exists to-day. The great gap in the act is in its lack of provision for those in the lower income brackets.

The Curtis report estimated that there were 300,000 sub-standard dwellings in our cities, towns and rural areas. That was the number

estimated two years ago, and it is higher to-day. Because of the doubling-up the number of families living in those dwellings is substantially greater to-day than it was then. We have to tackle that problem, and try to correlate our present plan in meeting the emergency aspects with the long-range approach to a problem which will be with us for some time.

I have been critical of what I have described as smugness and complacency in statements which have fallen from the lips of members of the government during this debate. If their words are a fair indication of their approach to the problem, then this problem will not be met. If the government is simply to be boastful of what it has done; if it is to be smug and complacent in the face of a national crisis, then the problem will not be solved. If there is one thought that transcends all others to-day, it is that government should give leadership, leadership on a wide front. We shall not solve the problem either by denying its existence or belittling it, or by belittling the efforts of those who draw its true proportions to the attention of the house.

The government has not given the leadership to which the people of Canada are entitled. Had it done so, would it have been necessary for the veterans to occupy the Vancouver hotel?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Golding): The hon. member has exhausted his time.

Mr. LIONEL BERTRAND (Terrebonne) (Translation): The year 1946 marks a troubled era in the history of the world. The war came to an end last year; still, all nations feel that peace has not yet returned. While the great powers are endeavouring to ensure it through an agreement based upon the respect of treaties and mutual confidence, the nations, great or small, are making a determined effort with a view to reestablishing their upset economy. Each country, in the turmoil of the post-war period, seeks practical solutions, works out the most diversified plans, but faces the future not without some fears that the circumstances justify.

Canada, like the other nations, must now solve internal problems which are both serious and complicated. They crop up so fast and in such numbers that the government, unable to solve them all at once, must perforce concentrate on the most pressing ones.

I recognize that such a situation is disquieting to them; besides, it is depressing for the people who, now that war is over, are anxious to enjoy peace and who, not finding it up to their expectations, voice their resentment in no uncertain terms.

Discontent is rife among the people. It is kindled less by democracy than by its occasional abuse, less by wealth than by its frequent abuse, less by our recognized laws than by their oft-neglected implementation. To our other evils, war has added excessive legislation which the people accepted as a necessary consequence of the armed conflict. To this legislation, hundreds of orders of all sorts were grafted, many of which smacked so obviously of sheer experiment, contrivance and artificiality that on the whole, they could not be favourably accepted. As a result, our democratic system is beginning to feel the repercussions of this discontent. "War is over, say the people. Then, why is such and such a policy still in effect? Why is such another preserved?" Dissatisfaction is intensified by the fact that while hostilities lasted, the praises of peace were sung far and wide and we were promised that the end of the war would bring about universal comfort and happiness. However, reality with its sad disillusions has kindled all over, but especially among the working classes a feeling of discontent which tends to become sharper. The piling up of insignificant causes inevitably brings about tremendous results. Unimportant facts, harmless if isolated, are sooner or later directed to some definite goal. Unconsciously or otherwise, they generate certain trends which, though weak at first gather more and more impetus and finally become overwhelming. Such trends are at present influencing our national life and current events are causing deep concern among the masses who are becoming impatient. Can you blame the people, driven to distraction by excessive legislation and generosity, subjected to all sorts of restrictions and witnessing the extravagant methods of capital, for still believing in happiness, and wishing for comfort, work and a home while at the same time pressing for security?

To live an honest and happy life, a minimum of comfort and well-being is needed. If that is lacking, if people are deprived of work, home, food and clothing, the door is wide open to the most dangerous abuses. Whenever a member of the national family, no longer believing in the democratic system, leans towards socialism seeing in this doctrine a remedy to all the evils he suffers at the hands of more fortunate individuals, another cell disintegrates and disappears. Since the end of the war, trends of thought—there is no need to specify—have taken shape and expanded. Unemployment has given rise to them. If we wish to insure the security of

the State and maintain peace within its borders, we must put an end to the dissatisfaction caused by hardship and insufficiency, and stamp out the evils which afflict society.

Nothing is so distasteful, now that we have emerged from a war in which we have spent billions of dollars, than to see again the loathsome spectre of unemployment standing watch at the windows of thousands of homes, and to notice on the brows of thousands of people the deep lines of a worry caused by their enforced idleness. From week to week, unemployment increases and those who cannot find work comment ominously, in front of the selective service's employment offices, on the fact that "it took a war to give us jobs". The explanation will be given that transition from war to peace cannot normally take place without any impediment; that may be true, but in my opinion the real cause lies in the fact that our war effort has overstepped the limits of common sense and that, during the war, not enough thought has been given to preparations for the period that would follow. The people have been made to pay exceedingly heavy taxes; we have had an income tax applying both to capital and savings. Those taxes have cut into the capital of the citizens with a fixed income; they have cut into the capital of manufacturers who have to meet obligations incurred before the war; today, unable to obtain raw materials, they no longer have, once their taxes are paid, the funds necessary for the modernization of their plants.

In 1943, I said in the house that our war effort was sometimes almost hysterical. We have granted loans interest free and now, through generosity, we are writing them off. We have given away billions of dollars because, we were told, war required it. We have made large contributions of manpower. We have generously drawn from our natural resources. Canada has supplied food and munitions as well as men. Our war effort was bound to give rise to problems and, because we are unable to solve them properly, they are creating serious difficulties to the whole nation. We are now at peace and yet, in the name of peace, we are asking Canada to lend money and contribute to loans which will add, in capital and interest, to the already heavy burden resting on our shoulders.

During the war I objected to such generosity. When the bill covering the $1,250 million comes before the house for approval, I reserve the right to define my attitude in the light of the information given and express my full views on the matter. At this stage of our national life, when our debt has increased from $4 to $16 billion in five years, we should not become overexcited but should tackle the problem of reforming our economy.

Canada should certainly help the devastated countries of Europe, because the great principle of charity compels us to do so. We should not be mean about it. We have helped them and are still doing so with pride as well as generosity. However, before lending vast sums of money which will carry millions of dollars in interest and will be more advantageous to the borrower than to the lender, before imposing additional obligations on the Canadian taxpayer, should we not first secure employment for our people, grant more facilities for the re-establishment of veterans, reduce the income tax, suppress social evils, provide our citizens with dwellings and take measures that will enable us to obtain without difficulty the goods produced in Canada, namely: materials of all kinds, clothing, foodstuffs, butter for instance, which is so important on the worker's table or in his lunch-box?

These are the causes of dissatisfaction among the people. Mingle with them and you will be convinced. Among veterans, there is more grumbling than we think. During the war, they were presented with a rehabilitation plan; this most wonderful, most generous and most perfectly balanced plan was truly a model for other countries to copy. However, its application has become absolutely impossible in many parts of Canada. Why? Because of the incompetence and neglectfulness of district officials and of inadequte advice and direction from selective service offices; because, also, veterans have found it impossible to obtain priorities both from War Assets Corporation and the Prices Board. *O-Pip,* the official organ of the Canadian Legion in the Province of Quebec notes in its March issue that "reestablishment is a fiasco". And Mr. G. Henri Gonthier, the legion president in that province said recently, during an interview:

> We had a terribly hard time trying to convince our veterans not to give vent to their ill-feeling. But we have had enough. We are not asking for charity; we simply want our veterans to receive, through regular and legal channels, the help they so richly deserve.

Other groups of citizens are also dissatisfied and crave a little more justice and attention. Failure of the government to forecast, in the speech from the throne, any relief whatever from our present tax set-up has been a source of great disappointment. The people claim they are entitled to such relief, in order to meet new and accrued responsibilities. Wages have been lowered although the cost of living is just as high and has a tendency to rise. Lower taxes would offer relief to industrialists, merchants, civil servants, farmers, heads of

families, as well as to our youth, who, under present conditions, cannot save for the years ahead. Let the government abolish those commissions which are now useless; let them return to civil life those hundreds of men in uniforms who have asked for their discharge and are being kept in the army willy-nilly; let all departments put into effect a policy of economy; let there be no costly or useless projects, no undue generosity, but let us rather spend a few hundred millions on public works.

Public works will be needed immediately in those cities where unemployment is more acute, in those centres which have been overpopulated through the presence of war industries. Public works will also be needed in those municipalities which, in their desire to cooperate with the government, have made enormous capital expenditures and are now financially embarrassed. The people will never understand or accept unemployment, when, during the war terrific sums were spent without haggling.

We shall have to reconvert, sell or turn over to private enterprise war plants—such as the Bouchard plant—which can still be profitably operated as private industries, unless the government be willing to take them over and produce for UNRRA. I shall have suggestions to offer later on.

The Department of National Defence will have to establish, in every military district, a regional board, to study each case of desertion on its merit and to make sure that the commanding officers of the detention camps are not wielding their powers to render more burdensome the serving of a sentence by those who have accepted it in compliance with the law of the land. On the other hand, I claim that it is unfair to keep in detention or in camps, farm labourers or skilled employees, as, for example, expert buttermakers when the scarcity of butter is so pronounced, or lumbermen, when they are so urgently needed in the bush, or again, electricians and skilled carpenters when the building trade is paralyzed. Personally, I would favour an amnesty, but if, for reason of discipline, it must not be resorted to, let us at least be decent enough to those who report for duty to consider their cases in the light of their special circumstances and eliminate those vexations which, in the past, have given rise to so much justified criticism and legitimate complaint.

The speech from the throne forecasts the immediate implementation of measures directed at maintaining employment at a high level and solving the extremely acute housing problem. These are both urgent legislations. I welcome them and so do the Canadian people who are clamouring for them. I shall support the address, as a token of my appreciation for those two pieces of legislation, but, as I said before, I shall reserve the right to vote according to my views on the bill concerning the billion and a quarter loan on which, no doubt, the right hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) will give us full particulars.

The housing situation is critical. I believe it is in our own interest to see that our markets are supplied with sufficient building materials; then it might be justifiable to ship our surplus overseas. In this field, as in others, there is no reason why foreigners should be supplied before our own people.

Employment is the means of supplying work. A nation cannot be happy when unemployment is prevalent. Prior to 1939, the undertaking of public works was urged; however, under pretense of curtailing expenses, they were denied. Then war was declared and millions were juggled around. To wage and win the war, billions of dollars were instantly available. Could we now refuse to earmark a few hundred million dollars each year to fight unemployment through the country, applying them to the undertaking of public works that would remain an asset for Canada? To ensure peace, maintain the democratic prestige of our country, prevent our population from subscribing to subversive doctrines, attain true national security, work is the essential factor.

I shall not support the amendment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken). It evidences a lack of sincerity which is characteristic of the party he directs. I fail to understand that it now stands for economies and reductions in taxes, since, during the war years, government expenditures were never large enough in its opinion. The Conservative party does not enjoy public confidence; even under its new camouflage, it has not been successful in overcoming the sorry reputation it acquired during the first Great War. On this side of the house freedom of speech is a reality; we may frankly utter our thoughts, even if they are at variance with those of our colleagues. This makes for strength in the ranks of the Liberals. Our party is not based on egotism, coercion, blind subservience to an official platform or a "believe or die" policy; it will survive when all others have collapsed, for no other party has recognized to a fuller extent the value of individuality and freedom.

I shall not support the sub-amendment of the C.C.F. party. I rely too much on private enterprise to subscribe to a socialist doctrine which, although moderate, must still be contrary to the best interests of a country like Canada. The war years, due to the amount of

work they have provided, have deprived socialism of its best opportunities. As I said before, so that this theory, with others similar to it, may have no chance of spreading, work is absolutely necessary.

Social security in all fields: food in the larder of every home, ownership of property made easy for all, hardship eliminated, social evils suppressed, maximum encouragement given to agriculture, private enterprise fostered, youth assisted and encouraged, happiness everywhere: that is the part the government should play in 1946 and in subsequent years. They have accomplished a tremendous task during the war. Why could they not do as much in peace time? Canada occupies an important place among the nations of the world. However she must continue her activities in the fields of industry, commerce, agriculture, mining, forestry, and in all other national spheres. Her future is in her own hands. The other nations, intent on solving their own problems, will not help her to reestablish herself and, in the field of business, where gratitude is frequently unknown, the nations including Great Britain will never surrender the freedom which they have always held of buying wherever they see fit. Therefore, it is Canada's duty, in the name of the elementary principle of self-preservation, not to exceed the limits of common sense. Will Canada have won the peace if within her own borders there are unemployment, dislocation and discouragement? First and above all, we must prevent the evil of unemployment. In addition, we must lighten the burden borne by the workers and others in the lower salary brackets and develop further throughout the country the program of social security which has been so successfully launched by the present government. We have reached a decisive hour when every Canadian must become a crusader in order to protect and defend the social structure against trouble-makers, against promoters of ideas which are inconsistent with our parliamentary system and our Christian traditions. That which fosters unity within a nation is the joy which everyone feels in belonging to such a nation. Social security and national security are two words which are inseparable and which are guarantees for the future. By keeping them to the fore, by uniting them, by blending them, we shall make Canada a healthy, united and powerful country.

(Text):

Mr. WILFRED LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, allow me first to compliment the government on the firm stand they have taken with regard to the fantastic espionage network which communistic Russia was in the act of establishing in this country. Some of our fellow citizens have reached a pass where they consider that their obligation toward communism must have priority over their allegiance to Canada. That is a logical consequence of the communistic propaganda in this country, a propaganda which I denounced when I introduced in this house on May 24, 1940, a bill to amend the criminal code for the purpose of outlawing all propaganda conducted by communists or nazis, who advocate an ideology opposed to our conception of democracy. That bill was rejected, but I must commend the government upon having seen the light and come to realize how justified I was in introducing that bill. Better late than never. I would suggest to the government that they should bring back that bill as soon as possible and outlaw the communist party in Canada. We are in duty bound to take action at once because to any shrewd mind it is obvious that the ambition of the dictatorship now in power at Moscow is to replace our Christian civilization by absolute atheism, and when belief in God is lacking, everything is possible in the field of international relations.

The communist party, which is the only party that exists in Russia, simply wants to spread its sphere of influence over all Europe and use its propaganda for the suppression of the two remaining bulwarks, England and Spain, which will prevent it from carrying out its dechristianization work. To reach that objective, it uses in certain countries people who are nationalist in name only and who arouse local patriotism in order to foment bloody revolutions through which it will benefit. In other countries, it uses a camouflaged communist party, as is the case in Canada. Those nationalists and communists hired by Moscow take pride in saying that they are working out the liquidation of England.

Would America, civilization and even Catholicism, stand to gain anything if the Soviet empire were to replace the British empire as a dominating influence in the old world? Sensible people will be unanimous in answering that question. The influence of the British empire in Europe is very much preferable to that of the Soviet empire, because the former respects the individual much more than does the latter and allows him a freedom which is completely lacking under Moscow rule. It will be a great mistake to hail any lessening of British influence in Europe without thinking of what will follow. What the world needs most at this time is sober thinking and realistic deeds; otherwise, our road will lead to absolute chaos.

No one more than I desires the independence of my country, but I wish to attain this object by orderly and legitimate means. Patriotism is instilled not by resorting to bloodshed but by winning over the hearts and minds of people. History shows that all those who have attained power or achieved their aims through violence have been forcibly brought down from the pinnacle on which they had ensconsed themselves.

We can reply to advocates of revolutionary communism and nationalism by striving to improve our social legislation for the benefit of the public, by firmly repressing monopolies and by passing laws which, economically speaking, will allow a better distribution of the national wealth. Now that we have accomplished a tremendous war effort, far beyond our means, sound patriotism must include a generous thought for our own citizens to whom we should grant relief from taxation as rapidly as possible to enable them readily to attain a normal social balance.

Hence I deem it my duty to protest forthwith against those periodical gifts to England, the brunt of which will be borne by the majority of our citizens. I have a great respect for the British commonwealth of nations, but as you know, sir, I have always felt that a Canadian worthy of the name, who has pledged allegiance to his country and must serve its interests first and foremost, should protect the public treasury against those who are prone to make gifts to other nations which, in many instances, are wealthier than we are.

Ireland safeguarded her own interests during the war. No one holds any grudge against her and her prestige has not declined anywhere in the world.

I respect the views of those who differ with me in regard to the meaning of the words "to serve one's country", but I deemed it my duty to vote against participation and against each billion dollar gift which, under one form or another, we have so generously made during the war. I have at the time stated the reasons for my stand and, in my opinion, those reasons still hold to-day.

From a strictly Canadian point of view, I believe that this further loan of $1,250 million, which will not bear any interest for five years, is not a good business proposition for our country, because this agreement which I have read most carefully, contains no provision compelling England to spend this money in Canada. England, whose memory is short where Canada's efforts on her behalf are concerned, does not, under this agreement, undertake to lift the restrictions she has imposed on Canadian products, not only within her own borders but all over the sterling area. England will be able to spend our Canadian dollars anywhere and in any way she sees fit in order to rebuild her pre-war economy. Whenever it suits her purpose, England can even continue to purchase wheat from the Argentine rather than from Canada, or give preferance to Denmark's bacon over our own farm produce, and experience has taught me that the dictates of her interests will be the sole guide in the matter.

In short, Canadians will not only have helped England win the war, but also assist her in her conquest of world markets. Our dollar will serve as Great Britain's ambassador. Since we export 40 per cent of our production, we shall help to impair our own markets, while ostensibly attempting to maintain England's; for, if she spends our dollars elsewhere, Great Britain will insist that the countries whose goods she purchases reciprocates with certain privileges. These will certainly not be to our advantage, and we shall recover our funds through banking transactions rather than through the sale of our goods.

It may be claimed that at the present time Great Britain has tremendous contracts in Canada and that the loan will help to pay for them. No mention is made of these contracts, however, in the terms of the agreement between Great Britain and Canada, and there is nothing to prevent England from cancelling them if she can do better business elsewhere.

The British are business men. Far from hating them, I admire them, but I sincerely wish we had, as members of the Canadian government, men with as much business sense as they possess.

Australia refused a loan to England and I fail to see why we should be an easier prey than the Australians. I much prefer, in Europe, Great Britain's influence to that of Russia, but I do not think it necessary to drain our coffers to attain that end. The loan and gifts we are making under this agreement are five times greater than the loan to Great Britain contemplated by the United States, in proportion to the respective populations of the two countries. Are we wealthier than the Americans? Are our anticipated revenues superior to those of the United States and England? I do not think so.

I beg to denounce with the greatest energy the condescension and lack of Canadian spirit evidenced by the leader of the Social Credit party, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), who blamed the other nations of the commonwealth for failing to grant loans to England and who stated, as reported in *Hansard* of March 19, 1946:

> I think the loan should have been made to Great Britain interest free.

This stand on the part of the Social Credit party does not surprise me in the least for, during the war, they have been the most imperialistic group in the House of Commons, and they are generally known as such throughout the province of Quebec. I have as much respect for a sincere partisan of social credit as I have contempt for those who attempt to use that doctrine as a platform to teach a political creed that has nothing in common with the social credit policy expounded in this house by the leader of the party, the hon. member for Peace River.

I also strongly protest against that part of the agreement whereby we make a gift of $425 millions to Britain, and even more I am told, which is supposed to represent the amount owed us by that country for the training of her airmen in Canada.

Why, in the same agreement, do we also cancel all interests on a loan of $700 millions made to Britain in 1942?

Since the greater part of the taxes collected by the government are paid by citizens whose income is below $3,000, the cost of financing that agreement with Great Britain will be borne by the great majority of our people.

Needless to say, the attitude of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), who approves this policy but finds our rates of income tax too high, is ridiculous. Therefore the people of Canada who have been unable to borrow money from their own government at two per cent interest in order to build houses or in the way of farm credits or public works to alleviate unemployment will be paying for those gifts to Britain.

Why should we again and always pay for such unsound generosity in the hope of helping a country whose possibilities of reestablishment, with its colonial empire, India for instance, are far greater than our own, without forgetting the high level of our taxes? All the party leaders in the house have approved this transaction as good business for Canada. I take the liberty of telling them that I find this business unsound and that I will vote against the agreement when it is submitted to the house for approval..

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GORDON B. ISNOR (Halifax): I hope the hon. members who moved and seconded the motion for an address to His Excellency in reply to the speech from the throne in such an excellent manner will pardon me if I do not make any extended remarks in congratulating them. Perhaps the best compliment which they received was that accorded them in the very careful attention given to the remarks of both the mover, the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau) and the seconder, the distinguished-looking hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Winters). I hope the hon. member for St. Boniface will pardon me if I make particular reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg. I was particularly interested in his remarks because they brought to the attention of this house and of the country problems affecting the eastern section of the dominion. Like the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg, I propose this evening to deal with two matters affecting eastern Canada particularly, although they will have a direct bearing on the rest of our nation. I wish to come directly to a portion of the speech which I believe is of the utmost importance to the maritime provinces, namely, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. In doing so I am going to refer at once to paragraphs 6 and 7 of the speech from the throne. Paragraph 6 reads:

> The government has steadily pursued its efforts to restore former markets, to secure new markets and generally to expand peace-time exports. In pursuit of this policy, export credits, for which additional provision was made at the last session, have been extended to several of our war-time allies.

Paragraph 7, which is closely connected with the thought expressed in paragraph 6, states:

> At this session you will be asked to approve an agreement, recently concluded, for a loan to the United Kingdom which will help maintain the British market for Canadian food products and other exports. The agreement will also contribute to the steady development of trade between the two countries, the removal of trade barriers and the free use of currencies for international trade.

I believe that on these two paragraphs depends the future prosperity of our country. If these thoughts are brought into fulfilment as expressed and all sections of Canada are given an equal opportunity to prosper, I do not believe that we need to worry very much as to the terms of the dominion-provincial agreements of which we have heard so much during the past six months.

It is easy for us sitting here in the city of Ottawa, the capital of the country, to think along industrial lines. In the past six years Ontario, and perhaps Quebec have prospered to a great extent due to the increased purchasing power brought about by the industrial plants which have been established here

because of the war. It is true that Ontario is known and recognized as an industrial centre, but I would not want the people of Ontario to overlook the fact that the very life of our country depends upon marketing in other lands the products of the farm, the forest, the sea and the mine. This is of paramount importance, for without active and expanding farm communities such as we have in the prairie provinces, without busy sawmills and paper mills such as we have in British Columbia, without a fishing industry such as we also have in British Columbia, in Nova Scotia and in the other maritime provinces, and an overseas market for our lead, zinc and copper operations, the manufacturing edifice of the industrial centres of Ontario and Quebec might well totter and collapse.

The report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for 1945 shows that in 1943, the last year of which we have a record, our exports to the United States amounted to 38·7 per cent; to the United Kingdom, 34·8 per cent, or a total of 73·5 per cent of all domestic exports. Thus it can be seen that Great Britain is one of our largest and best customers. On numerous occasions Great Britain has said that she must export to survive. She has made it abundantly clear that she will trade only with those who will trade with her on equal or nearly equal volume with herself. She lacked the dollars with which to buy in Canada, but as stated in paragraph 7, a loan agreement has been concluded and now awaits approval by this parliament.

Having brought Great Britain into the picture, I wish to refer to preferential tariffs within the empire which were put into effect in 1932. Some hon. members on the other side of the house may wonder why I take this occasion to bring to the attention of the house an agreement brought into effect in 1932, with which I propose to deal and about which I shall say some complimentary things. From careful questioning of persons living in the maritimes it is my considered opinion that these preferential tariffs should be continued to the greatest possible extent. I say that to the government without hesitation because I believe that the preferential tariffs such as were made in 1932 have been of real benefit to Canada and particularly to the section from which I come and have the honour to represent.

It is fully realized that pressure to have these preferential tariffs reduced or even abolished may come from certain quarters. But having regard to the time, energy and money spent during the years following 1932 to develop trade within the empire and to increase business between Canada and empire countries during that period, I urge on the government the necessity of doing everything possible to have the preferential tariffs within the empire continued. In this connection I believe I shall have the support of the prairie provinces and British Columbia, and in a broad sense all provinces.

It should not be necessary to emphasize the great advantages we have enjoyed by the establishment of many branch industrial plants in Canada following the introduction of the preferential tariff in order to enjoy the benefits of the united empire trade agreement, or the harm that may be done on the likelihood of many of them being withdrawn should the preferential tariffs be abolished.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) will be able to tell from the statistics of his department what these branch industries have been worth to Canada. I am convinced it has been a very important contribution, both in the amount of labour employed and in the various sources of revenue accruing to the government.

I would also bring to the government's attention a matter that has been the cause of a great deal of discussion in the maritime provinces, namely the terms of the West Indies trade agreements. These are such that preferential treatment cannot be given by Canada to islands or countries not mentioned in the agreement. The result is that sugar from Cuba and San Domingo had to pay full duty. This prevented the purchase of sugar from these islands by Canadian refiners, except on rare occasions when extreme world conditions forced their sugar to be sold at very low prices. Cuba became resentful, as the minister no doubt will remember, because they were large buyers of fish and potatoes in Canada. They were unable to secure favourable terms for the marketing of their sugar. The result of this was that Cuba put a practically prohibitive import duty upon table potatoes from Canada, thereby reducing the purchase in Canada to a mere 15,000 or 20,000 barrels of seed potatoes a year, as compared with a former purchase of 150,000 to 200,000 barrels of table and seed potatoes a year.

With a reciprocal trade agreement with Cuba the market for Canadian fish could be greatly increased. A large portion of their requirements have come for many years from Norway. And with the likelihood that the cost of production in Canada will be higher it will be difficult to hold the Cuban fish business we had previously.

That is why we in the maritime provinces, and particularly in Nova Scotia, think it neces-

sary that the West Indies trade agreement be modified to allow an intermediary preference agreement to be made with other countries that can provide a desirable volume of reciprocal trade.

I think I am safe in saying that the markets of Cuba and San Domingo for fish and potatoes alone would be worth more to Canada than all the British West Indies markets combined. I commend this portion of my remarks to the Minister of Trade and Commerce who, I am pleased to see, is in his seat. I know he will give my suggestion serious thought. In fact, I am led to believe that the West Indies trade agreement is now under review, and I trust that before negotiations are definitely concluded he and his experts will give those interested in West Indies trade an opportunity of making proper representations. Or, better still, it might be wise for him to send some of his commissioners or selling agents to our end of the country so that they might become enlightened and learn some of our problems from personal contact. In this way they would be more likely to be in a position to provide remedies which would help to bring about still greater prosperity in the eastern maritime provinces.

I would also draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the fact that in dealing with Cuba the Platt amendment which, under the Spanish-American war settlement provides a twenty per cent overall preference to the United States in the Cuban market, must not be lost sight of. This may be very useful to remember if too much objection is made to a British empire preferential agreement.

An important function in connection with import-export operations is the development of port business. Perhaps the primary purpose of my remarks is to impress upon the house just how necessary it is that any and all new preferential agreements that are made, whether for full preference or intermediary preference, should contain the paramount stipulation that all goods which are to enjoy that preference must be landed ex ship, directly at the ocean or river port in Canada, as has been the requirement under the British empire trade agreements.

I feel reasonably sure that every hon. member who in any way has been connected with the shipping business, or who lives in proximity to a port doing export-import business, will realize the importance of this. The greater the number of ships using our Canadian ports, the greater the prosperity in these ports. After the adoption of the British empire trade agreement with the direct shipment clause, many lines of steamships which had not previously called at Canadian ports came to Canada in increasing numbers, as shown by the shipping records following the 1932 period. During that period scarcely a week passed that there were not two or more ships, each with from 3,000 to 7,000 tons of cargo, at Montreal, Halifax or Saint John, discharging cargo which previously had been landed at Boston or New York and conveyed by foreign railways to inland points in Canada. When far eastern trade is restored these cargoes will again flow through United States ports if the stipulation asked for is not provided. This applies also to shipments of sugar from the West Indies for Montreal, which previously moved through New York.

I realize I am not making as eloquent a speech as the majority of hon. members in the house find it within their power to deliver. However, I am placing these facts before the government in a plain and businesslike fashion. My whole argument is based upon facts, and it was for that reason that I thought it advisable to speak on this occasion, and to stick to the one subject as it is covered in the two paragraphs I have mentioned.

I have referred to far eastern trade. Some hon. members may wonder why I say it will again pass through United States ports. The plain and simple reason is that the principal offices for these lines of ships in the western hemisphere are in New York. That is the home port for both British and American-owned ships in the Pacific trade; and it is only natural that they will not add to the expense of the voyage by calling at a Canadian port unless the buyer in Canada insists that they do so. And the buyer in Canada will not so insist unless the terms of the preferential tariff require him to do so. This has been proven time and again.

The point may be raised that the ship owner will charge a higher freight rate to call at a Canadian port, and thus offset the benefit of the preference. However, on checking this point I have found that it did not happen during the period under review. There was always enough competition to get the New York or Boston rate applied to Halifax and Saint John shipments. Not only did this traffic provide a great amount of labour for stevedores and freight handlers at the port of discharge, but it moved over Canadian railways to interior points, thus providing a large and profitable traffic which will again be needed in the operation of the railways in coming years.

I mentioned a moment ago that ex ship movements meant additional labour to our waterfront workers. We have in Halifax a longshoreman's union with a membership of

about 1,600 men. They are an extremely fine body of men. During the entire six years of the war not once was there the slightest sign of trouble, of a strike or anything else which would delay the shipment of supplies overseas. I know if the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) were here he would agree with me when I say that a finer body of workmen could not be found throughout the entire dominion. I wish to pay a tribute to those men because of the excellent work they have done during the war period.

In addition to the 1,600 longshoremen, there are about 1,000 freight handlers and additional checkers, coopers and porters, giving a total population of around 4,000 waterfront workers. Practically all those 4,000 men are married with families, so that hon. members can see what it means to a port, particularly to Halifax, to have ships making regular calls. Ships to and from everywhere load and unload at our docks, leaving money to the extent of many millions behind in the way of stevedores' wages alone. These wages total $4,500,000 a year. There are thirty or more firms of chandlers, brokers and line agencies which do the outfitting and clearing of these ships, and this represents another large item in the total of harbour-front business.

There is another factor that enters into this export and import trade, the building and repairing of ships. In one year these activities yielded something like $14,000,000 to our port. We sincerely hope that this work will continue and be a permanent part of our port activities. Twelve transatlantic lines are now operating out of Halifax. These lines are operating freighters and combined freight and passenger ships. These companies are getting their services back to normal, one of the latest being the Swedish-American-Mexican line whose services were suspended or curtailed during the war. As war losses in shipping are made up and ocean ferrying gets back on schedule there will be 300 sailings a year out of Halifax. Every time a cargo ship of 5,000 tons is loaded and unloaded it means that about $12,500 is paid to the stevedores, checkers, porters and freight handlers.

I would not want hon. members to think I am looking at this matter purely from the point of view of Halifax. What I have said about Halifax applies equally to Saint John, Quebec and Montreal on the Atlantic, and to Vancouver, Victoria and New Westminster on the Pacific. That is why I urge that we ship through Canadian ports.

I suggest to the government that certain measures be adopted, and I direct these suggestions particularly to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. First,—the British preferential trade agreement should be continued to the utmost extent. Second,—the West India trade agreement should be modified so that it will be possible to make intermediate trade agreements with other countries that can use our natural products and manufactured goods. Third,—all goods entering Canada from foreign countries under full preference or intermediate preference tariffs should be shipped directly from the country of production for discharge at a Canadian ocean or river port in order to enjoy the benefits of such preferential tariffs. Fourth, I almost feel like adding another which would be to the effect that any Canadian goods for export—I was referring to imports before—that enjoy dominion subsidy must be shipped through a Canadian port.

I should like to quote an editorial which appeared recently in the *Financial Post* reading as follows:

> There are few if any countries so largely dependent on a free flow of world goods as Canada. Our basic industries, agriculture, forestry, mining and fishing, must secure a huge foreign market for a great deal of their production. Normally we export over half of our wheat and bacon, ninety per cent of our newsprint, over seventy-five per cent of our minerals. On the import side, too, we lean heavily on world trade to make up deficiencies in domestic production.

I close as I began. To me paragraphs 6 and 7 of the speech from the throne are very important to the future prosperity of this our Canada, and I congratulate the government on their realization of this by including them as part of their post-war plans.

Mr. W. R. THATCHER (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne made no reference to several matters which to me appear to be of paramount importance to most Canadians. For instance, the citizens of my province will be particularly disappointed that the speech contains no proposal to commence any major irrigation projects in Saskatchewan during the current year. I raise the matter at this time, because in the constituency of Moose Jaw the shortage of water, which has plagued us for decades, has recently become dangerously acute.

As most hon. members know, the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina are located in the semi-arid section of the prairies. These two centres with a total population of approximately 80,000 people are almost entirely dependent for their water supplies on underground water and wells. For forty years, or ever since Moose Jaw became a city, the authorities have had trouble giving the people a twenty-four hour supply of water the year round. I have seen people in Moose Jaw

plant lawns and gardens in the spring, only to see them die later in the year because the city authorities were forced to shut off the water or ration it.

Several years ago the federal government, realizing the gravity of the situation, sought to alleviate it by building a pumping station and reservoir near Riverhurst on the South Saskatchewan river. From there an open ditch about seventy miles long was constructed to a point near Moose Jaw. That open ditch did help the situation somewhat, and we were grateful for it, but on the whole it has proved inadequate.

Since the first of the year the water situation in Moose Jaw has been worse than at any time in the history of the city. The day I left Moose Jaw to come to Ottawa the water-mains were closed for about twelve hours. That situation prevailed during most of February and part of January. I ask hon. members to try to realize what it means to a city of 25,000 to have the water-mains shut off for part of the day. This winter, housewives were forced to fill their bathtubs the night before, if they wanted to have water to cook during the day time. Sanitary facilities could not be used while the water was cut off. Several times when I got up in the morning I could not shave because I had forgotten to put water aside the night before.

During February several of our major industries which use large quantities of water had to close down for several days at a time, and during that period hundreds of men were unemployed. Moose Jaw is the main divisional point of the Canadian Pacific railway in Saskatchewan. We had the spectacle this winter of the railroad bringing in trainloads of tank cars filled with water to keep their trains running across the prairies. On top of all this the city authorities are worried over the health aspect. When the water-mains have been closed down for ten or twelve hours and the water finally comes, it is a rusty colour and apparently filled with foreign material. I mention these facts simply to give hon. members some idea of the magnitude of the water problem that the city of Moose Jaw is facing to-day.

The city of Regina is in a somewhat similar position. It has been a little more fortunate than Moose Jaw up to the present, but to-day Regina, with its growing population, is also finding that the demand for water is exceeding the supply. An article appeared in the Regina *Leader-Post* of September 15 last, headed "city near limit of water supply," which reads in part:

> "Regina has pretty well reached the limit of her present water supply," J. W. D. Farrel, waterworks superintendent, said Friday.
>
> Deep artesian wells from which the city has been taking its water give between 5,500,000 and 6,000,000 gallons a day on the average. This summer the city could have used 7,000,000 gallons a day, if the quantity had been available.

The city of Weyburn also has experienced grave water shortages over the past few years. In other words, the future growth and industrial development of these three prairie cities is almost completely dependent on their obtaining an adequate water supply. Indeed, if new supplies of water are not obtained they may have great difficulty in maintaining their present population.

The problem of obtaining water for these cities is tied up in an integral way with obtaining a larger amount of water for the farm lands of that part of Saskatchewan. As hon. members know, our farmers in that area have fought drought conditions for many years. On the prairies water is liquid gold. Yet, despite our great need for that liquid gold, we as a people are to-day letting vast quantities pass under our noses without using it in Saskatchewan.

What is the solution? Every Canadian I think knows of the mighty rivers that have their source in the Rocky mountains and flow across the prairies into Hudson bay. But perhaps many do not realize how little we are using these rivers to-day. There is very little navigation, not a great deal of irrigation, and very little hydro-electrical development.

One of these rivers flows about eighty miles northwest of Moose Jaw. When one reads of the immense dams that have been built in so-called backward nations such as India, China, Egypt, Spain, and others, for irrigation purposes, one cannot help wondering why we have for so long neglected to water our burning plains and why our major Saskatchewan cities must be so short of water. For many years the people of Saskatchewan have urged the building of a huge dam northwest of Moose Jaw. This proposed project has been called the South Saskatchewan power and irrigation scheme. It would involve the construction of a daw near Elbow.

The project would have three main purposes: (1) The providing of an abundant supply of water for domestic and industrial use for the two largest cities in the southern part of the province, Regina and Moose Jaw; (2) the development of hydro-electric energy; (3) the irrigation of several hundred thousand acres of land in that area.

Is this scheme feasible? Permit me to quote from an address by Mr. E. L. Gray, of the prairie farm rehabilitation administration, to agricultural representatives from all parts of the province gathered in Regina on February

19 of this year. He is reported to have said:

Construction of a dam on the South Saskatchewan river near Elbow as the hub of a great power and irrigation scheme is considered feasible.

Extensive drilling and surveys by the prairie farm rehabilitation administration had located a site where a giant dam could be built at the upper reaches of the Qu'Appelle and Saskatchewan rivers near Elbow.

Mr. A. W. E. Fawkes, Moose Jaw city engineer, in 1933 recommended the construction of such a dam. In his opinion the construction of a dam about 200 feet high to impound the waters of the South Saskatchewan is quite feasible, and the stored water would be capable of irrigating somewhere in the neighbourhood of 500,000 acres. Other authorities have made similar statements.

In Alberta water resources have been harnessed to the service of the people. Huge areas which were formerly useless because of lack of water, are to-day called the gardens of the west. Certain sections of the United States have been even more successful in irrigating dry lands. There is no reason why what has been done in Alberta and the United States cannot be done in Saskatchewan.

This scheme, if proceeded with, would have seven major advantages not only for the people of Saskatchewan but for the people of Canada as a whole:

1. It would provide a permanent water supply for Regina, Moose Jaw and many smaller centres, for both domestic and industrial use.

2. It would make possible a considerable development of hydro electric power.

3. It would permit the irrigation of several hundred thousand acres of fertile farm land.

4. Its actual construction at the present time or in the near future would provide jobs for many unemployed in that district who are to-day without work.

5. The project would permit considerable industrial development such as canning factories and sugar beet factories which, in turn, would employ many returned men.

6. The project would permit the stabilization of agriculture in that area by (a) the control of moisture and (b) allowing a diversification of crops.

7. Finally, I would suggest that the project would act as an insurance throughout the area against future heavy relief costs such as we had in the depression years.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government must favour the scheme because during the last federal election, government spokesmen stated definitely that the project would be completed. May I be permitted to quote from an advertisement which appeared in the Moose Jaw *Times* of Saturday, June 9 last:

The South Saskatchewan Thunder creek irrigation programme alone will undoubtedly contribute much to the prosperity of the city and surrounding district. This project will be commenced immediately men and materials are available. . . . It has been approved.

Both the men and the materials are, I believe, now available, or, if not, they soon will be available, and we ask that the government proceed in accordance with its promise.

During the past winter months the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) did some very fine work in focussing the attention of easterners on the urgent need for irrigation in western Canada. Every westerner is grateful to him for his efforts. The seriousness of this problem makes it essential that all political parties lend their support to it.

Since coming to Ottawa I have seen parliament lend or give away hundreds of millions of dollars to other nations. Surely we are not asking too much when we ask that the government spend a few million dollars on our own people and in the development of our own country. The South Saskatchewan river project would prove to be one of the finest investments that the government of Canada ever made. It would pay for itself in a relatively short period of time. I respectfully urge the government to include the scheme in this year's estimates and to proceed with its construction without delay.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): It may interest you, Mr. Speaker, and the house, when I tell you that I am in rather a unique position. If I followed the wish of the electors who sent me here I should spend half my time sitting on the other side of the house and half over here. I was sent here by Liberal and Conservative electors who preferred to elect a representative of one of the old standard parties rather than one of the new sort. One reason why I have not gone over there was that I have not been invited, and the other is that if I ever did go I do not think I would be able to come back here—

Mr. MacKINNON: You would not want to.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): —so that I think I will stay where I am. In all the years I have been in politics—and I was first elected to this house in 1921, before quite a number of hon. members were born—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. WEIR: Just the lady member.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): —and in all the parliaments of which I have been a member, I believe I have had a seat on the Speaker's left, except in one parliament, in which I was

fortunate, or perhaps unfortunate, enough to occupy the position, Mr. Speaker, which you do now. I tried to be neutral. Perhaps I had a more difficult task than your Honour has, for you never had to find your own Prime Minister out of order, which on one occasion I was forced to do; but that only added interest and perhaps difficulty to the position. I will say this as a former Speaker, that the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) treated me when I was Speaker with the utmost courtesy and consideration, as much so as though I had been his own choice for the Speakership.

My policy as a member of parliament has been to support, regardless of party, legislation which I believed was in the best interest of Canada, and that is what I intend to continue to do.

Perhaps this is rather personal, but forty-eight years ago this month I went to Yukon with the great gold rush of that day. I did not intend to live there. Like thousands of other young men, I expected to pick up a fortune in the gold mines in a couple of years and, as they say up there, come "outside" to live. To a Yukoner anywhere but Yukon, whether it be the United States, or Canada, or South America, is "outside." However, I found out that I could get along better by letting miners do my mining than by trying myself to mine, that I was better fitted to my own profession, and I went back to it and stayed with it. In 1896, fifty years ago, Dawson City was born; and I ask hon. members who know anything about mining how many mining camps in the world have lasted over fifty years and are still going strong, which is the case in Yukon. Yukon has produced approximately $300 million in gold and millions of dollars worth of silver, lead and zinc; and I predict—and I think I know what I am talking about—that fifty years hence we shall still be producing those precious metals in Yukon.

Some people have the idea that Yukon has been just a bill of expense to Canada; but if an account were taken of the royalties paid to the government on gold mined—and mind you, the royalties first charged on gold mined in Yukon were ten per cent of the output, then reduced to five per cent, and now 2½ per cent, and that runs into money—and when one stops to think that almost everything we use in the way of food, clothing, machinery, tools and equipment of all kinds is imported, it may be realized what a market it has provided for Canada, and what a large amount of money has been paid on customs duties on imported goods. Yukon does not get much credit for that, because most of the duties are paid at the ports of Vancouver, Edmonton and Victoria, but it is Yukoners who pay the bill.

During the war, mining in Yukon, as in the whole of North America, was practically suspended. Nearly all the young men of war age joined the army, the navy and the air force and went out to do their duty. By international consent the United States army came into northern Canada and in the common cause built war projects. Fortunately the exigencies of war did not require the use in conflict of most of these projects, and they remain to-day assets of Canada. On April 3 next the responsibility of maintaining the Alaska highway will be turned over from the army of the United States to the army of Canada. I hope our government and army will never consider for one moment allowing that road to go back to bush. It is too important a highway. It is not located where the international commission, appointed three years before the war to advise their respective United States and Canadian governments, would have recommended that the road should be built, but it was put through in a rush by the United States army, with our help, and it is a wonderful asset to Canada. Without expense to us it was built with United States money and labour, and already it has made accessible in Yukon and in northern British Columbia parts of the country which formerly were almost inaccessible. Prospectors going in there to look for minerals would take about a year to get in and they would go with pack horses and canoes and pack loads on their own backs. Now they can use the road and in a few days or hours make their camp and prospect in the vicinity. That, if nothing else, is what the road is now being used for.

Among other projects which the United States undertook and completed in northern Canada through northern British Columbia was a wonderful telephone system from Prince Rupert, on the coast, to all the interior small settlements. I hope that the governments of Canada and of British Columbia will, in their wisdom, maintain those telephone lines, not turn them over to War Assets Corporation, probably to be tossed into the lap of the monopoly known as the British Columbia Telephone Company, which would likely dismantle them and take the material into larger communities and use it there, and deprive the people in the outlying settlements of this means of communication. I hope the governments will maintain these lines and operate them.

Considering the great return which Yukon has given Canada in wealth, including levies

of various kinds, I feel justified in pointing out to the house, and in particular to the Ministers of Mines, of Finance, of Reconstruction, and of Public Works that Yukon to-day is suffering from lack of roads. Dawson City, the centre of that immense gold mining area, has no means of communication in winter except by plane; there is not a road into that town. The same thing is true of the centre of the wonderful silver mines, Mayo. In winter time they depend entirely on planes, and as hon. members know, the weather makes planes uncertain. In former times there were roads connecting both Dawson City and that silver camp with the coast, but they have been allowed to fall into disuse. A comparatively small amount of money would put them back into shape to use. For the immediate present I appeal to the Minister of Mines and to the cabinet to be generous even to a small degree and vote an amount of money that will put that road back in shape for trucking, not for joy riding but as a road that will carry trucks containing ore concentrates to the main artery of navigation on the Yukon river. This can be done for not more than $100,000; and what is that in these days when we are talking about and spending billions? Speaking on behalf of Yukon, I hope that we shall receive some consideration at the hands of the government.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Like the senior hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Isnor), I will not attempt to make a speech; instead I will try to say something. I do not think any man has a right to stand up here unless he has something to say. Some great speeches have been made in this debate on all sides of the house, but I have one criticism to offer. When a man rises in his place and makes a speech and you do not see him in the house until he comes back to make another speech, then I suggest that he is not making the best contribution to the debates of the house.

Congratulations are in order, but sometimes it happens that honours do not go to the right people, because I am convinced—it is not "I think" but "I know"—that there are men and women who are unknown one hundred miles from their homes and who nevertheless are the greatest heroes and heroines in our country by reason of their public service and of their sacrifices. Let me tell the house about one man. He was a missionary in China and was forced back home because of the war. His name is Duncan McRae. He took a church near Arnprior at White Lake. He is sixty-eight years of age and soon he will be on his way back to China. I say that man is a hero, and yet he is nothing compared with his wife, who will leave her daughter and son and go back with him to the front line. That is something we are bound to admire. That man was the best athlete in Manitoba; there was no one who could touch him. I have seen him take seven firsts. He took the weights, the hurdles and the jumps. I must admit that I played a trick on him once when he was nearly beaten in the broad jump. He had put his handkerchief in the tracks of the man who preceded him, and when he turned his back I moved the handkerchief up a foot. He came tearing down and cleared the handkerchief. There was laughter and he turned to me and said, "What is the matter, Dan?" I said, "Nothing is the matter, but I should have it up another foot. I moved your handkerchief up another foot." He was an honour student and a great athlete, and yet he could give his life to the greatest calling on earth. He is a real hero.

I congratulate those, whoever they may be, who in handing out honours did not pass up a member of the clergy, when Major Foote, a Presbyterian minister, received the Victoria Cross for his heroism at Dieppe. I do not think there is anyone who has surpassed him in quiet heroism and courage. He had done everything he could and was wondering how soon he would be in kingdom come, but he survived, and as he saw his fellow soldiers being taken off to the prison camp he decided that he simply could not go back to a comfortable bed and home. He therefore joined them and went back to the prison camp with them. He served faithfully, and I congratulate the person responsible for extending to Major Foote the highest possible honour which a man can win on the battlefield.

I congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on having the courage to take fifty per cent of the wheat out of the distilleries. I think that took courage, but I do not believe that there is in this house a man or woman, nor do I believe that outside this house there are men and women, who would not deny themselves their nightcap or eye-opener in order to give some hungry kid some shredded wheat and milk or no milk. I commend the Prime Minister, but I suggest that he might have done better. He might have taken it all and put it into food.

The Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) surprises me sometimes—

An hon. MEMBER: He surprises a lot of people.

Mr. McIVOR: —but he continues to be an optimist. Somebody says that one optimist is worth fifty pessimists, and after what the

Minister of Reconstruction has come through during the war years I do not think there is anyone who does not admire him. There is not a man in Canada who has done a better job and he has come through these war years an optimist. There was an election thrown into the bargain and there were pessimists who said he would not get elected; but he was as sure of being elected as I was, and perhaps a little more so. He came through that and now he has a right to be an optimist.

Let me give an example of reconversion. Take Canada Car in Fort William. He assisted them in more ways than one. When the strikes came in the United States and there were labour troubles, Canada Car had to shut down. I had an opportunity of visiting the managers and controllers, and I could see those telegrams, one after another, expressing regret that, owing to the strike, material could not be forwarded. I expect to see Canada Car humming before long. I have one criticism. I thought it should have kept going, making buses up to the point where they needed spare parts, but they did not do so. However, when I saw the plant I was amazed. I was pretty well acquainted with it, and I could see those aeroplanes lined up the full length of the plant, each receiving a part and being pushed on closer to the point of success. Now there are buses, one after another, a splendid example of reconversion. I repeat, the minister has a right to be optimistic.

I also visited Steep Rock. I do not know much about it, nor does Canada know much about it, but ere long, Canada will know that we have one of the greatest hematite mines in the country, and it will be doing things.

I do not like to say anything about the spy trouble we have had in Canada because I am not a lawyer, nor have I a judicial mind, but I like to help anybody if I can, no matter what mistakes they make. If we do not make those mistakes, dear knows we may make others. If a man says he never made a mistake, then he is just lying like sam hill. I should like to take the verdict of the leader of the opposition in the upper house, a college mate of mine. He has good sound judgment even though he is a Conservative. He commends the government for their stand. He can afford to do so without speaking politically.

I wondered in my own little mind what would have happened if Germany had not attacked Russia. Russia might never have been in the war, because neither the United States nor Great Britain would have attacked her. What we ought to have to-day is patience and Christian charity, because the Russian background is altogether different from ours. I have no patience with any man who breaks his oath or lies in any way. He has no right to do so, but I was proud in this house when the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) took his seat and nobody made any fuss over him, although of course, some of us looked that way. Tolerance is one of the things we need to practise.

We think of peace, but to me peace that leaves out the Peacemaker will never give us a permanent peace. On the Sabbath day most of the members go to hear the story of the Prince of Peace—if you do not, you ought to—and yet when we come into this house and think of the economic system of our country we forget all about the Prince of Peace, because I am convinced that money and things in Canada and in the United States are in the saddle. It is the dollar yardstick.

I heard a man who came back from the San Francisco conference say that the hope of the united nations lay in social security and economics. Hon. members know whether they believe that or not; I do not. I have heard—I am using my own words now—of a premier of a province who said that the hope of the united nations lies in having a common store of supplies; and yet the Great Teacher with thundering emphasis said:

> But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

That is from Him who knows. A man next to Him in greatness in the New Testament said:

> For other foundations can no man lay than that which is laid in Christ Jesus.

Offer social security, economics or dollars and you will go to the bow-wows sooner or later. That is not the finding of to-day; that is the finding of the history of every age since the world began.

I should like to encourage the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) just a little bit by saying that he should make sure that the Sabbath day is kept free from toil for every toiler. There are men in this house who remind me of the old commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy". Then I am reminded of a play I saw which said that if you break the ten commandments the ten commandments will break you. You cannot break the law of God and not suffer from it. I would encourage the Minister of Labour to make sure that, now the war is over, during which time so many inroads were made upon the Sabbath day, corporations will give to men their day of rest whether they use it in one way or another. I could recommend to them how to use it.

The rules of the house will be up for revision shortly. About seven years ago I circulated a petition in this house to have the acoustics improved. Hon. members are not as fortunate as I am. I have a hearing aid and I can hear far better than hon. members believe. I think the time has arrived when it will not be necessary for the Speaker to put his hand to his ear to hear somebody over yonder who has a good voice, and when our reporters can hear in any place in the house without having to move backwards and forwards. I think it is in keeping with the dignity of parliament to hear what is going on in any part of the house.

I congratulate the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) on the new bill. I took a while to read this bill and I have been surprised by it. If hon. members have not read it there is a treat in store for them. The bill has many fine things in it. An hon. member who spoke here last night said that we have no Canadian songs. I do not agree with him, but some of the Canadian songs do not altogether suit me because I was not born in Canada, but I have chosen to live here. One of our great Canadians songs starts off in this way: "O Canada, our home and native land." I looked around the other day to see if the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) was singing that and he was singing lustily. How was it his native land? Of course, there was an Irishman who said that patriotism to an Irishman is that "he is loyal to his native land whether he was born there or not." Therefore I can sing, "O Canada, our home and native land." When our national anthem is chosen or revised they should put in a better word than "native", because it shuts out pretty nearly fifty per cent of the Canadians; but this bill is going to clear up a lot of the difficulties that exist at this time.

I have been a little anxious for some time. Sometime ago I sat on the committee of health insurance. That committee, which sat for two years, heard specialists from all over the world, from New Zealand, England, and the United States, and experts from all over Canada. I am sure the Minister of Veterans Affairs will agree with me when I say that it is the best act to be found any place, but we have not it in practice. I hope that the dominion-provincial conference will make it possible for that act to come into existence.

I now come to my own pet subject, namely, labour. Some hon. members may think it is not my pet subject, but I shall never forget when I learned to dig on the farm and when I earned my way through old Manitoba college. I started out that year wheeling brick at fifteen cents an hour. I know what a man has to do who toils. I know the value of the money that he earns. It is not the amount of money that he earns but the use to which he puts it that counts. I should like to congratulate labour on the way they conducted themselves during the war and since V-E day. They have a right to be considered. I know we have had trouble at Windsor, but they tell me that it was not very serious trouble as compared with some of the troubles that have taken place in other places. To me there seems to be a cloud now appearing in the sky of labour. Great lakes seamen are looking for better working conditions. They may be looking for a raise in pay, but that is not their chief trouble. I would advise that ship owners and workers' representatives get together, thresh out their differences and avoid a strike.

There is one thing I do not like—and of course that does not make any difference—I do not like to see a corporation represented by a lawyer, when the future of toilers is at stake. I think it could be far better represented by a good minister, priest, clergyman or bishop who would understand the problems of the working man. I believe if that were done they would have their troubles straightened out more quickly. It would be better to have the heads of a corporation sit in on a meeting of that kind. I am convinced that if our present Minister of Labour, these corporation lawyers and the union leaders on the great lakes got together the trouble could be cleared away. This is just another case where I would hope that things could be settled before coming to a head.

I am not going to talk about labour without offering a plan. When you and I are at home we think things out. I had a group of men meet with me to formulate a plan and, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall give it to you now. This is a plan or policy for sharing the excess profits of industry and commerce with capital, labour and management. It states:

Whereas at this time there is grave unrest in our social structure, we are of the opinion that this matter should be studied and active steps taken to further this idea and project. We suggest that there be established by law for each industry a minimum wage for labour, a minimum salary for management and a minimum return for capital invested, and that after paying the incidental expenses of running a business or industry, and subject always to special modifications in any particular industry, the excess profits of that industry should be divided equitably among capital, labour and management in the same proportion as the minimum already specified for each of these various factors in production.

We feel that government oversight should be exercised in each instance to make sure of the equitable character of that distribution.

We believe that more and more must the working man be taken into partnership in the industry and commerce of this country in order to secure a just return for additional effort and to give that independence of outlook which a living wage gives to every conscientious worker, to fulfil that pledge of our war-time efforts, that the country be made a land fit for heroes to live in.

It is further stated that competition should only be allowed after capital has secured a proper return, management a proper salary, and labour a living wage, and that all these be taken together with a fair price for goods and services as charged to the public. We recommend that social engineers be appointed by law to study these matters and give effect to these provisions.

I was proud to hear the Minister of Labour say on one occasion last year, when a strike was being discussed, that it is necessary for capital and labour to walk the same road together. That was fine. But when the three young Hebrews were cast into the fiery furnace it was found, when someone looked in, that there were four of them there—not three. One was like unto the Son of Man.

If capital and labour take the same road together they must make sure that the spirit of the Master Workman is controlling each of them, or they will not get very far. They will have a fight before they come to the end of the road.

As I said, things are in the saddle. We are living in a civilization that glorifies prosperity. Apparently we are on the threshold of the age of the bank book, when property rights, profit making, good business and prosperity are insisting that they have the right of way, leaving the traveller like the man in the parable who fell by the wayside, beaten by robbers, stripped, wounded and half dead.

I was reading a story about a great American who gave away much of his money for a special project. He said that every dollar has three kicks in it. The first kick is when you make it. As he said, "We are Yankees, and we like to make a dollar." Then he said, "The second kick is when we are sure we have it, because we have a lust for saving. The third kick is when we give it away to help somebody in need—because my mother was Irish."

So long as we allow our young men to grow with the assumption that it is with the consent of parliament, churches and municipalities that they should have power, that they should keep it who can, and that the straight road to happiness is by way of getting all the money one can, just so long will church and state perpetuate a policy which is sinful, unsound and superficial.

If I dared address clerics outside the house I would say to them, sweat up to your jobs; practise what you preach; live out your policy, and do not try to do it alone. Then you will be able to lead Canada into a greater life and a larger liberty.

I know what the programme is. I have great pleasure sometimes—and dear knows I make many mistakes. But I was one who, without having to say anything about it, received extra pay at Christmas. I had a lot of fun in the Christmas season. I had more money to spend, and I spent it in a way I do not regret. I did not have any headache after and I do not expect to get the money back.

But the programme you and I must live, whether we are in this house or out of it, is: Feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick, go to those in gaol; put God first, and others next. If we are not prepared to do that, then let us not listen to the prayer by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MAURICE LALONDE (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking part in this debate. However, after hearing my colleague who has just taken his seat, after hearing his words which were full of inspiration I felt it my duty to speak briefly in this debate. I shall confine my remarks to those of a general character, and take pleasure at the outset to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address upon their magnificent speeches.

(Translation):

I shall not needlessly take up the time of the house but I believe that I should make a few remarks in order to discuss the merits of certain proposals contained in the speech from the throne and to offer a few suggestions to the members of the government. Therefore, my remarks will come under two separate headings. At the outset I shall say a few words on international politics and I will conclude with a few remarks of local importance.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that as the result of the last conflict, Canada has won a well-deserved place, a foremost place in the world, despite the theories of isolationists, despite the furious outcries loosed by certain nationalists of my province who were determined, at any price, to bring the ideals of my race down to the level of local and political interests. We all agree that Canada has emerged from the conflict badly shaken financially and physically. A tremendous task lies ahead; like the governments of the other countries that have suffered and that have given of

their best for victory, we are faced with the task of physical, spiritual and moral reconstruction.

For some years, thanks to the far-sightedness of our leader, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), we have been sending ambassadors to different countries, thus placing our country on a level with the most important nations in the world. Mr. Speaker, if the head of our government wishes to pursue this upward course towards total independence, why should we not, as a Christian and democratic people, be represented in Rome, at the Vatican, by an official ambassador?

The speech from the throne also sets forth a policy which aims at Canada's complete freedom in the concert of nations, and the honourable the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) is sponsoring a bill by which every citizen of our country may proudly, even gloriously, claim the legitimate title of Canadian citizen. I congratulate the government on this occasion; this new gesture is but one of the numerous steps taken by the Liberal party during the past few years towards Canada's emancipation in the international sphere. Like every right-minded Canadian, I shall support this bill. It is high time that we should claim that title and that right at peace conferences and other official gatherings at which other countries are represented by envoys, delegates or ambassadors, so that our own representatives may, like those who were delegated recently, be vested with all the authority and prestige granted to the full citizens of a free state. That bill reflects credit on the government. Besides, it is consonant with the liberal tradition, and our honourable friends across the floor will have, this time at least, to be as liberal as we are.

Mr. Speaker, another matter has lately roused public opinion in my province. Some papers have expressed opinions which I repect; other citizens, taking advantage of their political prestige, have begun a series of meetings for the discussion of the proposed loan by our country of $1,250,000,000 to Great Britain. In my constituency, as elsewhere, as soon as that decision had been broadcast, the nationalist gang swung into action. Protests have come from the same political ghettos where lie in hiding those who have not yet learned, after nine years of war, that the thought, in Ottawa, could not be directed along provincial channels. Some municipal council members have at once sent me resolutions protesting against that loan of $1,250,000,000 to Great Britain, without knowing the first thing about it, without having any knowledge of the details or of the machinery involved. They would want me to commit myself to the point of stating, from my place in this house, that I oppose that loan. I shall do nothing of the kind, Mr. Speaker.

I shall value this legislation according to its merit in as much as it serves the interests of Canada and in the measure in which I sincerely believe that this loan is advantageous to my fellow-citizens and to the Canadian economy in general and that it may result in stabilizing the value of the pound sterling and restoring to world economics the equilibrium which has been jeopardized by the anomalous transactions of the war.

If I am convinced that this loan may result in giving work, in my constituency, to my farmers, to my lumbermen, to all who labour for a few dollars a day; if, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this loan has been inspired by a true Canadian spirit as has been the case with the whole government policy in the last ten years, I will not hesitate to give it my earnest support.

This afternoon, I heard my colleague from Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix) state that he would vote against this loan. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is taking a hasty decision. The bill has not yet been tabled; the authorized people are not yet in a position to supply all the details concerning it because the American congress is engaged in a debate on a similar matter; and we, as representatives of the Canadian people, must not commit ourselves officially, one way or the other. To my mind, this would prejudice our opinions before the debate in this house has been initiated.

Mr. Speaker, the economic chaos which followed the first Great War from 1929 on, was, for the most part, if we are to believe the experts of that time, attributable to the fluctuations in the value of money which resulted in an almost complete stagnation of international trade. The same economic phenomena is threatening to-day, because the English pound has fallen to the lowest level ever, because England's gold reserves have been wiped out, because Britain has been forced to recall its Canadian securities; because now, the English people, in spite of what certain nationalist groups in my province may believe, are not as wealthy as they were at the outset of the war and that Canada, due to the international stature it has grown into during the conflict, has become an indispensable cog in the proper functioning of universal economy. In a way, we have become the transmission gear of an automobile which, if it fails, causes the vehicle to stop.

In certain quarters, we are accused of trying to keep up with the Joneses, of tagging along with foreign powers in this world upheaval, and we see our Quebec nationalists, led by the Bloc Populaire—whose members are unfortunately not in the house to-night—claim that they advocate the true doctrine of nationalist charity conceived by Mr. Henri Bourassa.

Mr. POULIOT: Whom you defeated!

Mr. LALONDE: Whom we defeated. But, Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Populaire is a disgrace to real nationalist doctrine. I have no brief to defend Mr. Bourassa, but in his book entitled *What Do We Owe England?*, he states very plainly, on page 253 if memory serves me right, that Canada should participate in all foreign wars involving the interests of France and England, on condition that such participation be not the logical outcome of colonial bonds.

That is the nationalist doctrine advocated by our leader and by our party as well.

If we refer to the debates of 1939, we will see that we, the members of parliament of the time, declared war voluntarily without securing anyone's authorization and without being compelled to do so by colonial dependency.

What is being said in my province? People animated by unjustified anti-British feelings are saying exactly the opposite. One must not be afraid to say so, Mr. Speaker, although it may be against his political interests.

I mention that fact because the same propaganda is being disseminated in my province, inspired by false patriotic ideals, and through the influence of newspapers and meetings which have already been started some people want to go back to the former days of total colonialism.

I refuse to agree with them, Mr. Speaker, and will do so as long as I sit in this house. I have learned in the eleven years I have been in the Canadian House of Commons that we must examine the laws which are submitted for our approval from a federal and not a provincial point of view.

I reserve my decision in connection with that loan. After having earnestly studied the matter, I shall approve it if I find it acceptable; otherwise I shall reject it. To my mind, anyone who acts in good faith cannot commit himself in advance, on such an important matter without going into it as fully as possible.

(Text):

I have something to say to the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Low), if he will permit me, through the Chair. As reported in *Hansard* of March 19, page 64, he said, in the course of a very interesting speech:

> His Excellency's speech mentioned the recently concluded agreement for a loan to Great Britain of $1,250 million. I personally was glad to see that this credit had been made available to Great Britain. As a matter of fact a similar credit should have been arranged for Great Britain last fall. I am satisfied that if the various parts of the commonwealth had risen to the occasion last autumn, they collectively could have prevented the United States from bludgeoning Great Britain into submission to the nefarious Bretton Woods agreement.

Mr. LOW: Hear, hear.

Mr. LALONDE: Do not say "hear, hear" too soon. I have something for you.

> But while I am pleased to see a huge new credit advanced, which will I feel stimulate trade between our two countries and materially contribute to employment in Canada, yet I think the loan should have been made to Great Britain interest free.

I respect his intentions and opinions, but I would suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, through the channel of the Chair, that he should go into my province and have personal contact with the leaders of his party who have been distributing, during maybe the past month, a certain newspaper which is waging a stiff fight against the loan. Do I understand that we have two Social Credit parties in this country? Unity is one of the conditions of the survival of a political movement.

Mr. LOW: Autonomy is another.

Mr. LALONDE: Not when autonomy is in flagrant contradiction of unity. You will not be there after the next election.

Mr. LOW: Perhaps.

Mr. LALONDE: I say this, in a spirit of goodwill to my hon. friend, that his group in my province is trying to be more nationalist than the Bloc Populaire. More than that, it is robing itself in a religious propaganda, is distributing pictures of the Virgin, and I think it went so far as to make propaganda with a prayer of the Social Credit party. It would be a good thing if my hon. friend the leader of the party would say something to Mr. Even, the leader of the party in Quebec, so that the whole party might be united in its doctrines throughout Canada. Otherwise we shall not know what to believe—somebody is telling us lies—for the Social Credit party in this chamber has one theory about making a loan to Great Britain and their friends outside wage a campaign against it.

Mr. LOW: I said personally.

Mr. LALONDE: But I am speaking to my hon. friend as the leader of a so-called party, not personally, and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am fed up with seeing so many political parties divided up into as many parcels as there are provinces in the dominion. But on our side we are all united and the Liberal party was the only national party that went into the last election. I say this in all good friendship to my hon. friend.

(Translation):

Mr. Speaker, that loan to England has a meaning which will have to be carefully pondered. We shall have to make sure, when examining the proposal in the light of the documents that will be communicated to us, that it is a premium against unemployment and that, if we do not make funds available to those who wish to purchase the goods that will be produced in Canada, our people will before long suffer from unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I shall use the last few minutes at my disposal to discuss the matter of espionage which, in my province, has given rise to much criticism in some quarters. I have heard my good friend the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) and the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) wax eloquent on the subject of the magna charta. I am respectful of traditions but there is no man-made constitution in this world which does not grow obsolete with the years. At times, it has to be transformed, to be adapted to the needs of the day. I realize that the magna charta is an expression of principles, but the manner in which those principles should be applied is quite another matter.

Who are those that disregard the magna charta? It is the British themselves who have refused to release Doctor May on bail. Why hide behind the screen of legal technicalities in order to arrest those who have betrayed their country? We must bear in mind that treason is the vilest form of crime. Suppose that some of our own citizens were caught spying in Russia; do you think that they would have a chance of escaping by being allowed their freedom on bail? No, gentlemen, they would face the firing squad within 24 hours.

I commend the government for its action, and I hope that if the accused are found guilty, the punishment will fit the crime.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I wish to offer a few suggestions to my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier). I know that he is cool-headed and that he will not get over-excited.

[Mr. Low.]

I live in a district which depends on three main industries for its livelihood: tourists, farming and forestry. Mr. Speaker, you have probably visited the northern hills and admired the majesty of the Laurentian scenery. By Laurentian scenery, I mean our mountains and our lakes. I am sure anyone who has been there looks upon our part of the country as a tourists' paradise.

Other federal and provincial governments have encouraged the tourist industry; that is why I urgently beg the federal government to vote large sums of money in order to encourage travel in the northern part of the province of Quebec, and in the parts of our country where such an asset may be developed. In my district, the population relies to a great extent on the tourist trade and you have no idea how prosperous it could be if the federal government would only grant certain sums of money for the construction of roads to the best fishing spots in the whole world.

The government could stimulate the tourist trade by establishing a sort of travel bureau to make more widely know the beauties of our region. As a help to tourists, maybe the government could also, at the next dominion-provincial conference, establish in Quebec some of those schools for tourists' guides, as may be found elsewhere. There is a great need for them in our province. Outsiders who visit us should be taken in hand by people able to cook fish, build a hut, handle a canoe, shoot rapids, and in short ensure to the tourists all the excitement, the thrills of that great sport.

There is another programme that could be carried out by the dominion government if unemployment were to recur. Let us not forget Mr. Speaker, that our forest industry in the province of Quebec will, within twenty-five years, be in a precarious situation, if we do not plant at once thousands of trees to replace those which have been felled by lumber companies.

I am informed that the companies are willing to co-operate closely with the government in the planting of millions of trees, so that, in some twenty-five years, a new crop may keep the lumbermen busy.

Further remarks would be warranted. However, I notice that my time is nearly up. I have drawn those matters to the attention of the house and the government in the hope that they may be of some use.

I am offering those suggestions in good faith, convinced that I have done my duty. I know that the government of our country is desirous

of preventing an economic disaster such as that which followed the first great war, and that under the wise leadership of the hon. ministers of the present cabinet, I am sure that our people, despite the unavoidable dislocation of the post-war period, will soon find their normal balance and enter upon the road to progress.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

Monday March 25, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

GRAIN

INCREASE OF WHEAT DELIVERIES—1946-47 PROGRAMME FOR OATS, BARLEY AND OIL SEEDS

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement in regard to a special measure to increase wheat deliveries in western Canada and to announce the government's 1946-47 programme for oats, barley and oilseeds.

As the Prime Minister has stated, the government desires to make available the utmost quantity of food to help meet the needs of people in less fortunate parts of the world. While we have been working on a very large wheat and flour export programme during the present crop year, we hope to be able to increase shipments over the quantities originally planned. To accomplish this, it will be necessary for producers in western Canada to deliver promptly their remaining farm surpluses of wheat. Deliveries of grain have been exceptionally good this year and marketings have exceeded estimates, month by month. However, there is still a substantial quantity of wheat on farms, available for early delivery, that can be moved abroad to needy areas.

There is some wheat being held on farms in western Canada, principally due to the present levels of income tax combined with the uncertainty of yields from the new crop to be harvested in 1946. The amount of wheat so held on farms is not large in relation to the quantities which have already been shipped abroad, but if made available now would be of material help in meeting the present food situation. With this objective in mind the government has made an arrangement whereby wheat, which producers may not have intended to deliver at the present time, can be marketed and sold over the next three months, with cash settlement made at any time the producer may choose in 1946, 1947 or 1948. The arrangement will become effective on April 1, 1946, and details will be announced shortly by the Canadian wheat board. There may be a few days' delay in getting the new emergency wheat receipt forms into the hands of the elevator companies, but producers need not delay their wheat deliveries on this account. They may continue to deliver, taking storage tickets for later conversion into emergency wheat receipts. Of course those farmers who wish to deliver their wheat and take cash tickets in the usual way can proceed as in the past. There is no change in this respect. The new arrangement merely provides a means whereby producers may elect to deliver wheat between April 1 and June 30, 1946, with cash settlement taken at their option in 1946, 1947 or 1948.

Special transportation arrangements have been made to move the additional wheat forward to mills and seaboard.

I now desire to deal with the government's programme for oats and barley for 1946-47.

The 1945-46 oats programme will be continued in 1946-47. The government, through the Canadian wheat board, will guarantee a minimum price of forty-five cents per bushel for No. 2 C.W. oats, basis in store at Fort William and Port Arthur. The oats equalization fund will again operate in 1946-47, and producers will receive advance equalization payments of ten cents per bushel at the time of delivery.

In the case of barley the government will guarantee a minimum price of sixty cents per bushel for top grades basis in store at Port Arthur and Fort William. The barley equalization fund will operate in 1946-47, and advance equalization payments of fifteen cents per bushel will be made on delivery. In addition, premiums up to five cents a bushel may be paid for barley accepted as suitable for malting.

During the present crop year all barley produced and marketed in Canada was needed for our own requirement, and exports were prohibited except for small quantities sold for export prior to July 31, 1945. With exports eliminated, the government felt that producers should be protected on premiums they would have received on barley accepted for malting purposes and exported to the United States. For this reason, the advance equalization payment was increased to twenty cents per bushel for the present crop year. The producer of feeding barley received the same price as the

producer of malting barley. This policy was announced to meet a feed emergency in Canada and has served a useful purpose this year. The government, however, does not desire unduly to limit exports of barley for any longer than necessary, and hopes that barley supplies in 1946-47 will be sufficiently large to permit the resumption of exports. The government must, however, reserve the right to reexamine the barley situation when the extent of 1946 production is known.

During the greater part of the war there has been an urgent demand for vegetable oils, and the government has endeavoured to encourage the production of oil seeds. At the present time there is a world-wide shortage of both fats and vegetable oils. In order to assist in meeting oil seed requirements the government proposes to increase the present guaranteed price of flaxseed from $2.75 per bushel to $3.25 per bushel, basis No. 1 C.W. flaxseed in store Fort William, Port Arthur or Vancouver, effective August 1, 1946, for the crop year 1946-47.

In announcing the new price for flaxseed the government wishes to emphasize the importance of this crop during the present crop year and to urge producers to seed a larger acreage in 1946.

The 1945-46 rapeseed programme will be continued in 1946-47. Producers will be guaranteed six cents per pound for top grades basis country shipping points.

In 1946-47 producers will be guaranteed five cents per pound for top grades of sunflower seed basis country shipping points.

In announcing the government's programme in respect of feed grains and oil seeds, I should like once again to appeal to producers in the prairie provinces for prompt delivery of their remaining supplies of surplus wheat. Up to the present time wheat producers in western Canada have exceeded all estimates for the delivery of grain. Marketings have been high throughout the present crop year. There is still a large volume of wheat to be delivered. Wheat is urgently needed in Europe and elsewhere.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask the minister a supplementary question, to clarify what I think is an important point? On the deliveries of wheat after April 1 in 1946, 1947 and 1948, the farmer may take payment at his option. Does this mean that he must declare, in each year when he delivers the wheat, when he will exercise the option, or may he exercise the option at any time during the years mentioned?

[Mr. MacKinnon.]

Mr. MacKINNON: My understanding is that the farmer exercises his option in the year in which he wishes payment.

Mr. QUELCH: Does he have to pay storage charges—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Speaker, it is occasionally my responsibility to criticize the government for certain of its acts, but when I can, I am glad to offer words of commendation. At a later time I shall take occasion to criticize the minister for the shortcomings of his statement to-day. For the moment I wish to commend both him and the government for the action they have decided to take with respect to getting marketed now a considerable proportion of the wheat that is being held by the farmers, because, as the minister has said, they do not like the present burden of the income tax, and because of the possibility of smaller crops in later years. Considering the needs of the world to-day and the wheat held back by some farmers in western Canada, this action of the government is in the right direction and I am glad to commend them for it.

Mr. BURTON: Has the minister given consideration to increasing the flow of wheat—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have permitted the leader of the opposition and the leader of the C.C.F. party to put questions to the minister following his statement, but I must call the attention of hon. members to the fact that the minister's statement is not debatable.

Mr. BENTLEY: Is it not possible to ask the minister a question arising out of his statement, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: The statement is not debatable, but an urgent question can be put with the permission of the minister.

(On the orders of the day):

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: May I ask the minister a question arising out of his statement? Suppose the farmer decides to dispose of his wheat and delivers it to the elevator, and he has not determined on the sale until 1947 or 1948. Is he subject to storage fees and expenses at the elevator between the time he delivers the wheat and the time he determines to sell it?

Mr. MacKINNON: My understanding is that the wheat so delivered will, before storage charges start to accrue, be sold for forward sale, with the storage charges being assumed by the purchaser.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: So the farmer will not be subject to storage charges?

Mr. MacKINNON: He would not be subject.

Mr. BURTON: Has the minister considered increasing the flow of grain by making more railway cars available so that the farmers may have greater freedom in delivering to the elevator of their choice?

Mr. MacKINNON: A very serious situation exists in western Canada on account of the shortage of grain cars. We have a large number of them in the United States, and have some difficulty in bringing them back. We are taking steps to get them back.

Mr. WRIGHT: In cases where wheat is delivered this year and certificate accepted, will payment for that certificate be made on basis of the price of the wheat in the year in which the certificate is issued, or in the year in which the certificate is cashed?

Mr. MacKINNON: I would think the price would be based on the year in which the certificate is issued.

PRINCE RUPERT DRY DOCK

INQUIRY AS TO FUTURE USE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): I should like to ask the Minister of Transport a question, of which I have given him notice as well as the reason for my putting it. What steps have been taken by the government to make use of the Prince Rupert dry dock?

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): That question has already been put on the order paper by the hon. member, and I am afraid that he will have to await the reply until the question is answered. If he wants a reply now, all I can say to him is that the policy of the government will be announced in due course.

POSTAL SERVICE

TWO DELIVERIES A DAY IN URBAN RESIDENTIAL AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General. Is he in a position to state when the twice-daily house to house mail deliveries will again be put into effect?

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Postmaster General): I cannot say exactly on what date, but the officers of my department are working on it and we hope to be able very soon to reestablish the two deliveries a day.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

ALTERNATIVE SERVICE WORK—RED CROSS SOCIETY—AGRICULTURAL LABOUR

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, under the national selective service regulations, men who were called under the mobilization regulations and who were recognized as conscientious objectors by mobilization boards, were required to perform alternative service work subject to specific conditions. One of the requirements was that a portion of the conscientious objector's earnings (which was designated under contract) must be paid by the employer to the Canadian Red Cross society. Conscientious objectors in alternative service work number 10,870, and 6,749 are employed in agriculture. Contributions to the Red Cross society from the inception of the regulations to January 31, 1946, amounted to $2,248,913.84.

I do not intend, nor do I believe that the citizens of this country would agree, to relieve conscientious objectors from alternative service work until all enlisted men in the armed forces, or at least the majority of them, have been discharged.

However, in view of the urgent need for increased agricultural production, it has been decided that some relaxation of the regulations should be effected which would encourage greater effort in agricultural production and to assist in furthering the supply of available agricultural labour. Therefore, under authority vested in me under the national selective service regulations, an order has been issued providing:

(1) Every postponed conscientious objector at present engaged in agriculture, or who becomes engaged in agriculture after the date of the order shall at the conclusion of the employment period ending March 31, 1946, be relieved of further payment to the Canadian Red Cross society, provided he continues to be engaged in agriculture.

(2) Every qualified agricultural worker at present engaged in the performance of alternative service in alternative service work camps shall be granted leave of absence for work in agriculture and will not be required to contribute from his wages to the Canadian Red Cross society so long as he continues to be engaged in agriculture.

(3) No postponed conscientious objector or alternative service worker to whom the order applies may work for an employer other than the one with whom he is at present engaged,

or with whom he enters employment except by first obtaining the consent of a divisional alternative service officer.

It is understood, of course, that any conscientious objector who leaves agriculture will immediately become subject to the regulations as they have applied heretofore.

Under the plan as proposed, I am confident there will be no movement of farm labour to the city in so far as conscientious objectors are concerned, but I believe there will be a definite movement of these workers from the city to the farm, as a result of this change.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

TIME AND TIME ZONES A MATTER FOR PROVINCES AND MUNICIPALITIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, numerous inquiries have been received as to whether or not it is the intention of the government to take measures for the establishment of daylight saving time throughout Canada during the summer season of 1946.

These inquiries are no doubt prompted by the fact that in 1940 an order was made under the War Measures Act providing that daylight saving should be observed in the province of Ontario and in the province of Quebec primarily for the purpose of conserving power in connection with the war effort of Canada. Subsequently a further order was made under the War Measures Act, on the 28th January, 1942, providing that beginning with February 9, 1942, daylight saving time should be observed throughout Canada. This order became effective at the same time as measures taken in the United States went into effect and was based upon the desirability of synchronizing the time in the time zones of both countries in relation to the production and transportation of munitions and in relation to the war effort generally.

The order under the War Measures Act providing for daylight saving time was rescinded in September 1945, effective on the 30th September of that year. At the same time the similar measures taken in the United States came to an end.

Statutes as to time and the fixing of the boundaries of the various time zones have always been enacted by the provincial legislatures and not by the dominion parliament. Under provincial legislation, various municipalities throughout the country have, by by-law, provided for daylight saving time in those municipalities during certain periods of the year.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

It seems to the government that since the subjects of time and of defining the time zones have been a matter of provincial legislation, there would not be justification this year for dominion legislation or for the making of an order under the National Emergency Transitional Powers Act. The matter seems peculiarly one which should be dealt with by the provinces and the municipalities.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS LAND ACT—REGULATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF QUALIFICATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs): On Friday last the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. McCullough) asked the Minister of Veterans Affairs the following question:

Will he consider an immediate change in the regulations governing the Veterans Land Act which compel joint approval by the board of the veteran and his wife before issuance of a certificate of qualification under the Veterans Land Act, and discarding the present regulations which prevent a veteran with an overseas wife from taking advantage of the act without hardship and long delay?

On January 28, 1946, the following instructions were issued by telegram to district superintendents by the director, Veterans Land Act:

Reference qualification veterans with wives overseas and confirming views set out recent conference please make known all regional supervisors immediately that policy laid down head office letter October tenth now modified and that veterans who by virtue of their maturity, soundness of outlook and experience in farming or stability in a job are well qualified in their own right for establishment on a farm or small holding and who have suitable proposition in view which might reasonably be purchased for backlog purposes may be set up on a rental basis and bailment agreement and supplied with essential stock and equipment provided they make necessary initial payment as evidence of their bonafides. Qualification certificate should not be issued until after arrival and satisfactory interview of wife at which time consideration can be given to establishment on regular purchase contract. Rental should be such that veteran will not suffer financially as result deferred establishment. These instructions intended to meet in a reasonable way the problem confronting veterans in securing homes in advance of arrival their dependents from overseas and also to protect the veterans rights under the act in cases of dissatisfaction.

The general run of applications are being satisfactorily handled in accordance with the foregoing.

When the veteran is a man of mature judgment and experience, the proposition he has in mind is sound and within the spirit and scope of the act, and information available in regard to the wife is such that it

appears an unreasonable risk would not be taken in proceeding with establishment under the purchase contract, settlement on a permanent basis may be completed before the wife arrives.

HOUSING—RECOMMENDATION OF APPLICATIONS BY VETERANS AFFAIRS OFFICIALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. NORMAN J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): Arising out of the statement of the Minister of Reconstruction, and based on release No. 27, and several letters which I have received, may I ask the Minister of Reconstruction, and perhaps the Minister of Veterans Affairs, if the situation can be clarified as to the coordination between his department and that of veterans affairs. I have already received three or four letters, Mr. Speaker, pointing out that the veterans are very anxious to start the erection of houses, but they are alarmed at the instructions which require that they will first have to be recommended by other officials. Can the minister amplify these instructions so that the veteran may know whether they can proceed or how quickly they can proceed? They are in desperate need of houses.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Is my hon. friend referring to housing under the small holdings portion of the Veterans Land Act?

Mr. LOCKHART: Release No. 27, just sent out from the Minister of Reconstruction, reads—I quote the last paragraph:

> The veteran is required to certify that he will occupy the house in question, and applications will be accepted by the priorities officer only after they have been recommended by an official of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

They are all at sea as to what the procedure is.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Instructions have been sent out to all district officers in regard to the very point mentioned by my hon. friend, and the object is to ensure from the records of the Department of Veterans Affairs that the applicant is in fact a veteran and entitled to priority.

Mr. LOCKHART: May I ask one supplementary question: there will not be any undue delay?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, no.

Mr. LOCKHART: Because there are scores ready to go ahead.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No, there will be none at all.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

The house resumed from Friday, March 22, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fernand Viau for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate very sincerely the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) on the address, who have spoken very well, and who deserve every praise for having performed excellently that duty.

I will ask you, sir, to make a correction in the prayer that you have just read. You mentioned the governor general. We have none at the present time. The former governor has left us, and his successor has not yet arrived and has not been sworn in. We have an administrator, however, and I hope that at the next sitting you will substitute the administrator for the governor general or will add the name of the administrator until the new governor is sworn in.

I desire to offer my congratulations to the two ministers who have been appointed to the privy council at Westminster. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has received a reward for the work that he has done for Canada, for the British empire and for the countries in the sterling area, and as regards the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), I do not believe it is an honour, but rather a recognition of his excellent work in the government.

There has been some controversy in the press about decorum in the House of Commons. The journalist who wrote it, and general subscribers who wrote to their papers, are not familiar with what happens at Westminster, because once I saw a gentleman of great distinction, Mr. Anthony Eden, with his feet on the clerk's table during a sitting, and when Lord Baldwin made his last speech at Westminster, Mr. Attlee, who is also a gentleman of distinction, had his derby on his head and his feet on the table while Lord Baldwin was bent over the treasury box about a foot and a half from Mr. Attlee's feet. But that did not disturb him. Of course he was a great agriculturist.

One must not forget that disagreement is no offence and that the best way to be taken seriously by others is for a man not to take himself too seriously. When I am at home, far away in the province of Quebec, I read even the western papers, and in the Regina *Leader* of February 8 I saw a report

of a talk given by my genial friend the member for Regina City (Mr. Probe). He said, and I thank him for it, that I was the most striking character in the House of Commons at Ottawa. He went on to say: "He is a Liberal who invariably criticizes the government", which is not always true, "but always votes with it", which is not always true. "He deliberately breaks all the rules of procedure", which is not true, "but has the faculty of obtaining all he wants for his constituency." I hope he will be right at the end of this session. Apart from all that, what my hon. friend said was correct.

I will tell my hon. friends, through the chair, that I wish to cooperate with all of them, and to be useful to them as a member of parliament, and that is why I have asked certain questions on the order paper. They are not intended to embarrass the government. There is a purpose and a motive behind these questions. The first question in my name on the order paper is intended to find out what precisely we have done for Russia. It is difficult to answer that question, because for a time Russia obtained Canadian help through Great Britain. Everything that we had to send them passed through Great Britain. However, it would be well to know it.

The questions on international policy are intended to find out where we stand now with all countries. I ask about cultural relations with Russia, and of course we have such relations—we have the ballet Russe. I am wondering however whether we have any other cultural relations with Russia.

There is another question, one that has to do with the British commonwealth air training plan. Members of parliament were not informed at first about that plan. It was only a long time afterwards that we got information, and the reason why the plan was delayed was that some English industrialists—Nuffield, the iron lung man, or someone else—had to supply aeroplane propellers, which he did not do. At any rate, no member of the house was informed about it, and we did not learn anything until much later.

There is another question, No. 48, which may seem strange because it asks whether any trainees from Australia and New Zealand were killed or lost on their way to Canada to follow the B.C.A. training and, if so, when, and who were they. I also asked:

Did the then minister of national defence for air declare to press reporters that the Hon. R. B. Hanson, K.C., M.P., and former leader of the opposition, was "Hitler's new recruit"?

[Mr. Pouliot.]

I asked that because he had said that some young men from the Antipodes were coming here for training. Another question was:

Was it said because the said Mr. Hanson had just referred publicly to the partnership of any sister dominion to the said plan?

This was struck out but I would like to have it answered.

There are three problems of major importance now before the house. There is the UNO matter, and you know we must read it instead of hearing it said to realize what it is, because UNO means that no one knows about it but UNO.

As regards UNO, I always think of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt at Casablanca, as they were planning the future of the world, making a distinction between great and small countries on the basis of what was said by the kaiser during the first world war, that might is right. The idea was to give more importance to the more powerful. It is not a question of right is might; might is right.

Then there was the Atlantic charter, which was a palliative. Then the big three met at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam, and we learned afterwards that in spite of what Woodrow Wilson had said about open diplomacy, secret promises had been made to Stalin. On March 13, 1944, I asked whether Canada had been represented at Teheran and Cairo, and the answer was "no." Then I asked another question:

If not, is Canada bound by the decisions taken at such conferences?

The answer was:

No, but obviously any conclusions relating to the conduct of the war reached by the representatives and heads of governments participating in these conferences will carry very great authority with all members of the united nations.

Afterwards we had the San Francisco conference. It started eleven months ago to-day. Then there was the conference at London, and another one is starting to-day in New York. Iran will be the No. 1 issue. At London there was a rumour that Canada was to be on the security council. Canada was not elected to that council on the understanding that we would have the secretaryship of the organization which we did not get. If we do not have anything on that, it is due precisely to the theory that might is right, that great powers have to decide the destiny of the whole world.

Let us see who is in New York to-day. The names of these gentlemen have appeared in the press. Who knows Lieutenant Colonel W. R. Hodgson of Australia? Who knows

Doctor Pedro Leao Velloso of Brazil? Who knows Doctor Quo Tai-Chi of China? Who knows Mahmoud Hassan Pasha of Egypt? Who knows Ambassador Henri Bonnet of France? Who knows Foreign Minister Francisco Castillo Najera of Mexico? Who knows Eelco N. van Kleffens, of the Netherlands? Who knows Ambassador Oscar Lange of Poland?

An hon. MEMBER: Everybody.

Mr. POULIOT: I am very serious. Who knows Mr. Byrnes? Who knows Edward R. Stettinius, Junior, of the United States? And who knows Sir Alexander Cadogan of Great Britain? Who knows Andrei A. Gromyko, of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics? The hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) may be the only one who knows him, but he is not in the house to-day.

At this conference Iran is the number one issue, and what is it? It is that at the end of the second world war we have not gone any farther than at the end of the first world war. In the first world war everybody was trying to get the oil wells of Iraq. At the end of the second world war the cause of trouble is precisely the oil wells of Iraq again, and the oil wells of Iran. We may hear a lot about democracy, about this and that, and future happiness and prosperity, but it is a matter of oil. Oil is the most expensive thing in the world because it has cost so many lives. The Russians are there, and they say: "We want it." The British are there, and they say: "We want it." The Americans are there also, and they also want it. The fight is around oil wells. Is it not incredible to think that the world has sunk so low as to forget all spiritual values and we are coming to the stage where we may have another war? Some people speak of it; some hon. gentlemen have mentioned it in the house during this debate. We hear a lot of people speak of it on the street, and it is just to serve either British interests, Russian interests or United States interests that we may be on the verge of a new war. It is unbelievable.

What is the use of arguing with these people? The diplomacy of Churchill and Roosevelt has failed lamentably. They had their qualities. Roosevelt was a man with a big heart. Churchill is a powerful orator, but they had several opportunities to come to some definite understanding with Stalin when they met him. Nothing was done. To-day Roosevelt has gone to a better world; Churchill is completely out of the picture because the English, the Scottish and the people of Northern Ireland no longer had confidence in his government. He has no right to speak for the United Kingdom unless he has a mandate from the present government of the United Kingdom. But I have something to ask him as the survivor of those conferences with Stalin, and it is this: When you were representing not only the interests of your own country but the interests of other countries of the world, why did you not come to some definite arrangements with the Russians so that to-day we should not be in just as bad a position as we were during the war? The war is not finished; the war is still going on, in spite of the fact that our two most powerful enemies, Germany and Japan, have been brought to capitulation. There is still some trouble in China; there is still some trouble in Europe, and there is plenty of trouble in Asia. It shows that these men who had the fate of the world in their hands were not equal to their task. It is evident, too. How is it that no one will say that, when it is the truth? I do not question their motives. Their motives were surely good, but they were not equal to the occasion.

We come now to another matter, namely, the British loan. It is incredible to think that Canada has financed the whole British empire during the war. She has financed not only the United Kingdom but also the sterling area, meaning all the countries which had British currency, the pound sterling. How was it done? It was done by increasing the national debt to an astronomical figure and by imposing upon the Canadian people the heaviest burden of taxation we have ever had—imposing it not only upon this generation but upon generations to come. And it is not finished; it is not settled. We financed them during the war. The war is over, yet we have to finance them again. And what do we get in return? We get the jumping up of members of parliament at Westminster, saying, "Good. That is very good. That is fine. Canada is a great country." What about the securities which were given by Great Britain to Canada for the special loan of $700,000,000, the finest and most profitable of securities; Canadian Pacific Railway stock, Eno's fruit salts, et cetera.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. POULIOT: One may laugh, but that stock brings in good revenue; and also all sorts of industrial securities. What happened? They were given as a guarantee of the loan, but through some Toronto brokers some of those securities were sent to New York via Toronto. When I suggested that the banking

and commerce committee should investigate the whole matter, I was not allowed to go on. A great deal of research work in that connection could be done. Smuts, who is a great imperialist, got back all the South African stocks from London. In the same way all the Indian stocks were taken back from London to India. The same thing has been done by the United States, and now Canada is the only country in the world which is willing to impose a burden upon its taxpayers without asking anything in return.

An hon. MEMBER: They did not pledge the C.P.R. stock, did they?

Mr. POULIOT: I did not mean to mention any particular stock; I mentioned the whole thing. They should come here; we should have them. We should have possession of everything that was given by way of guarantee. Instead it goes to the United States little by little, and we shall be left with nothing. It is just as silly as when the former minister of national defence for naval services refused to accept two ships which were offered as a gift by Great Britain. He would not accept anything. Well, any hon. member can make a gift from his own pocket. It is his own money; he is free to dispose of it as he wishes, but how can the government make a gift like that without first consulting the members of parliament or, if not all members, at least those who support the party, who are the bumpers for any reaction that may result in the country?

Mr. Speaker, Canada is the moon of the British sun. When the British sun sets in glory below the horizon it is time for the moon to rise; otherwise we shall be in complete darkness. There shall be no half-breed citizenship. If this country had not reached the stage where one is not ashamed to call himself in the first place a Canadian, then we shall have no legislation conferring a hyphenated citizenship. And the question of our citizenship should be decided before that of a Canadian flag. It is only after it is decided that we shall be in a position to decide whether or not we shall have a distinctive Canadian flag. I want hon. members to think a little about questions of citizenship; to realize that Igor Gouzenko, though Russian by birth, is a good Canadian, and that the hon. member for Cartier is more of a bolshevik than a Canadian. Those who are imperialists can hardly blame the hon. member for Cartier. He does not think first of Canada; he thinks first of another country. The imperialists think first of another country; they think first of the United Kingdom, and we cannot tell them anything. If we say, "Well, that is the way it is done in Great Britain," they bow their heads in great respect and it is all right. They live in another age. They are Victorians. They are not up to date; they do not belong to modern times. I do not say this in any offensive way, but I believe we shall never be able to have good government in this country so long as we have that small group of imperialists, who are just as noisy as the Tories are in my county, where three Tories can cry as loudly as a whole parish. They say, "Let us not speak of Canada; let us not speak of Canadian citizenship; let us not speak of a Canadian flag. Let us remain colonials so that we will not deceive anyone." Then we shall have a big union jack, the biggest possible, which will be the emblem of colonialism and serfdom. Then we shall know where we are; we will make the point, as navigators say.

Hon. members will remember that last session I complained bitterly about the strike of stevedores in Great Britain which prevented the British people from having food. Now according to the newspapers there is another strike, of tugs, and again the British people will not have food. I was informed that before Christmas a shipment of turkeys was sent to Great Britain. It was not landed there because of the strike. The shipment was brought back to Canada; and when those turkeys which had made the return trip to the United Kingdom were served, they tasted of the ocean salt. If the only purpose of the loan were to feed the British people, unquestionably I would be for it. I do not know yet what I will do. But if it is to be used to carry on war in Indonesia and throughout the world, then I am against it because I want peace. I will not vote for the granting of money to Great Britain in order to encourage imperialism, because I am against it.

I am in full accord with what has been said by a very capable journalist, a member of the press gallery representing *L'Action Catholique*, Mr. Lorenzo Paré. He has been elected vice-president of the press gallery, and I congratulate him upon that election. My dear friend, Mr. McDougall, has been elected president of the gallery, and I want to congratulate him. Mr. Paré has written masterly and powerful articles opposing the loan on the grounds of patriotism. As he states, a man cannot have patriotism for a country other than his own. One must have patriotism for the country of his birth, the country in which he lives, the country in which he has chosen to bring up his family, the country in which he expects to be buried. Such a man is a patriot. But the

man who always thinks of another country before making any decision is unquestionably wrong.

Here in Ottawa we live in an atmosphere different from that of the rest of the country. My good friend the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), has rightly said that the atmosphere of Ottawa is different from that of the rest of the country. We live under an illusion. The government is under the illusion that it governs, but government is really in the hands of men whom nobody knows. Certain men will decide just what our contribution will be to the UNO. Those who will decide that will be, among others, the representatives of the trouble-maker, Russia. They are the bosses, and we agreed to that without thinking of what was right and without thinking of spiritual values.

Then there is a third question, the arrest of a member of parliament who has been accused of being a spy for another country. This is a delicate matter to discuss, because I have consideration for all members of parliament. He is a colleague; he has been elected by the electors of his constituency. I disagree strongly with what the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) said in his most contradictory speech the other night. My friend the leader of the C.C.F. (Mr. Coldwell) thought that it was one of the finest speeches ever delivered. It reminds me of a judge whom I once asked to let me have some of his unreported judgments to include in the Municipal Code which I published years ago. He sent me a number of these judgments and I quoted a few of them. When the book was published I sent him a copy and the next time he met me he said, "My boy, that is the finest book I have ever seen." Perhaps the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar has the same reason for thinking that speech was so good.

Salus populi, suprema lex is an old Latin axiom of law—the salvation of the people and the security of the people are the supreme law. It is a fine thing to talk about the magna charta, but I do not believe that all the walls of the old Irish home of the father of the hon. member for Quebec South were papered with the magna charta. Probably there was a picture of the hon. member for Quebec South playing hockey somewhere around the place, instead of the magna charta being on all the walls of the room.

Centuries after the magna charta, history records that there was what was called the gunpowder plot in Great Britain. The purpose of that plot was to blow up the king and parliament. This conspiracy has not been forgotten; for in England at the beginning of each session Mr. Speaker inspects the cellars to make sure that there is no conspirator anywhere in the parliament buildings. That is exactly what the government has done. My only regret is that we were not informed earlier about it. The government must defend the state against any one who attacks it. The Tories may attack the Liberals; I may attack the Tories or criticize the government; that is our right. But no one in this country can be against all of us; no one in this country can be against this country. The government was right in making an investigation which has unfolded the threat of this conspiracy. It shows how careful we must be with diplomats; it shows how careful we must be in checking the relations, social or otherwise, of the civil service with outside powers.

The hon. member for Quebec South complained of the shock to his ideas of liberty. This order in council was passed by virtue of bill No. 15, which was introduced by the Minister of Justice and had its first reading on October 5, 1945. On that same day the hon. member for Quebec South spoke in connection with another matter. A copy of bill No. 15 was delivered to the hon. member, as it was to every one of us. If he thought it was so important, why did he not stay here and discuss the measure with all the power he has at his command when he wants to say something? He did not do it.

On looking at the index for *Hansard* of last session I find that there are only two references under the name of the hon. member for Quebec South. These are:

Royal Canadian Air Force, 836-37
War expenditures and demobilization bill, 836-37.

That is all; he just made a little speech. Then I will go further. Tim Buck was imprisoned at a time when the hon. member for Quebec South was a member of the cabinet. He did not resign. Mayor Houde was imprisoned, and the hon. member for Quebec South did not resign although Mayor Houde was a member of the Quebec legislative assembly as well as being mayor of Montreal. The hon. member shared the responsibility for that. One of our most esteemed colleagues, the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Gauthier) was arrested. He was confined to gaol, accused of a crime of which he was not guilty. The member for Quebec South was then a minister, but he did not resign from the government. How, then, does he protest vigorously now against the arrest of one of our colleagues, an arrest which was a state necessity at the time?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Golding): Order. The hon. member has exhausted his time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not want to take up too much time, but there is another thing that I do not understand. I have a clipping here of December 13, 1944. It will be remembered that someone who was very close to the big powers left the plans for the invasion of Normandy in the library at the Chateau Frontenac in Quebec. The clipping is dated September 13, but naturally the incident happened the year before, and we see that a major got a decoration and a non-commissioned officer was also decorated, but no one was arrested for such grave carelessness. Action should have been taken against any general, however big and powerful he might be, to have him arrested because he was compromising the success of the plan for the invasion of Normandy, which resulted in victory over Germany. But nothing of that sort was done. It was treated as just an ordinary matter. In that case justice was not severe enough.

I gave an interview in February last to a paper which is published in my constitueney. The interview was about the atomic bomb and the Canadian loan. But I will say only this, that I am not at all surprised at the Russian conspiracy, because at the time of the padlock law I notified the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) of the intrigues that were being carried on by the Russians, and told him that although some of his ministers—the present Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) was not a member of parliament at the time—were in favour of disallowing the padlock law, I opposed such a step. I told the Prime Minister that the cardinal has more influence than Tim Buck, and the Prime Minister understood that it would have been very unwise to disallow the padlock law at the time. It was left on the statute book, and there was no trouble. But I gave names to the Prime Minister, and I told him that that was the way in which Russia was handling diplomatic business. It is all right to do business with any other party provided the other party acts like a gentleman. But let us stop all aid to Russia if they will not compromise and come to terms.

There is something else that I want to say. What the leader of the Social Credit group said in this debate was right, and the confirmation of what he said about McGill can be found in the fact that Doctor Boyer has been suspended from McGill. It is not the first time that there have been seditious professors at McGill, Toronto and Queen's. One professor at Queen's has just been arrested. I remember the time when King Gordon was a professor in Toronto. I complained about him, also about the teaching that was being given to McGill students, and in the Montreal papers that same night there was a protest from Colonel Bovey, the man who makes molasses peaches that pay him well. He said I was wrong. But what happened after that? Sir Edward Beatty, who was the chancellor of McGill, took the first opportunity to go to Queen's university to give a calling down to the students of his Alma Mater. I asked him for some of his speeches to the youths and he sent me all those speeches except the one that he had delivered at Queen's after Colonel Bovey's protest.

What is happening in the case of the member for Cartier, and what is happening now in this country, should be a lesson for us. We should be very careful in our dealings with other nations. We should develop a Canadian spirit so that our people will start to think of this country before thinking of anyone else. If I disagreed with the member for Quebec South on some points, there was one on which I agreed with him and that was when he spoke of various political affiliations and putting some other country before one's own. I know that it will be very hard for some members to extirpate that obsolete feeling of inferiority that exists in some places, but every time they attempt to do it they will be satisfied that they have performed a national duty.

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): I had intended if His Honour the Speaker were in his seat to say at the beginning of my remarks that I was not rising to ask any questions for which I might be called to order. But to relieve your mind, sir, I will say the same to you.

The hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Pouliot) would not expect me to follow him in his fluent remarks, and my reference as such to his speech is all that he can expect from me at the present time. If I attempted to follow him I should not have time to get my own remarks on the record.

This debate, Mr. Speaker, may be called one of the chief conventions of parliament, since it affords to a great many of us an opportunity to speak on almost any subject and to mention some of the major problems we have in our respective constituencies.

Last session, when speaking on the address, I extended due congratulations to those who in my opinion deserved them. This time I will follow the time-honoured custom, and I sincerely congratulate the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address. The mover of the address deserves special

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Golding).]

commendation, because he spoke fluently and with great eloquence in his mother tongue. I hope that he can do the same when he comes to speak in the English language; he will have a distinct advantage over most hon. members. The seconder of the address always makes a good speech. His speech on this occasion was free from any of the embarrassments which attend some of the rest of us when we speak in this chamber. I therefore congratulate both hon. members. I know full well that the leader of their party was greatly pleased with their remarks, as these gentlemen came through and kept to the straight and narrow path of liberalism.

The text before me to-day is the speech from the throne. I have read it several times. It is of great length, but it does not offer as much as I thought it would. It makes several offers of something for nothing, but has very little for the jobless citizen of Canada. It is a brief prepared by the cabinet and placed in the hands of His Excellency to be read to the House of Commons and the Senate; consequently any remarks I may make in criticism of it are not a criticism of the governor general, because this document was handed to him by his constitutional advisers.

Criticisms of this speech have to do with some of its omissions and also some of its commissions.

As I have said, the speech is lengthy, and it was prepared by the cabinet; but when I read a few days ago the speech recently made by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann) in his constituency of Renfrew South, I began to think that either the speech from the throne was not prepared by the cabinet, or that while it was being prepared the minister was asleep. No doubt the minister has been rapped over the wrists for his expressions with reference to taxation. He is reported as having said that there were great things coming in the speech from the throne in this respect, that there were to be large reductions in the corporation tax, personal income taxes, and taxes of all kinds. So optimistic was he on this matter that he is reported as having said that "it will be about fifty per cent reduction." That must have been a pleasing announcement for his constituents to listen to. How popular he must have been on that occasion! But in view of what the speech from the throne has to offer them, what will they say to him upon his next visit? However, when the subject of taxation comes up under the budget we shall have—perhaps I may have—an opportunity of contrasting the enthusiastic minister's speech with the realities as disclosed by the budget.

The speech from the throne allows us some latitude in our remarks. During the fall session of 1945, speaking in the debate on the speech from the throne, I said that our province had been neglected under the terms of confederation. I was pleased to find that I had proved to quite a number of ministers that we are really neglected. In fact I thought I was getting along fairly well when the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier), and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier) were quite liberal in what they did for my province, and for all of which I was very thankful. But within the last few days there has come an advertising blast which has rocked us right down to the ocean. Last Friday I endeavoured to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) a question in reference to a map and pictures which appeared in the New York *Times* of March 17, and from which map Prince Edward Island is entirely deleted. The Minister of Trade and Commerce did not have an opportunity to reply at that time, as I was called to order by Mr. Speaker and required to sit down; but to-day I am glad to report that I have in my possession—it was handed to me as I came into the house—a letter from the minister which practically answers my question. With his permission—I have already asked for it—I am going to read the letter.

Dear Mr. McLure:

My secretary notified me of your intention to ask about some map that had been published, presumably by this department, in the New York *Times* and that had omitted Prince Edward Island.

I purpose seeing the map to which you refer. Map publications of this department are trade routes maps; map in the hand book we publish, and our travel bureau map, all of which show Prince Edward Island in its proper place.

I can asure you that I would join you in protest against the omission from any map of Canada of Prince Edward Island, Canada's smallest province but in many ways one of its loveliest.

I am sorry that I did not have an opportunity to say on the floor of the house just what I have said now.

This is signed by the Hon. James A. MacKinnon. It is much better, and I know that he will look into this matter and not allow such omissions of our province, the cradle of confederation, from advertising by the department.

I might mention another matter with reference to this advertising. I have before me a beautiful little calendar. I have not been able to find out who put it out, who authorized it, or anything else, but it is made up of tourist scenes and tourist views throughout Canada, starting on the first page with the

majestic parliament buildings, and it gives two or three views from every province except one, Prince Edward Island.

This adverse advertising, when we are all looking for tourists, when our province has been struggling year after year to better conditions and to obtain greater tourist traffic, is certainly something for us to complain about. Looking at the map I was disturbed, because I had a constituency when I came here and I did not know whether I was going to have one when I got home, if I was to judge by the map. I should not be able to sing that old song which is familiar to all hon. gentlemen, "I had a hat when I came in, and I had a hat when I went out." I did not know whether I should be able to sing that I had a constituency when I came in and that I had a constituency when I went out. The tourist industry is of such importance to us that we should like to have the very best for our share of the advertising which the travel bureau, or whoever puts out this advertising, can possibly give us.

May I now refer to one of our problems. I do so because I have some figures which I wish to put before the house. I refer now to our truck transportation problem. The handicap to Prince Edward Island and her participation in the advantages of truck transportation from and to the mainland via Borden and Tormentine are practically prohibitive to us according to the rates we are charged. I quoted these rates in detail last year, and now I will submit only the rates on a five-ton truck carrying a load from and to. I will give simply these particular rates. The rate for a five-ton truck loaded with a first class commodity, return trip with a similar load, crossing the straits, is $60.65. For second class material it would be $54.65; for a third class commodity $50.65; for a fourth class commodity $44.65. If the truck were to return empty the rates for the different classes would be from $40.65 down to $32.65. This is for a distance of 18 miles. It costs for a five-ton truck with a first class commodity $3.37 per mile to cross the straits. These rates that I have just given are based on the assumption that the truck can be transported without loading from a platform. If it is driven onto a platform there is an extra charge of $10.

Let me discuss this with reference to the authorities that have to do with it. First of all, the agreement that my province entered into was made with the Dominion of Canada, and I am going to put on record again one clause which provides that our transportation system shall be kept up to date. You will find this in the agreement:

> That the Dominion of Canada shall assume and defray all the charges for the efficient steam service, for the conveyance of mails and passengers, to be established and maintained between the island—
>
> Meaning Prince Edward Island.
>
> —and the mainland of the dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial railway and the railway system of the dominion, and such other charges as may be incident to and connected with the services which by the British North America Act of 1867 appertain to the general government and as are or may be allowed to the other provinces.

That binding term of our agreement is the one on which I base my remarks. In the fall session of 1945 I endeavoured to place this truck problem before the Minister of Transport, but it was in the hit-or-miss days when estimates were going through at the rate of millions per minute. However, on page 3685 of *Hansard* of December 17, 1945, I find that I asked the Minister of Transport a question. I made this statement:

> I want the Minister of Transport to set the rate himself.

The minister replied:

> The Minister of Transport cannot set the rate.
>
> Mr. McLure: Does the minister tell this committee that he has no authority over rates?
>
> Mr. Chevrier: I said that the miister could not set the rate.
>
> Mr. McLure: Does the minister mean by that, that the government cannot set the rate?
>
> Mr. Chevrier: I will explain what I mean when I answer the hon. gentleman.

Then on page 3686 of the same *Hansard,* the same day, the minister, replying to some remarks of mine, said, referring to myself:

> He is of the opinion that the Minister of Transport should eliminate what he calls these prohibitive rates. I say to him that the minister has no authority to do that. The rates are filed with the board of transport commissioners on automobiles and trucks carried by the Canadian National Railways on the ferry between the island and the mainland, and it would appear from the information I have at hand that anyone who wishes to complain about these rates can do so before the board. I am not prepared to disagree with the hon. gentleman upon the amount of these rates. The explanation given before the railways and shipping committee by the president of the Canadian National Railways was that in fixing the rates on the ferry regard had to be had to similar railway rates.

I should now like to refer to what the president said. We can find it at page 86 of

the report of the railways and shipping committee. The hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman) asked this question:

> Are the rates on the ferry high, and does the C.N.R. set them?

He was there referring to the Northumberland ferry. It was a very good question. Here is the reply given by the president of the Canadian National Railways:

> We do not think the rates are unusually high. Of course, everything that goes over on the ferry is in direct competition with the railway.

He does not think that a rate of $3.37 per mile for taking a truck is prohibitive or high. He then goes on to say this, which is a classic:

> We think we are generous in allowing the trucks to go on the ferry at all.

This is a ferry owned by the Dominion of Canada. The boat and equipment were built by the Dominion of Canada, and yet the subcontractor makes the statement that we ought to be pleased to be allowed to take our trucks over, even though the rate were twice as high as it is.

I have no complaints against the Canadian National Railways; they are running the service. But I do complain that the government are not doing justice to Prince Edward Island in permitting those excessive rates to be charged. I could hardly believe that the president of the Canadian National Railways would say "we think we are generous in allowing the trucks to go on the ferry at all," this man who occupied the position of president of the Canadian National Railways could not have known what the rates were when he spoke thus. I have confidence in his ability and common sense, and I am sure that if he had known of the rates which I have put on the record to-day his reply would not have been as I have stated. Instead it would be something like this: Yes, the rates are ridiculously high, and no province with a guarantee from the dominion government should stand for such treatment. I feel certain that he would have put it in still stronger terms. This year I hope to have an opportunity to appear before that committee and to give them a true picture of our transportation problem.

Let me for a moment refer to what some of the prime ministers and leaders of the different parties have said, and how they have viewed our situation. For thirty-five years we made practically no advance whatever in our transportation problem. In 1911 the province began to exert itself with regard to the fulfilment of the agreement of union. At that time Sir Robert Borden came to our province. He had made a study of our problem, and he made definite promises to us with regard to the ferry. I am proud to say that through these promises and the study he had made of them we have our present ferry system. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said in the House of Commons in 1912, as reported at page 5680 of *Hansard*:

> Prince Edward Island has not profited by confederation. For some years past it has been losing its population by reason of its connection with Canada and going backwards instead of forward.

The Right Hon. R. B. Bennett also studied our problems and gave us a further fulfilment of our contract. The present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has made a study of the matter, and definite promises were made by him for further fulfilment. I was unable to locate to-day his exact words, in *Hansard* and on the public platform, but he did give assurance of further fulfilment of our contract. To show you, Mr. Speaker, that the present Prime Minister is in accord with the view we hold that the agreement is not being lived up to, I shall quote what the Hon. Charles A. Dunning, a former Minister of Finance of the Liberal government had to say when he was seeking election in my constituency. He was not speaking without the consent of the Prime Minister. Mr. Dunning contended, as had all others, that the water separating Prince Edward Island from the mainland of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia was the king's highway, and that we were entitled to have it negotiated at the expense of the federal government. Here are his exact words:

> It is in the bond of confederation agreement and must be honoured and its obligations fulfilled.

He was elected by acclamation. Your humble servant chose not to oppose him. I am not presuming too much when I say that on that occasion Mr. Dunning was the mouthpiece of the Prime Minister. Therefore I give the Prime Minister credit for these encouraging words with reference to our problem.

We had other men come down there time after time and study our problem. For instance, the leader of my party in this house (Mr. Bracken) made a study of this problem prior to the 1945 election. He spent considerable time there, and he had practical experience with the ferry which gave him fuller knowledge of our transportation problem. In his opening campaign speech the hon. gentleman promised that if his party were elected there would be proper fulfilment of the terms of confederation with regard to our transportation; and I believe that had he been elected, this would have been done.

During the same campaign the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) was in our province, no doubt in behalf of the Prime Minister who was unable to come there. I did not hear that fluent gentleman at that time, but from what I read in the newspapers he was not far behind anyone else in making promises in regard to our transportation. He is here in the chamber at the present time. I will say that I believe he was sincere, and according to what appeared in the press his statements were to the same effect as those of Mr. Dunning, when he said, "It is yours by right, because it is in the bond of agreement." I may not be quoting nearly all that was said by the hon. gentleman on that occasion, but I am sure if there was more he will say so when I am through.

In addition to the matter of automobiles and trucks we had other promises made in reference to our roads and the things that should be given to us. As well as the ferry we should have a highway to connect us with the mainland by the Tormentine-Borden route; and some day I hope we shall be given that highway under the terms of confederation. It should be a super-highway, such as all the other provinces have; it should go from Borden to Charlottetown, the shortest route to the capital city, which would save us a drive of fourteen miles. This would require the construction of one bridge, the Brighton bridge, which according to some estimates would cost nearly a million dollars. I do not know how far the Minister of Agriculture went in his remarks in reference to that subject, but I do know that at several meetings the Liberal candidates in our constituency said this bridge would be built as part of the highway. All the candidates gave the same pledge, so when the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) begins his task I hope we will have an opportunity of presenting this matter in connection with our highway.

I might mention many other things in connection with our transportation. Last session the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) dealing with this matter, said at page 3685 of *Hansard* for December 17, 1945:

> My hon. friend is not unmindful of the fact that already we have made commitments for improving the facilities at Tormentine and Borden. . . .
>
> It does not matter under whose department it is. At the moment it is under the Department of Transport, but that is aside from the question. We are spending on these facilities somewhere in the neighbourhood of $5,500,000. That is over and above the new ferry boat, which will cost between $4,500,000 and $5,000,000. That is over $11,000,000 for these facilities. So that I am sure the hon. gentleman cannot say that we are not looking with interest into the transportation problems between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

[Mr. McLure.]

I say now, as I said then, that I appreciate the interest the minister is taking in our problem, but I want to tell him now it will require another $12,000,000 to bring our transportation up to the standard guaranteed to us in our terms of agreement with the dominion government.

If time permitted, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in reference to the other ferry and its system of operation, but in conclusion may I say that for over fifty years my province has been deprived of the efficient, continuous service which was guaranteed by confederation. How therefore can any government expect us to be fully satisfied with a service operated by a subcontractor who is not interested in the terms of confederation? As I said before, when I make that statement concerning the subcontractors I do not intend to criticize them, but I do criticize the dominion government for not seeing to the fulfilment of the terms of confederation as they deal with us. Public opinion is behind us. During the past year I have noticed editorials in some of our leading newspapers, all voicing the opinion that this stretch of water must be treated as a highway, as a bridge, as part of the trans-Canada highway, with no cost to traffic other than the normal cost of moving a truck or other vehicle nine miles on the highway. Public opinion will support that; and not until we get a better service at a proper rate can we be content; nor can we be satisfied until our agreement with the dominion government has been fulfilled.

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, on September 24 last, six months ago, I introduced into this house a subject relating to one of the gravest problems that have arisen out of world war II, and I had earnestly hoped that there would be no necessity of bringing the matter up again this session. I refer, of course, to the tragic fate of displaced persons and their forced repatriation from western Europe to regions behind "the iron curtain which to-day divides Europe in twain," to use Mr. Churchill's dramatic description. I had hoped, too, sir, that English-speaking countries would eventually take a firm stand against this inhuman repatriation and that all persons who consider themselves stateless would be given asylum and protection in the western world until they could find permanent homes. I firmly believed also that the British and United States governments would take the right course in this matter, not only for humanitarian reasons but also because of the long-established practice of international law under which protection and asylum have always been extended to refugees in the past, and because the use of force against defence-

less people is incompatible with the principles of freedom and justice to which the western allies have pledged themselves. Unfortunately, my hopes were not realized.

To my great disappointment, and to the disappointment of many Canadian citizens, including thousands of our returned men and women who are deeply concerned about the fate of their relatives now in western Europe, forced repatriation of displaced persons continues despite the assurances by the British and United States governments to the contrary. Alarming but authentic reports continue to reach Canadian citizens to the effect that United States, British and Canadian soldiers not only are permitting Soviet authorities to comb British and American zones for refugees, but are actually aiding the Soviet authorities in this man-hunt of defenceless peoples.

Contrary to the general belief that the displaced persons problem has been partly solved, the grim fact is that the problem has gradually become even more serious. This was recognized by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, that great American lady, and also by the Hon. Hector McNeil, British parliamentary under-secretary of state for foreign affairs, when they considered the displaced persons problem of sufficient importance to voice their stand on it at the recent united nations conference held in London, England, and in their stand they were supported by Premier Peter Fraser of New Zealand. A press report on Februay 9, 1946, said that "the refugee debate was the highlight of the work of the assembly committee apart from the debate on the headquarters site". The London *Times* of February 13 of this year described in the following words the conference proceedings of February 12:

> The assembly rose at the end of the afternoon sitting without having reached a vote. The debate was resumed at 9 p.m. with the galleries crowded and the public flowing into the press seats. It was a dramatic sitting . . . Mrs. Roosevelt went to the rostrum. She was given a great ovation, and in the course of a speech in which she pleaded eloquently for the right of the refugees to make their own choice she was repeatedly cheered. She was followed by Mr. Hector McNeil . . . with a speech which also moved the gathering. He recalled the words of the charter pledging the united nations to practice tolerance and to respect the worth of the individual. "These," he said, "are the lamps that light this assembly." If the words "tolerance" and "pity" were to be eliminated then the English tongue would no longer be the English tongue. The right of asylum had to be preserved, he remarked.

Supporting the British and American case, Premier Peter Fraser of New Zealand warned that "we must be careful that in the attending of the birth of the united nations we are not also attending the funeral of liberty and freedom." The references which I have just quoted are a fair indication of the importance that was attached at the united nations conference to the problem of displaced persons.

On January 19 and February 23 of this year, His Holiness Pope Pius XII issued two protests against forced repatriation of displaced persons and the persecution of the Ukrainian church. Following these protests, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant made two further protests on March 1 and 5, 1946, against allowing Soviet authorities to kidnap displaced persons, and against persecution of the Ukrainian church.

The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), now parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, spoke on this subject in this house on September 26 last, and by his impassioned appeal on behalf of the homeless displaced persons endeared himself to thousands of Canadian citizens across this country. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny) made his worthy contribution on this matter on September 27 last.

The Ukrainian Canadian committee, which is the coordinating body of all non-communist Ukrainian Canadian organizations in Canada, comprising more than eighty per cent of all Canadians of Ukrainian origin, and whose first objective was more effectively to aid Canada in the winning of the war, has also made several presentations to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Canadian government on behalf of relatives of Canadians who find themselves among the displaced persons in Europe. On October 22, 1945, twenty-five members of this parliament sent a telegram to the Prime Minister of Canada while he was in London, appealing to him to make representations to the British and American foreign offices to cease forced repatriation of displaced persons to the east.

Within recent months further appeals were sent to the Prime Minister by Canadian church organizations. On January 28 of this year the chairman of the social service committee of the Baptist church of Canada urged the Prime Minister "to take a firm and Christian stand against forced repatriation of refugees." His appeal reads in part as follows:

> There are constant and disquieting reports that, in violation of international law but in alleged conformity with the dictatorial Yalta pact, the military authorities in the British and and American zones are forcing such refugees—especially Ukrainians, Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians and Esthonians—into Soviet repatriation camps for compulsory transportation . . . At a time when American, Canadian and British troops abroad are clamouring for speedy repatriation, these millions of displaced persons in

western Europe dread repatriation worse than death and are committing suicide or starving in the forests in order to escape the horrors of coming under Soviet rule. These are not war criminals . . .

To hand them over to the red army and the N.K.V.D. is to murder them. He who deliberately surrenders an innocent man to his murderers is himself guilty of the felony. It would be a moral calamity of the first order if our Canadian government should share in the responsibility for these crimes.

Never before, to my knowledge, have Christian nations connived at such an atrocity on such a scale . . .

May I urge, Mr. Prime Minister, that the Canadian government should make itself the voice of the conscience of Canada, and actively try to prevent these crimes against humanity? And may I urge that Canada should bear its share of an offer of asylum to these fugitives from death?

Another appeal, bearing the date of February 22, 1946, and signed by Mr. W. A. Cameron on behalf of the sub-executive of the general board of missions of the Presbyterian church in Canada, was sent to the Prime Minister. This appeal urged that all orders authorizing forced repatriation of displaced persons be revoked. Finally I should like to mention the speeches and writings of Doctor Watson Kirkconnell of McMaster university. Doctor Kirkconnell's articles on this subject have been authoritative and instructive.

Let me mention what has been done in the United States in an effort to secure justice for the displaced persons. On November 21, 1945, Hon. Clare Booth Luce read into the congressional record important documents and extracts from letters concerning the fate of Ukrainian displaced persons, and urged the revocation of forced repatriation orders. On December 11, 1945, in an effort to prevent the displaced persons in the American zone of occupation from being repatriated by force, Senator Arthur Vanderburg and Mrs. Clare Booth Luce introduced in congress a joint resolution requesting an immediate and a thorough investigation into the whole refugee problem.

Recently, on March 7, 1946, Congressman Michael J. Bradley, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, delivered a strong address in the house of representatives in the United States capitol, against forced repatriation and political persecution of Ukrainian displaced persons.

The Ukrainian congress committee in the United States, which is also a coordinating body of all non-communist American Ukrainian organizations, comprising the large majority of Americans of Ukrainian origin, made similar requests to the President of the United States and the United States government.

Again, the writings on this subject of such outstanding men as Doctor Clarence A. Manning, a professor at Columbia university, and William Henry Chamberlin, one of the foremost journalists of this continent, are in line with the true principles of freedom and will remain a tribute to the men of learning in the United States.

But in spite of these numerous appeals, protests, requests and representations, the Soviet authorities are still being extended the privilege of combing the British and American zones of occupation in search of their victims. It is extremely painful and disappointing to learn that United States, British and Canadian soldiers are being used to assist the Soviet authorities in forcing the unfortunate displaced persons to surrender to the Soviets, even though most of them come from territories which never were a part of Tsarist Russia or the present communist empire. Some of the letters which I receive from Canadian and American soldiers describing the treatment that is meted out to large numbers of displaced persons defy the imagination. After witnessing one of these massacres in one of the displaced persons camps, an American officer said, "It just wasn't human," and "there weren't men in the barracks when I reached it—they were animals. Nothing has ever affected me like that scene."

In view of the well-organized campaign which is being carried on against these tortured people by persons with the definite purpose of diverting the sympathy of Canadian citizens and confusing the issue, I am compelled to deal with this matter for the second time in this house. On this occasion I should like to document my arguments so as to leave no doubt whatsoever in regard to the whole question. It is obvious that these people cannot speak for themselves. This fact alone, I think, justifies my discussing the problem. And because the subject is so immense I can deal with only a portion of it; I shall leave other aspects of it to other hon. members.

I should now like to call three witnesses to testify in this matter, to describe from their own knowledge the conditions in which displaced persons find themselves and indicate something of the agony which unfortunate refugees experience. I will first call on Emma Birkett to give her story to the house. In the September 6, 1945, issue of the *Weekly Review*, London, Emma Birkett says:

The period from October, 1939, until June, 1941 . . . (the period when Russia and Germany were on the same side) will forever remain in the memory of western Ukrainians as that of their greatest sufferings.

Executions combined with mass deportations into the depths of the Soviet Union filled the

whole population with terror. Many political leaders essentially nationally-minded, were deported into Asia and soon died in exile.

To-day these people, of whom there are millions, are scattered all over Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, Roumania and the Balkans.

To-day, all Ukrainians, regardless from which part of their country they come, are in tragic position. By nature individualists and western-minded, imbued with fanatical love of personal freedom, they find themselves geographically squeezed between two totalitarian systems, both of which they feared and hated.

To-day, when the guns are quiet in Europe, the future of Ukrainians scattered across the continent is still very dark.

The problem of all these wretched people is one of the greatest magnitude. Their fate in Europe is one of the terrible consequences of this war. They do not claim any priority in getting help from the outside world. But should not their case, simply for reasons of humanity, receive more attention than until now.

I am certain that Miss Birkett's testimony requires no comment; it is a document which speaks for itself and will remain in the permanent records when the story of the agony of millions of displaced persons is written.

The second witness upon whom I wish to call to testify briefly is a United States army M.P., Harry Polche. This soldier's testimony in part is as follows:

> . . . I have been travelling through Europe and have seen many sights, but there is one in particular I want to tell you about . . . It was only recently that I was stationed in Ingolstadt, Germany. I happened to take a walk through the park, and suddenly I heard Ukrainian voices. I looked into a grove of trees and there I saw about thirty children, ranging in age from three to seven . . . and a teacher.
>
> They were saying a prayer in Ukrainian . . . I approached the group and introduced myself. The teacher then had the pupils recite for me and sing familiar Ukrainian songs. They sang very well with their childlike voices.
>
> They were all poorly dressed.
>
> It made me very sad to see the Ukrainian children reduced to this. I visited the barracks where they lived, and it was pitiful to see where they slept. Many people slept in a room and on straw mattresses. I do not know how they will be able to spend the cold winter . . .
>
> They are a homeless people . . .
>
> I feel sorry for these people and something should be done to help them. They need food, clothing and most of all encouragement.

The third and last witness whom I wish to call cannot now be named, for obvious reasons, but his testimony can be relied upon. The letter is dated September 11, 1945, and written from Diel, near Coblenz, Germany. He says:

> To the camp at Manheim, south of Frankfort, where there are 3,000 Ukrainians from eastern Ukraine and from Galicia, Soviet officials came there recently and demanded the surrender of Ukrainians to them. The American authorities ordered the Ukrainians to prepare themselves to leave. The Ukrainians refused to obey the order. A tug-of-war ensued. Women and children began to cry and threw themselves at the feet of the American officers. But to no avail. The American officers threatened to shoot . . . Finally one American officer ordered them once more to prepare to leave and those who refused were beaten with rubber clubs . . . The Ukrainians did not give in . . . To this the officer said: "If that is the case I will give you four days to think the matter over." What of the future no one knows.

This, Mr. Speaker, gives us some idea of what the displaced persons must go through. I need hardly say how Canadians or Americans must feel when they receive such letters, especially when persons near and dear to them are in one of these camps. Indifference on their part is unthinkable.

I know there are those who will argue that the conditions which I have described may have been true in the past, but that forced repatriation has now ceased and conditions have greatly improved. One such Associated Press dispatch, dated October 4, 1945, announced that General Eisenhower had issued an order to United States officers to stop forced repatriation of persons who did not wish to place themselves in the custody of the Soviet officers.

In the same dispatch one United States officer is quoted as having said:

> Possibly for a time some of them were pushed into trains without our asking many questions, but that's all stopped now.

That report was indeed very encouraging and was happily received by Canadian and American citizens. A few days later, however, heart-breaking reports continued to come in, to the effect that there was no marked change in the policy in regard to forced repatriation of displaced persons. In a letter dated November 21, 1945, which I personally received from a Canadian officer stationed in London, England, he said:

> With regard to the Associated Press dispatch that General Eisenhower had issued an order to cease forceful repatriation of displaced persons from the American zone, I am afraid that I cannot give you much more information than what we have received from certain territories in Germany, which is to the effect that there is no marked change in the general attitude of the authorities . . . In other words, the initiative and decisions are a matter of local commanding officers, because they, and only they, represent the military authorities and therefore they are the only semblance of law and order in their respective districts.

After receiving a number of distressing telegrams and letters, such as I have just quoted, I asked the Prime Minister a question in this matter on December 18, 1945, which is in part as follows:

> Has the government anything to say on the subject of further forceful repatriation of

Ukrainians from military occupation zones to the east? They are being refused food unless they agree to go.

The Prime Minister was kind enough to give me this reply:

The subject to which the hon. member has referred is one which relates to Europe. I am not in a position to say whether the representations made are wholly correct. I would suppose in that respect that my hon. friend is in the same position as I am. I can assure him however that the government has watched this whole Ukrainian situation most carefully, and so far as it is within our power to control matters, we have sought to see that the course taken would be such as would protect their interests.

I am now in possession of a copy of the United States zone order of December 5, 1945, to which I referred when I directed the question to the Prime Minister. In brief the order says:

It is hereby announced that from 08.00 hours December 8, all food, shelter, etc., for those displaced persons who . . . are Soviet citizens are to cease forthwith. (They) are instructed to report to the Soviet camp at Stuttgart . . . Those who do not report will be seized . . . and brought to Stuttgart under armed escort . . . All local burgomasters have been informed that Soviet citizens are not to be employed and the German population must refuse them food.

I have two other copies of similar orders which I will not take time to quote, but one is a United States order dated November 27, 1945, signed by Captain Robert Wallach, and the other is a British 30th corps zone order (No. 219DP) of December 29, 1945, issued in a similar sense.

I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot reconcile such orders as these with the words of the president of the preparatory commission and temporary president of the general assembly of UNO which he used when addressing the united nations conference at London, England on January 9, 1946. He declared:

The San Francisco charter, which to-morrow we shall start to bring into effect, repeatedly stresses the vital importance of stimulating in the world real respect for fundamental liberties, individual rights, and dignity of man and the dictates of justice as an indispensable basis for the maintenance of peace.

I quite realize that the western allies are anxious to lighten the load which they are carrying in feeding and clothing several millions of people, but I feel that apart from humanitarian and Christian considerations we should also take into account their sacrifices for us. I should like to quote in this connection two or three sentences from an article which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* of January 27, 1945, written by Edgar Snow while in Kiev. Mr. Snow said:

. . . it was not till I came here on this sobering journey into the twilight of war that I quite realized the price which Ukrainians have paid for Soviet victory. This whole titanic struggle, which some are so apt to dismiss as "the Russian Glory," has, in all truth and in many costly ways, been first of all a Ukrainian war. No fewer than 10,000,000 people, I was told . . . by a high official here, have been "lost" to the Ukraine since the beginning of the war. That figure excludes men and women mobilized for the armed forces.

If we take into consideration, therefore, the sacrifices of these people we may perhaps come to the conclusion that we, too, owe them a small debt of gratitude. I hope that Canada does not dismiss this tragedy by merely saying that it is a European problem.

I am pleased, however, that Canada has carried its share of the burden by way of contributions to UNRRA and other similar agencies. I am pleased, too, that all parties in this house have in their recent references included Canada among the powers of the world. In the farewell address to their excellencies the Governor General and Princess Alice the house unanimously agreed, as reported in *Hansard* of March 15, that Canada is now recognized as a foremost world power. May I read one sentence from the address:

. . . It must be a source of profound gratification to you, on your retirement, as Governor General, to realize that your years in Canada have witnessed victory over the enemies of freedom, and the emergence of Canada as a world power, with a foremost place among the united nations.

I am sure that it is a source of deep satisfaction to all hon. members that Canada has reached this position, for there is hope now that Canada, occupying the foremost position among the united nations, will have a stronger voice in the councils of nations concerning international matters.

I am pleased, also, that in the speech from the throne considerable emphasis is placed on the need of supplying of food to the starving peoples of Europe, and indeed to the world. The speech says:

The turmoil which has followed in the wake of war has created new problems for governments in all parts of the globe . . . Hunger, privation and sufferings have become the lot of millions. Other millions are homeless, many of them in exile.

Of world problems demanding immediate action, the most pressing is the provision of food to those people facing acute shortage, and, in some regions, widespread famine. Unless the need is met, grave disorders, endangering peace itself, must be anticipated.

In view of Canada's recognition of the widespread shortage of food in many countries of the world, I would also urge upon the government not to overlook the needs of displaced persons and to do all in its power to assist these people by all practicable means.

We must take into account that in time the work of UNRRA will be terminated. It is definite that UNRRA cannot feed, house and clothe millions of people indefinitely. A permanent solution of this problem must be sought, and without delay. Canadian citizens are not only now worrying about the present lot of their relatives; they are also concerned about their future.

Having outlined the grim conditions under which so many relatives of Canadian citizens find themselves, I should now like to place before the government four specific requests.

1. That the Canadian government make further representations to British and United States governments requesting the revocation of all forced repatriation orders which are applied to Ukrainian and other refugees; and, further, that in compliance with international law the right of asylum and protection be granted to all persons who consider themselves stateless, regardless of their origin or religious belief. I shall cite but one reference to international law relating to the refugee problem.

On page 238 of "The Refugee Problem" (A report of a survey), by Sir John Hope Simpson, it is stated:

> The political and juridical protection of refugees has been the subject of international agreements—such as the arrangements of 1928 for "Nansen" refugees and of 1936 for refugees coming from Germany—secured by the action of the league of nations, and the binding convention of 1933 and 1938.

Time does not allow me to quote further references in regard to this matter, but I should like to quote article 129 of the U.S.S.R. constitution of 1936. It clearly states:

> The U.S.S.R. grants the right of asylum to foreign citizens persecuted for defending the interests of the toilers or for their scientific activities or for their struggle for national liberation.

I submit that in view of the international law which, if unobserved, denies any protection to persecuted peoples and persons whatsoever, and in view of the fact that the U.S.S.R. reserved to itself this right under its own constitution, the English-speaking countries should insist that this law be observed. Surely the U.S.S.R. cannot expect us to deny, to persons who look to us for protection, the protection which they guarantee to their supporters.

2. (a) In view of the heavy load which UNRRA is carrying in the matter of feeding and clothing the people in displaced persons camps, the government should take immediate steps to making proper arrangements to make it possible for Canadian citizens to send food and clothing parcels to their relatives in the camps until such time as they are permanently resettled and are able to support themselves. In the United States, arrangements for sending mail and parcels were made as far back as November 23, 1945. This was reported in the New York *Times* of November 24, last. And in the New York *Times* of February 28 of this year, Lieutenant General William N. Haskill announced that a cooperative organization will soon have several millions of food parcels available to be sent to relatives of Americans. I should ask, too, that the Postmaster General (Mr. Bertrand) confer with the British postal authorities in the matter of lowering of postal rates for this purpose.

(b) To give serious consideration to allowing Canadian citizens to send to their relatives in large quantities flour and perhaps other imperishable foodstuffs and to allow them also to send clothing.

(c) To make immediate arrangements for personal and direct mail service between Canada and displaced persons camps. Here, again, this has already been done in the United States as from November 23, 1945. The war is over and we owe it to our people at least to allow them to write to their relatives. It is now seven years since most of them have not had a letter from those dear to them. I need hardly emphasize the fact that people, who have gone through war and who have been living in camps for months, are most anxious to locate their relatives and to write to them.

3. The third request is that the Canadian government make proper representations to British and United States governments to rescind the following order:

HQ 30 Corps District
219/DP
29th December, 1945
British Zone

Subject—Ukrainians

To: Mil. Gov. Detachments—(enumeration follows).

1. H.M.G. do not recognize Ukrainian as a nationality, and persons coming from the Ukraine are classed as citizens of the country in which they had their residence on 1st September, 1939. No recognition can be given to any Ukrainian organization or representation as such.

2. All such persons who lived in Soviet territory are compulsorily returned to the U.S.S.R. under the terms of the Yalta agreement as soon as they are proved to be such.

3. Ukrainians of other than Soviet citizenship receive education and welfare facilities in the language appropriate to their citizenship, and for the time being it is impracticable for a variety of reasons to publish books or other literature in Ukrainian.

4. All Ukrainian organizations will be disbanded forthwith, and where they are established outside camps, the representatives will be

brought into camps as normal D.P.'s. All stationery pertaining to these organizations will be confiscated.

5. Continuation of such activities is punishable under articles 26 and/or 34 of ordnance 1.

Brigadier,
Chief of Staff
30 Corps District.

Ref:

.....

Ten days after this order was issued, Prime Minister Attlee made the following statement to the united nations conference, as reported in *The Times,* London, of January 11, 1946:

I am glad that the charter of the united nations does not deal only with governments and states or with politics and war but the simple elemental needs of human beings whatever be their race, their colour, or their creed. In the charter we reaffirm our faith in fundamental human rights. We see the freedom of the individual in the state as an essential complement to the freedom of the state in the world community of nations. We stress, too, that social justice and the best possible standards of life for all are essential factors in promoting and maintaining the peace of the world.

I want to believe, that either the order to which I referred was issued without the knowledge of British and United States governments or they must have been tragically misled. One cannot imagine British or United States governments denying human beings the most elementary human rights of having their own welfare organizations.

4. The fourth and last request which I should like to direct to the Canadian government has to do with immigration. I should like to make an earnest appeal to the government to make provision for admission to Canada of a generous number of close relatives of Canadian citizens.

As hon. members are aware, even the United Kingdom, having suffered devastations on a colossal scale, made provision on November 13, 1945, for admission of close relatives of persons residing in Great Britain and have offered to share their meagre supplies with those who have none.

Then let me draw the attention of hon. members to an item in *Time* magazine, New York, of February 19, 1946, concerning Australia's immigration policy:

Australia has plans for the greatest immigration project in history. It's a drive for an eventual threefold increase in the country's population of 7,000,000. An Australian delegation has been in Europe making a survey to determine how many British, Norwegian, Swedish, Dutch, Swiss, and other emigrants can be attracted to the island continent. To deal successfully with the economic problems posed by such a mass migration, Australia has set the number to be admitted at 70,000 a year for the first few years.

[Mr. Hlynka.]

Let me now turn to the United States immigration policy as announced by President Truman on December 22, 1945:

The war has brought in its wake an appalling dislocation of populations in Europe. Many humanitarian organizations, including the united nations relief and rehabilitation administration, are doing their utmost to solve the multitude of problems arising in connection with this dislocation of hundreds of thousands of persons. Every effort is being made to return the displaced persons and refugees in the various countries of Europe to their former homes. The great difficulties is that so many of these persons have no homes to which they may return. The immensity of the problem of displaced persons and refugees is almost beyond comprehension.

. . . The United States shares the responsibility to relieve the suffering . . . everything possible should be done at once to facilitate the entrance of some of these displaced persons and refugees into the United States.

In this way we may do something to relieve human misery and set an example to the other countries of the world which are able to receive some of these war sufferers. I feel that it is essential that we do this ourselves to show our good faith in requesting other nations to open their doors for this purpose.

. . . I consider that common decency and the fundamental comradeship of all human beings require us to do what lies within our power to see that our established immigration quotas are used in order to reduce human suffering. I am taking the necessary steps to see that this is done as quickly as possible.

. . . This period of unspeakable human distress is not the time for us to close or to narrow our gates.

What is Canada's immigration policy? Here are two paragraphs from a letter from the Department of Immigration in reply to a request to allow three displaced persons to join their relatives in Canada. This letter is dated March 6, 1946.

Literally hundreds of similar applications are being received in the department from residents of Canada who are anxious to assist relatives in distressed circumstances in Europe. Practically all of the proposed immigrants are inadmissible under existing regulations and, after careful review of the whole situation, it has been decided that the entry to Canada at this time of any considerable number of aliens would not be advisable. With the return to civilian life of our servicemen and women, it is considered they are entitled to first priority in the matter of rehabilitation and establishment.

It would not be possible to offer any encouragement on behalf of your relatives above named, when we are obliged to refuse so many applications which present at least equal merit from a sympathetic standpoint. I can only express regret, therefore, at being unable to let you have a favourable reply.

I do not wish it to be understood that I am pressing the government to decide now on the general immigration policy for Canada for the next few years. I am merely appealing to the government to admit a generous number of displaced persons to Canada purely on the basis of humanitarian consideration.

I am glad that there are Canadians who take a sympathetic attitude toward the displaced persons. May I read a few sentences from a letter written by a Canadian officer:

I am a Canadian of British parentage . . . In our displaced persons camp here . . . we have two thousand Ukrainians and in the short time I have had the pleasure of associating with these people I have come to like and admire them greatly. I suppose I need not tell you of the many hardships and privations these folks have undergone in the past few years but I would like to tell you a little of what they are doing and are trying to do now. Our camp is composed completely of Ukrainians and we moved into a rather badly bombed German barracks. I have never seen such industry and ambition shown by a group of people, as these put forward in making the camp not only livable but as near to home as a military barracks can be made to be.

There are two things that prompted me to write this letter. It was part of our work to register all people living in the camp and one of the questions asked on this registration card was the person's choice of a place to settle. Many answered "Canada" and I don't mind admitting I felt very proud that my Canada was so well known among these people . . . A school was opened in the camp and I beg consideration of your sending these people dictionaries. Also considering the great interest shown in Canada any available literature would be more than welcome, especially anything to do with immigration to Canada or plans for it, and also daily newspapers for very news-starved people.

I would like it understood that I am not writing this as an officer but rather as a Canadian who would like to see a good many of these people come to Canada and help it to become the really great nation it is destined to become and for them to know the peace of mind that comes from living in a free country.

I should like to quote, in conclusion, from an article in the Ottawa *Citizen* of March 23, 1946, entitled "Displaced Persons 'Good Citizens' ".

That it would be a sound move on Canada's part to put in a bid for some of the "best" of the displaced persons still in Germany, is the opinion of a deputy director of the displaced persons programme in Germany, William Bagnall.

Mr. Bagnall, who arrived in Ottawa yesterday en route to his home in Calgary, after eight months in Munich with UNRRA, told the press that there were still many displaced persons in Germany.

He believed the solution to the problem of what to do with citizens who had no place to go, or couldn't return to their own land with safety, lay in the hands of the united nations.

Mr. Bagnall said it was up to each country to take its share of this displaced population. He was sure many of these people would like to go to other countries outside Europe, particularly to Canada.

Many of the displaced persons were good citizens, he claimed, who were in their present position through no fault of their own.

If Canada offers a welcome to a number of these homeless people, if she offers them freedom and homes, I am sure they will be forever grateful to the people of Canada and to this land.

Mr. E. B. McKAY (Weyburn): I believe it is my duty at this time to make several observations with reference to problems facing our ex-servicemen and women; but first I wish to congratulate the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Both these veterans have made an able contribution to the debate, and I am glad they were privileged to serve in the capacity for which they were selected. Ex-service personnel throughout the country were signally honoured in the selection of two veterans for this important function. I believe it is also a recognition of the debt this nation owes to men and women who served her so conscientiously during six years of devastating war. However, veterans have never wanted to be a privileged group. They served Canada as a duty in her hour of trial and sacrificed in order that Canadians might pursue their way of life. They have no regrets. The most of them would gladly serve again should Canada ever be in need of their services. But to-day they are facing the problems of the return to civil life. They are entitled to a consideration of their problems. They hope for a square deal; they are anxious to obtain jobs, procure homes and become firmly established in the home community which it was their lot to defend in the greatest war in history.

That they have become accustomed to the economic security of service life has been most apparent. Adjustments to civil life which lack that economic security have not been an easy task. Satisfactory employment at adequate wages has aided that adjustment but that alone is not sufficient. Some employers, fortunately not a great many, take the attitude that the veteran must again prove his worth in order to hold his job. He has already proven his worth to his country once, and the employer should have some regard for his new status. Other employers consider they have performed a patriotic duty by accepting the veteran back in his job. Many forget, however, that he is more mature now than when he enlisted. He is often a changed man, and for him to adjust himself to the quiet life of a routine job after an exciting life in the services is not easy. Every employer should recognize this fact and be prepared to bear with the veteran until such a time as he finds his niche in civil employment. I am certain

that if this is done every veteran will co-operate with his employer and give his best, as he has done before.

I am greatly disturbed by the fact that unemployment exists in the ranks of our returned personnel. Thousands are drawing unemployment insurance; other thousands are in receipt of out-of-work benefits, while many others are dissipating their savings and gratuities in forced idleness.

On the day the veteran received his discharge this government should have implemented its promise to the veteran and to the nation of "jobs for all". Veterans do not want charity. What they desire is employment with adequate wages. Private enterprise now has its chance to prove that there can be full employment under this economic system. Let the veteran have a practical demonstration, without delay, that private enterprise has the ability to provide him with work. Many a veteran is still waiting for the job he was promised while he served on the European front, on the high seas or over the hostile skies of Europe and Asia.

May I at this point draw the attention of the house to the extensive report made by the interdepartmental rehabilitation information committee of Montreal district? This survey of conditions amongst veterans in that area is a good example of what is happening everywhere in the dominion. More than four thousand veterans were interviewed on this occasion. One sixth of them were unemployed, and only one-third of those were drawing out-of-work benefits because, as they expressed it, "they were unwilling to seek charity." Fifty per cent of the veterans examined had serious housing problems, and only four per cent owned their own homes. Of those renting, only half had adequate accommodation. Of those who while in the services had expressed a desire to take vocational courses, about fifty per cent were unable to do so because of difficulties they had encountered on returning to civil life. Many had hoped to utilize service-acquired trades or skills, but few have realized their ambition. Of those employed less than half were found satisfied with the long-term prospects of their jobs.

That is not a very pleasant picture. It is one that should cause grave concern to every hon. member in this chamber.

No one needs to emphasize the fact that housing conditions throughout this country are deplorable. It is small satisfaction to the veteran to be told that people like himself are homeless in Russia and the United Kingdom. This country never suffered the ravages of war. But we are told that Canada has a housing scheme. I am afraid most of that scheme is on paper. The one thing lacking in it, but an essential part of it, is the small cottage or bungalow which it was set up to provide, the small cottage that the veteran so urgently needs to shelter his wife and children. This shortage of homes exists while stocks of materials lie idle in various parts of the country. Business blocks, hotels, factories and even theatres are being constructed while many ex-service men live in single rooms. The export of building materials continues, exports to the United States to provide luxury homes, while men who fought for the Canadian way of life go from house to house seeking shelter for their families.

I insist, Mr. Speaker, that stocks of materials, whether held by government agencies or private concerns, should be immediately released for veterans' housing. We are facing a national emergency, and it must be treated as such until the needs of our own people are met. Numbers of houses located on small holdings under the Veterans Land Act stand uncompleted because of lack of finishing materials. The government should place an embargo on the export of all construction materials, except perhaps for housing in Britain, until the present situation is relieved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a word about land settlement. The settlement of veterans under the Veterans Land Act is anything but successful if figures released by the Department of Veterans Affairs are accurate. Under this act only some 1,800 veterans were actually established on farms in Canada by November 30, 1945, and certainly few would be settled during the winter months. Thousands of young men have been unable to procure farms under the act. Many veterans are becoming disgruntled and are either purchasing land with money borrowed at high rates of interest from private sources, or are seeking other fields of endeavour. Settlement under this act must be accelerated, or another season will slip by with veterans still standing in queues for the privilege of securing the bit of land which it has been their heart's desire to obtain.

The major reason for the slow settlement under the act is the inadequacy of the loan provided by the government for the purchase of farm land. Land prices now throughout the country are considerably inflated. In western Canada the economic farming unit is considered to be a minimum of 320 acres. At the present time it is doubtful if a half-section of land, even without buildings, can be purchased anywhere in the west for $4,800 or even $6,000, which sum may be provided

under the act if no machinery is involved. Even if such land could be purchased at this figure, the veteran then would have the problem of obtaining construction materials for farm buildings.

I suggest that the loan be increased to $10,000, with an additional $3,000 allocated for farm equipment. This amount is not excessive, and would enable the veterans to settle in some of the better farming communities. It is not excessive, when one considers that the estimated cost of training a Royal Canadian Air Force pilot was $25,000. Surely Canada can afford to spend half as much to rehabilitate properly the same young man on his return to the civil occupation of his choice. Loans should be granted to veterans who desire to farm cooperatively. Veterans have been used to cooperating for their common advantage in the fighting services. They are used to comradeship, which the isolated farm unit does not always provide. The trend in farm operations everywhere is toward large, mechanized farm units. This is quite impossible for the beginner owing to the excessive cost of farm equipment, unless veterans are able to combine in a cooperative undertaking.

I question the policy of refusing permits to veterans desiring to settle in southern Saskatchewan on land generally classified by soil tests as sub-marginal. Not all the land in this area is poor. It is now recognized that a large part of that region can be profitably farmed. Much has been done in recent years by way of experimentation and improved farming methods in that area. Thousands of farmers are prospering throughout this district in southern Saskatchewan. During the war millions of tons of foodstuffs were produced there, and tens of millions of dollars were contributed by the farmers of that area to victory loans. Surely farm boys brought up in such localities would have better prospects of success on land with which they are familiar than on timber or bush lands of the north, where it appears to be the present plan to locate them.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. McKAY: Mr. Speaker, I have been discussing the problems confronting veterans. I now wish to discuss briefly the matter of pensions. Many returned servicemen are dissatisfied with the handling of war pensions. A great injustice is caused veterans by the difficulty many have of proving eligibility for a pension. In no case should the onus of proving that a disability is associated with war service be upon the applicant for a war pension. If a member of the armed services was accepted as physically fit it should be assumed that he was fit unless the department of pensions can prove otherwise.

Furthermore, there should be an upward revision of the scale of pensions. A single veteran with 100 per cent disability receives no more than $75 a month, an amount totally inadequate to maintain a decent standard of living at present living costs. Why a private with complete disability should only receive $75 a month while a general requires $300 a month to live is difficult to understand, especially when one compares the service incomes of these individuals.

The government claims to be providing an adequate educational allowance for veterans attending our seats of higher learning. However, the situation of veterans at our universities with regard to maintenance allowances is becoming increasingly acute. As a result of a survey conducted by veterans associations in Saskatchewan, western Ontario and Queen's universities it was revealed that the average expenditure for a single veteran attending courses in these institutions was $90.90 a month. The maintenance grant provided by the government is $60 a month. The single veteran is therefore short $30.90 every month in meeting his normal expenses. The average expenditure for a married veteran was $123.89 a month, with a maintenance allowance from the government of $80 to offset this expenditure. Obviously a student attending a university under this plan must have a considerable amount in personal savings in order to carry on. Even so, few married veterans can continue an educational career with an average deficit of $43.89 every month, although they have some personal savings and gratuities from which to draw, and these veterans are not on the whole extravagant. According to data supplied by "Family income and expenditure in Canada 1937-38," plus the added cost of living as indicated by statistics issued in November, 1944, the average Canadian wage-earner with one child expended $135.43 a month, which is more by $5.22 than a veteran of the same marital status spent while attending the three universities surveyed. It has been suggested that veterans can obtain remunerative employment during the recess between terms and thus bolster their incomes. The probability of employment with fair wages for transient labour is becoming increasingly difficult. The

expenses of a married veteran are fairly constant. He would be fortunate indeed to secure employment which would pay enough to keep him and his family, far less enable him to replenish his depleted savings.

When a student discontinues university training because his savings become exhausted his reestablishment credit will have been dissipated by absorption in educational benefits. Therefore, not only does the student lose his reestablishment credit, but the money provided by the government for his education is lost since the ends desired in the matter of rehabilitation will not have been achieved.

Several veterans associations have suggested that the maintenance grant for a single man be increased to $80 a month, with $100 monthly for married personnel; allowances for children to be arranged at service rates. I suggest to this house that this is the bare minimum and that it would be better still to continue service pay to the veteran while undergoing his training programme and until such time as he is established once again in a satisfactory civilian occupation.

I wish to appeal to the house at this time on behalf of the veterans of the first world war, particularly those who were settled under the old Soldier Settlement Act. Many of these older veterans of another war are still in debt to the treasury of this country. Is it too much to ask that this parliament cancel their indebtedness and grant these men a clear title to the land upon which they have laboured for more than a generation? This nation can well afford to be generous to these people who have contributed so much to this country. If Canada can cancel war debts of the United Kingdom, and veterans generaly commend this action, surely we can afford to cancel the few millions of dollars still outstanding against these early soldier settlers.

The lack of a business loan for veterans has caused real hardship and is one of the weaknesses of the government's rehabilitation programme. I do not believe it is too late yet to rectify this error. There should be provided for veterans business loans similar to those employed in the United States. Veterans setting up small businesses are obliged in many instances to negotiate loans with private companies at excessive rates of interest. This will definitely handicap the prospects of ultimate success of their business enterprise.

Finally, this parliament should give some thought to the plight of the many widows and dependents of men who made the supreme sacrifice. Some assistance should be provided by the government in order that these war victims might be able to provide themselves with homes.

On the way to parliament hill this morning, I was forcibly impressed by an attractive hand-painted sign over the door of a drab little home. A son was apparently about to return from overseas service. Many hon. members have seen such signs of welcome. It reads, "Welcome home, son; we are proud of you." Of course they in that little home were proud of their son. We should all be proud of such boys. But actions speak louder than words. What sort of reception does this lad often receive? He comes home to a dead-end street of unemployment where he has to beg for a job. He searches in vain to obtain shelter for his wife and family. If he is ill he frequently has to argue with the pension commissioners in order to secure an adequate pension for disabilities incurred while serving his country. Let us begin now to put into effect the words accredited during the first world war to Sir Robert Borden, "Our soldiers shall never want after fighting so gallantly." But I am sure our returning sons want action, not idle promises.

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I can only hope that time will justify their optimism. I should like to endorse the speech that was made by my friend, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), who leads this group, and also the speech made by the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Gauthier), which I think was an excellent one. But I did not wait until I reached the House of Commons before making public my ideas on espionage in Canada. I happened to be in Victoria when the news broke, and I wrote a letter to the press which has been published in various papers in this country and which I will now read:

> The existence of a "Communist Spy Ring" should surprise no one. To-day Marxian socialists, internationalists and other totalitarians occupy key positions in government, organized religion and education.
>
> The communist party is an organized concern with unlimited funds, directed by a permanent general staff, many of whom have been trained in Moscow in the arts of moulding the thoughts and actions of the workers.
>
> The communist party holds key positions in most labour unions, has infiltrated all channels of publicity. They have penetrated the teachers' federations, the theatre, all avenues of education, instruction and entertainment. That is true of every democratic country.
>
> The police are exposing not merely a ring of professional spies, but a nation-wide con-

spiracy inspired by Marxian socialists who, for years, have been undermining our Christian and democratic ways of life, thus threatening the sovereign rights and freedoms of Canada.

Only a few weeks ago the Canadian Soviet friendship council (one among the fifth column identified by the police) held mass meetings across Canada which were sponsored by the leaders of church, state and business.

For years columnists and commentators of press and radio, the "Red Network", directed by the "Hidden Hand" of world bolshevism, have been poisoning the minds of Canadians with anti-Christian, anti-democratic propaganda without let or hindrance.

I do not blame the Russian government for carrying on this espionage. I continue to quote:

It is the men entrusted with the safety and welfare of church and state, and not their underlings, who must be held responsible for the existence of "Communist Spy Rings" composed of men and women who have been systematically taught by socialists that Christianity has failed, that patriotism and loyalty are national vices, and treason a virtue.

That, I maintain, is no exaggeration of the situation in Canada to-day.

Nobody has mentioned the fact, the amazing fact to me, that we practically had to apologize before we arrested the enemies of this country. Nobody has remarked on the equally remarkable fact that, so far as we are told, no arrest of spies has been made in the United States and only one, I believe, in the United Kingdom. Are we to suppose that there are no spies in the United States? Or are we to suppose that their police arrest them and that they then disappear without anybody's knowledge? Or are we to suppose that this communist movement has become so powerful that its adherents can defy the police and government authorities? It must be one of these three things, and from what I have read in United States papers the fact is that the control exercised by these people is such that so far they have carried on with impunity.

Criticism has been made, I believe, of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the first place, coupled with the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) also the mounted police or, if you like, the police commissioner. Nobody hates tyranny more than I do, but I think those people who have criticized the steps taken by the Department of Justice and the police have failed to realize the dangers that face us. Surely everybody knows that the honest Canadian need have not the slightest fear of either the Minister of Justice or of the police or of the commissioner. To-day in Canada no honest Canadian need fear the Department of Justice, and might I add that that cuts both ways, that the Minister of Justice and the commissioner of police need fear no honest Canadian.

Let me quote two statements by two of the world's great men. The first is a very short one by his holiness the Pope, from an encyclical by Pope Pius XI on "Atheist Communism". These are his words:

No one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever. Those who permit themselves to be deceived into lending their aid towards the triumph of communism in their own country will be the first to fall victims of their error.

Then we have this statement which was written by Winston Churchill just prior to the war. It is taken I believe from his book, "Great Contemporaries". He says:

Communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign. A communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the communist faith as the doctrine itself. At first the time-honoured principles of liberalism and democracy are invoked to shelter the infant organism. Free speech, the right of public meeting, every form of lawful political agitation and constitutional right are paraded and asserted. Alliance is sought with every popular movement towards the left.

The creation of a mild Liberal or Socialist regime in some period of convulsion is the first milestone. But no sooner has this been created than it is to be overthrown. Woes and scarcity resulting from confusion must be exploited. Collisions, if possible attended with bloodshed, are to be arranged between the agents of the New Government and the working people. Martyrs are to be manufactured. An apologetic attitude in the rulers should be turned to profit. No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-communists. Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin. Then when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions must be extinguished by death. Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterwards broken, liberty but a sentimental folly unworthy of the logician. The absolute rule of a self-chosen priesthood, according to the dogmas it has learnt by rote, is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigation, progressively forever. All this, set out in prosy textbooks, written also in blood in the history of several powerful nations, is the communists' faith and purpose. To be forewarned should be forearmed.

And then, to those who think that the Prime Minister took a liberty or a risk when action was started in this espionage case,

there is quite a pertinent editorial in the *Saturday Evening Post*. It is headed, "Is it immoral to trip up a spy?"

> When the Canadians could no longer keep the well-known secret that Soviet agents had long been operating on this hemisphere, former ambassador Joe Davies rushed up to declare that Stalin had a "moral right" to spy upon America because America has the atom-bomb secret and Russia, so far as is known, hasn't... One could point out that Joe Davies, who endorsed Stalin's murders of thousands of Russians without trial, is an odd man to mention morals in this connection, particularly as it seems not to have occurred to him that, if Russia has a moral right to steal our secrets, we have a moral right to prevent her from stealing them. Furthermore, officials in this or the Canadian government have a moral duty to protect the interests and security of their country, and not use government time to think up excuses for other nations' spies.

The mention of Mr. Davies and the Moscow trials reminds me of a statement which I put on *Hansard* a few years ago. In July, 1943, I called attention to a letter which had been recently published in the New York *Times* dealing with a motion picture called "Mission to Moscow". I quoted a letter which was signed by Mr. John Dewey and Suzanne LaFollette, who were the chairman and secretary of an international commission that went to examine into the Moscow trials. In the light of what has happened since, this letter is certainly prophetic. I will read only the first and last paragraphs:

> The film "Mission to Moscow" is the first instance in our country of totalitarian propaganda for mass consumption—propaganda which falsifies history through distortion, omission or pure invention of facts, and whose effect can only be to confuse the public in its thought and its loyalty. . . . The film is anti-British, anti-congress, anti-democratic and anti-truth. It deepens that crisis in morals which is the fundamental issue in the modern world. . . . "Mission to Moscow" is a major defeat for the democratic cause. In putting out this picture the producers, far from rendering the patriotic service on which Mr. Davies compliments them, have assailed the very foundations of freedom. For truth and freedom are indivisible, as Hitler knew when he expounded his method of confusing public opinion through propaganda. The picture "Mission to Moscow" makes skilful use of the Hitler technique. To quote Matthew Low of the *New Leader*, "This kind of 'truth' is on the march, and God help us if nothing can stop it."

Mention has been made, I believe by the Prime Minister, quoting the judges who are investigating the activities of these alleged spies, that the accused excuse themselves for their spying on the ground that their loyalties are not inside this country, their loyalties are outside; and I say that the reason for that is very largely the propaganda which has been put over by every possible means for the past many years to confuse the people in their loyalties. I have repeatedly in this house protested against it. I can only say that I got very little support either inside or outside the house; in fact I might say that there has been great deal more sympathy shown to the spies than to those who have tried to enlighten public opinion on this dangerous situation. Three years ago this next week I called attention to a statement which was made by a well-known editor in this country, Mr. Sandwell. He said—at least he is reported to have said—at a meeting of the league of nations society in this very building, though not in this chamber:

> A supranational authority with power to settle questions of immigration, natural resources, treatment of minorities, repudiation of debts, finance, etc. To bring about Canada's acceptance of the new "authority" it would be necessary to bring all the people to a diminution of their loyalty to the crown by substituting a new loyalty to an authority wider than Canada, than the British commonwealth of nations, or all the democracies together.

When I called attention to this in this chamber and asked if that were not treason, I was greeted with either ridicule or jeers from one end of Canada to the other. I say that these few spies who have been caught in the net are not the danger; it is not these few men, misguided as they are, who constitute our danger; the danger is that these opinions are shared by, I should not like to say how many, but altogether too many Canadians in this country. Their loyalty is no longer to Canada but to something outside the country, something outside the British empire, outside democracy. It is the direct result of a lying propaganda which has been used in every possible way to confuse the loyalties and the thoughts of the Canadian people.

Now a few words about the idea of a world government, of which we have heard so much in the past few years. Both Lenin and Stalin have declared that "the prolonged existence of the Soviet republic side by side with the imperialist states is unthinkable and in the end either one or the other will be victorious, and until this happens a series of terrible conflicts between the Soviet republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable." What is the result? What has been the big idea, these past many years, if it is not the dissolution of the British empire—because there are three great powers in the world to-day. There is the British empire; there is the United States of America, and there is the U.S.S.R. How, then, is it possible or conceivable that a world government can be made up of these two contrasting ideologies? Has anyone ever read a statement by Premier Stalin or any

other Russian indicating that they have any intention of surrendering one atom of their sovereignty to any world government? No. All the surrendering has been done by the others. There has been appeasement, and the idea has been to drive a wedge between different members of the British empire, destroy their strength, and then drive a wedge between them and the United States. Thus there would be only two to decide the issue.

That cuts both ways. Can one wonder that Premier Stalin and the Russians are suspicious of the rest of the world, the bourgeois states, as he calls them, or the imperialist states? Imperialism is of course another word for anti-communism. Can one wonder that they are suspicious when we are doing all we can to spread the idea of one world government? They know very well that government will never be theirs; that is, if we can prevent it. It will never be from Moscow, and is it not only natural therefore that they should think that before there can be a world government the power of Moscow will have to be eliminated? Do we not fear exactly the same thing? Is not that what it has come to? What else was the reason for Churchill's speech at Fulton? I heard the speech; Mr. Churchill was speaking beyond the shadow of a doubt, if not with the approval of the government of Great Britain, with that of the majority of the people in the old country; and beyond question he spoke with the full approval of the President of the United States.

If you sum that all up in one sentence you can say that Churchill made this statement: If we do not hang together we shall hang separately. That is where the idea of a one world government has brought us, to the verge of a third world war. That is the position we are in to-day. Had we kept to the Atlantic charter and guaranteed all countries their sovereign freedom, then no country would be afraid of any other. But that was where the tragic mistake was made. What happened when the President of the United States and Mr. Churchill stepped off their battleship? Why was that charter torn up? Who tore it up? That is something we have never been told.

One thing is certain, that no people in the world to-day wants war. The British people do not want it; the American people do not want it; the Russian people do not want it and never did want it. We have had two wars. Why are we faced with a third? Because there are people who are determined upon world power, and in order to get it there will be another war and another after that until there is only one power left on earth. That is what we face.

I would not for a moment accuse anyone—I would not name anyone—of deliberately helping that along. I am quite willing to believe that the majority of the world's people have been frightened into the conviction, by these horrible stories of atomic bombs and so forth, that they have been put into a frame of mind where they are willing to surrender everything they have, including their liberties, in order to prevent another war. But that will not prevent it. There are people, whose names perhaps will come to light, who are and have been for a long time deliberately plotting and planning just that thing.

I said that the big idea has been to eliminate the British empire, using, as an excuse Greece or Palestine or India or some other place. Always the socialist is against British action and British control. I remember a year ago last Christmas when Britain was having trouble to keep order in Greece. I was, I believe, the only member of this house who publicly made a statement endorsing the British action. For that I was abused more than these spies have been abused. I was the subject of an abusive editorial in the *Citizen*, for instance, because I said that very thing.

The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation at their national convention a year ago last Christmas or thereabouts issued a statement, which was published in the press, that they condemned British action in Greece, saying that Canadians were not dying to restore discredited governments or reactionary monarchs. When the representative of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation was over in London at the united nations organization conference he had the great pleasure of hearing Mr. Bevin call Mr. Vishinsky "a damn liar" for using those very words.

Mr. COLDWELL: Oh no.

Mr. JAQUES: Yes, he did.

Mr. COLDWELL: Quite different.

Mr. JAQUES: Exactly the same.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Bevin did not say he would restore discredited monarchs or discredited governments; quite a different thing.

Mr. JAQUES: I shall not mention Palestine because I intend to make some further remarks on that country later on. Then we have the Argentine. At the peace conference in San Francisco the admission of the Argentine was opposed by I do not know how many people, but I know it was opposed by the leader of the C.C.F. party.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. JAQUES: I will tell you why, because the Argentine is not a communist government. That is the real reason.

An hon. MEMBER: Fascists.

Mr. JAQUES: We now have the proof of what I say. They have had a perfectly democratic election without bloodshed. It was in perfect order and they have elected the government they wanted. That is their business, not ours, may I say, unless we want to bring about another war. So it is with Spain. I hold no brief for Spain, but I believe that the Spanish people are perfectly capable of running their own affairs. Whatever one may say about Spain or the Spanish people, they never interfered with us during the late war. I know I have heard them accused—

Mr. COLDWELL: They tried to.

Mr. JAQUES: I have heard them accused of certain things, but when you consider the position in which the Spanish government found themselves when only the British empire stood against the might of Germany and all Europe was overrun by Hitler, do you think it was any great sin, for the Spanish government to play along with Hitler to the extent that they did in order to preserve their own people?

An hon. MEMBER: Certainly.

Mr. JAQUES: They did not do anything to us.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. JAQUES: Where was the C.C.F. when Britain stood alone against the might of Germany? What did the C.C.F. say? "Not a man overseas".

Mr. PROBE: At that time members of the C.C.F. were in the armed forces.

Mr. BENTLEY: Our boys were over there.

Mr. JAQUES: "Not a man overseas"; not before Russia came into it.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is a lie.

Mr. JAQUES: It is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must call the attention of hon. members to standing order 34, which reads as follows:

> Every member desiring to speak is to rise in his place, uncovered, and address himself to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JAQUES: I heard the B.B.C. broadcast last night. I hope what they said is not true, and coming from the B.B.C. it may very well not be true. When I was over in England two years ago I heard that the B.B.C. was a sort of code name for Beelzebub's Brethren Calling.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is what Hitler said.

Mr. JAQUES: Well, he was not far out. However, I was going to say a word on behalf of General Mihailovich, who, I am sorry to say, has been captured. I know the stories that have been told; I know the other side, too. Let me quote a statement of the British ambassador to Yugoslavia, which is good enough for me. What did he say?

> All the accusations of the partisans that Mihailovich is a fascist, collaborating with the occupational forces, are completely unfounded, and spring entirely from the efforts of the partisans to blacken Mihailovich among the Serbian population, and frustrate him when the moment comes to seize power in the country. General Mihailovich from the beginning of the struggle has loyally collaborated with the allies and no one can doubt his loyalty as an ally or as the representative in the country of the Yugoslav government.

That is the statement of the British ambassador with regard to General Mihailovich. If he has been captured I suppose he has not long to live and I should like to pay that tribute to a gallant and honourable man.

Before I resume my seat I should like to make an appeal if I may. An appeal has been made on behalf of Canadian unity. I should like to appeal to French and English, Catholic and Protestant, to unite in their loyalty to the truth. Let us be true to ourselves and we can be false to no man. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Mr. L. W. SKEY (Trinity): May I commence my contribution to this debate by offering my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I must say I was surprised at some of the praise they had for the government, but perhaps that is understandable. I was also particularly interested in one reference which the mover of the motion made to the four freedoms of the Atlantic charter, and I should like to refer to it later on in this debate.

Turning to the business of the government, after listening to the speech from the throne I was reminded of my one and only meeting with Sir Robert Borden, that illustrious Canadian whose record is written in the annals of this house. It was on an occasion when Sir Robert was exchanging some money. He had reason to complain of the rate of exchange which he was receiving, just as to-day we may have reason to complain about the rate of

exchange we receive when we purchase United States dollars. Sir Robert Borden said, "Well, what can I do? A corporation has no body to be kicked and no soul to be damned." After listening to the reply of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he dealt with the speech by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and when he defended the failures of the government's policies, I would venture to suggest that we can now say that "the government has no body to be kicked and no soul to be damned." I say this chiefly because of the inadequacy of the replies that have been made up to the present time. Those who were present when the leader of the opposition spoke will remember that he challenged the government on several issues. So far, the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) have replied; but this house and the country still have to hear from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) and the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen) on major policies which may be proposed by this government.

When the Prime Minister replied to the remarks of the leader of the opposition it struck me, as a young member of this house, that it was hardly right for him to say he had expected one big blast. Personally I would say he was not disappointed; but he went on to ask the leader of the opposition to confine himself to one topic, though when challenged on that subject he admitted that the leader of the opposition had a right in this debate, to discuss anything at all of interest in the country. I must say, too, that I felt it was rather inadequate for him to say, "Well, all you may say is true, but still Canada is better off than any other nation." I felt that it was a negative approach. When there was so much more that could be done I felt it would have been better had he said "We are glad to have your suggestions," or " We can do more."

Turning first to the Department of Labour, that department which is so much in the public eye in the United States of America and which hangs in some ways like the sword of Damocles over our fate in Canada in regard to reconversion, I should like to point out again to this house just what has been proposed. We suggested that a dominion-provincial labour conference be called at the earliest possible moment. The leader of the opposition drew a distinction between a labour conference to clear up a legislative difficulty created by the British North America Act and a conference such as that dealing with the taxation problems which are under discussion at the present time. He pointed out the necessity of having such a conference, the necessity of the federal government giving the provincial governments some lead in their own labour legislation so that the Provinces will be better able to deal with the problems now confronting them. He called for the relaxation of wage controls on the lower wage groups because, as every hon. member knows, the lowering of the wages of the working men, while prices have remained the same or tended on the whole to be inflated, has created a hardship and has actually lowered their standard of living. I am sure the working man would prefer to see a slight inflation in prices, a slight rise in the cost of living, and have the ceiling taken off his wages in order that he might get a better return for his efforts.

Then I come to immigration. The leader of the opposition called attention to a report No. F-4, called, "The Future Population of Canada", by one of the government's own agencies, and traced for us the growth in Canada's population as this report sees it, showing that by the year 2,000 Canada will have reached the magnificent total of some fifteen million and that thenceforth her population will decline. I would recall to the house the remark of the leader of the opposition in that connection: "I do not believe that Canada's future is limited by any such narrow horizon." Neither do I believe we are limited by an such narrow horizon, especially when I read in the *Letter-Review* of March 25:

> Emigration from Britain to Australia is being actively encouraged by the United Kingdom and Australian governments. There will be free passages for all service men and merchant navy personnel, assisted passages for others approved. Migrants will be given rights under social security plans, but will not receive service preference for employment for seven years. No limit is set on the number to move during the next two years.

The same review points out:

> Canada, meanwhile, has no immigration policy, and lack of a policy means exclusion.

This is only one class of immigration. What of the others? What of those Canadian girls who are engaged to men of the allied armed services, those men now prohibited from coming to Canada because of our immigration laws? What of the families of Canadian citizens who cannot leave Europe to seek the protection of their own people here, their own Canadian blood relatives who will guarantee to support them? This country needs an immigration policy, and the sooner

we have one the better. We have had no reply from the Minister of Mines and Resources or from the Minister of Labour on either of these points.

One other question remains unanswered. If I recall correctly, the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) has failed to say how persons of doubtful loyalty were selected for positions of trust in the civil service and in the armed forces.

Turning from these criticisms for a moment, I should like to point out that when the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) spoke in this debate he proposed policies for agriculture, for reconversion, for full production to relieve unemployment; he seemed to me to agree with the policy we suggested in regard to the loan for Britain, on the handling of the espionage case and the cases of the civil servants who are now being held. For perhaps the first time in the history of this house the hon. gentleman agreed with the majority of the policies set forth by the leader of the opposition; and as a new member I must say I was glad to see that for once the official opposition had to bear blows from only one side, where previously we have withstood attacks from our left and from our right. This time there seems to be some measure of agreement, which I think is an indication to the government that the united opinion on this side of the house calls for more positive action to adopt the suggested policies. So I hope they will do something about the major recommendations that have been made. Our only difference with our friends to the left was on the subject of controls, and I have something I should like to say on that matter to-night. The leader of the opposition has analysed the causes of inflation. He has stated them briefly to be increased savings and shortages of goods. I think most of us will agree that these are fundamental causes. He has recommended as a relief from inflation the removal of price controls as rapidly as possible, the removal of these controls which were useful to us in war time in channeling our production effort toward the services and goods needed for the armed forces and for the prosecution of the war, but some of which in peace time operate against the laws of production. Therefore the best method of encouraging production, as well as relieving unemployment, is full-out production. We must be relieved of these controls as rapidly as it is economically possible to abolish them. As another example of the necessity of reducing controls as quickly as possible I should like to quote from a pamphlet which is issued as a reprint from the March issue of the *Board of Trade Journal*. I shall quote just one or two items, the first being:

Canada's urgent need to-day is to cut out controls and promote production.

Canada must choose—and should choose soon—in order to establish the standard of living she wants. We have two choices:

1—Large production and full employment; or

2.—Small output, and unemployment, due to price ceilings and wages control.

That is published as the opinion of an executive of the board of trade, a member of an industrial commission and the president of one of the largest corporations in Canada. It is men like him who should know. Another extract reads:

Unless present costs including somewhat higher wages are covered by new sale prices the result will be smaller and smaller "take-home" pay for our workers which no "rate increase" can recover.

Finally it says:

Business and private employers always provide the lion's share of employment and even in the period when governments were doing their greatest spending for relief and public works, wages provided by private employers were many times those paid out by governments. Yet, to-day present policies practically prevent industry from proceeding freely with enterprise and production which will solve unemployment problems.

Full production with its accompanying maximum employment is Canada's primary need to-day, and involves freedom from controls and a complete and immediate return to peace-time business.

It is high time that the war-time mentality of our authorities was obliterated and that the control of prices and wages was lifted.

I turn for a moment to reconstruction and housing, two pressing problems which face this country. The leader of the opposition has criticized the fact that veterans and the wage-earning groups are suffering the most from the housing shortage. He has proposed a remedy, a remedy which the government has tried in part to meet. These are the things he has recommended: coordination of government agencies; government cooperation with provincial and municipal authorities; government cooperation with private builders, and the relaxation of those controls which are holding up the production of the necessary fixtures.

The Minister of Reconstruction told us that during 1945 that a total of 44,000 houses were built in Canada, but he could not say what proportion of those had been built by the government. I am not aware of any government housing objectives for 1946, but we have some indication of the limitations of any government programme if it should be announced. We have reliable reports from the industry itself that 35,000 houses will be the

maximum which can be built, and that, with the supply of fixtures being what it is, we shall be lucky to get 25,000. What we need is anywhere from 70,000 to 100,000 houses in this first year. We need the boldest action that the government can take on this most urgent problem.

It is the duty of the government within the shortest possible space of time to outline their programme and to call in the other cooperating authorities and put the strength of this nation behind the solving of the housing crisis. The Minister of Reconstruction when he answered the leader of the opposition made several references to reconversion, but he could not reply fully to one thing the leader of the opposition said. The leader of the opposition pointed out that in May, 1945, the Minister of Reconstruction had said that reconversion was fifty per cent finished in Canada. Nine months later this same minister said that Canada's reconversion job was fifty per cent done. What did the Minister of Reconstruction say in his reply? In one part of his speech he said:

> For a time I was pleased with the rate of expansion. To-day I am rather alarmed by it. It seems to me that the expansion is coming too rapidly.

Unless this country can have more positive action on the problem of housing and reconversion I suggest that the minister's three statements make strange reading.

I should like to turn now for a moment to the question of exports and the policy outlined by the Minister of Reconstruction. I am no expert in this field, but I think one thing we should keep in mind in Canada is that we should not commit the economy of this country to a policy which will make it increasingly economically vulnerable to tariff barriers and economic nationalism as practised by other countries. I mention this because I feel that in many ways the government must be aware of it. There is an article which appeared on page 29 of *Time* of January 28, 1946, which shows that other countries in this hemisphere are aware of the advantages of economic nationalism as have been demonstrated by the high tariff barriers of the United States and by the extremely efficient economy of the nazi state prior to the war. Here is what *Time* says in reporting on Latin American and South American actions:

> Most important of all, the republics set to work to make what they could no longer import. Argentines shipped fewer hides, turned them into finished leather goods themselves. Chilians proudly looked for the label "Fabricacion Chilena" on their tires, even though the rubber and cotton material still had to be shipped in. In Brazil's San Paulo alone, 300 new firms grew up during one year, to make such further import stand-bys as cotton and wool yarns, rayon, rails, leather goods, cellophane, ceramic and chemical products.
>
> What the advocates of economic nationalism had accomplished was not a patch on what they planned. "The Latin Americans," said the commerce department's George Wythe, author of the current and authoritative "Industry in Latin America," "have gone hog-wild for industrialization."
>
> Almost every country had its blueprint. One of the best was Fomento's (Chilean government planning and financing corporation), sparked by vigorous Oscar Gajardo. Fomento had already spent $110,000,000; expected to put $140,000,000 more into economic landscaping this year. Its comprehensive plan reaches from steel to oil, from cattle to fish canning.

All I wish to do is to call the attention of the government to the tendency toward economic nationalism which is evident in the Americas, and which has been practised in Europe, and to point out its dangers to us unless we so guide the economy of this country that we do not become economically vulnerable to countries which can close out our products at will.

I turn now to the speech from the throne. The mover (Mr. Viau) of the motion mentioned the Atlantic charter and the four freedoms. Just to refresh the memories of hon. members, may I say that the four freedoms are freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of speech and freedom of worship. The mover is a returned soldier, and as a returned airman I wish to second his remarks in bringing us back to fundamentals and his insistance that we keep our eye on the ball in what we are trying to do here. Another good soldier spoke on these fundamentals this month, the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, former prime minister of Great Britain. When he spoke at Fulton, Missouri, on March 5 last he showed that he, too, had his eye on the ball and kept in mind the fundamental course which this house should follow. He spoke of the necessity to prevent war and tyranny, poverty and privation and of our need to preserve freedom of speech and freedom of thought. But he is not the only one who has spoken on the same subject. *Time* Magazine of February 25 last says at page 43, when it reports a clerical opinion; that:

> "Injustice, poverty, disease, and squalor are increasing and spreading. Cruelty is becoming normal, and sadism is as virulent and as contagious to the mind as typhus is to the body. . . .
>
> "Formerly, statesmen tried for balance of power to keep peace among nations; now some statesmen have swung to the theory that monopolies of power may be solutions to world peace. . . . It would certainly be a mighty advance if human beings could regard other human beings, not as pawns in a game, but as individuals with sacred rights to life and liberty."

Only democracy seems to offer this hope to mankind at large, the opportunity to regain their Christian concept of human dignity and worth.

The thing that challenges us here and challenges men in all governments and in all parliaments of the world is how to proceed to bring about better conditions which will offer greater hope to the peoples of this world. I would suggest that the answer is to be found in Mr. Churchill's speech on March 5 at Fulton. But first let me go back in years and call attention to the history of the British navy, a navy which helped to keep peace in the world during the century prior to 1914. It was its dominance of the sea lanes and the fact that both Britain and America sought trade, and not war. They were keeping the sea lanes open for commerce. Had Great Britain or the United States been aggressive, warlike nations, their two navies during the past century undoubtedly would have clashed, but they were both dominated by the same thought, that by keeping the sea lanes open for commerce they would produce a better livelihood for all and would raise the standard of living of all the peoples of the world. We can bring the same idea down to our own communities by showing the necessity for law enforcement. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that but for law enforcement we would to-day be barricading our homes or building walls around our industry. We might be unable to trade at all. Mr. Churchill showed a solution when he said:

> I have, however, a definite and practical proposal to make for action. Courts and magistrates cannot function without sheriffs and constables. The united nations organization must immediately begin to be equipped with an international armed force. In such a matter we can only go step by step; but we must begin now. I propose that each of the powers and states should be invited to dedicate a certain number of air squadrons to the service of the world organization. These squadrons would be trained and prepared in their own countries but would move around in rotation from one country to another. They would wear the uniform of their own countries with different badges. They would not be required to act against their own nation but in other respects they would be directed by the world organization. This might be started on a modest scale and grow as confidence grew. I wished to see this done after the first world war and trust it may be done forthwith.

As an airman I have flown over a good part of this world and I have a realization of how small it is. Mr. Willkie has given us a lead as to the size of the world to-day when he said:

> Continents and oceans are plainly only parts of a whole, seen, as I have seen them, from the air. England and America are parts. Russia and China, Egypt, Syria and Turkey, Iraq and Iran are also parts. And it is inescapable that there can be no peace for any part of the world unless the foundations of peace are made secure throughout all parts of the world.

With all the force that I have I endorse the suggestion that Mr. Churchill made that we should start law enforcement throughout the world to-day, on a small scale, not so large that any country could say it was an aggressive force. But let us have the beginning, the nucleus, just as the British navy had its beginning in policing the world and played such a part in keeping the peace and expanding the trade of all nations.

I conclude by quoting again from Mr. Churchill:

> Our supreme task and duty is to guard the homes of the common people from the horrors of another war.

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my remarks are going to be short this evening. Last session in my first speech I made the remark that coming here as a newcomer and an industrial worker this institution had for me an air of unreality, and that it was operating in a vacuum. I did not know at the time whether I had made a mistake or not in so describing it, but the more I have seen of it the more I realize that my first impression was right. We dealt on an international plane with such things as atomic energy—a beautiful phrase—it was to be used for the benefit of all mankind, but since that date we have had to arrest some of our leading scientists who have been dealing with atomic energy.

In the United States a great many scientists are quitting in disgust because all the research is going into the bomb, not into peace-time uses for atomic energy. More and more the state is interfering with and hindering the development of science. We are rapidly moving into the conditions of which we accused the nazis. At one time Great Britain and Canada were so sure of themselves that they could allow all the world to come in and witness what they are doing. We knew that our modern technology could keep us far ahead of the other fellow. But now there is a different set of conditions; we are frightened of the things we are creating. One thing I notice—and we can disregard the political set-up for the moment—atomic energy developed in Russia will not upset any capital structure, but atomic energy developed in this country is apt to upset too many people's apple-carts, and they want to keep it down. I am not so much interested in the political set-up or the words of men; I am interested in the development of science and what occurs in human society as that development con-

tinues. In the United States scientists are afraid that we are heading toward a military dictatorship.

We also joined in the Bretton Woods agreement. Since that time Russia has had to go her own way and has been making bilateral agreements with all the border states. It is what is called the barter system of trading; bookkeeping is all that takes place; the great god gold does not interfere; there is no necessity of three per cent interest, for everything is settled with goods. Great Britain also signed the Bretton Woods agreement; but since then, through sheer necessity, she has been forced to enter into the same trading arrangements as Russia did, namely, to set up bilateral trade agreements throughout Europe on the bloc basis. Lord Keynes said when he was in New York that if Britain did not get the loan they would have to adopt the bloc system. In spite of the Bretton Woods agreement they still have to use it. It is a method which will yet be developed more widely on the international scale; we are not going to be tied to this great thing called gold. Mutual Aid is a system which worked perfectly well during the war in the form of lend-lease, and we shall have to return to it and do away with interest rates. I say, therefore, that in spite of the acts of men, in spite of our attempts to put humpty-dumpty back on the wall, the development of natural laws forces men in certain directions whether they like it or not.

When we were previously assembled in this house we dealt with certain internal problems of Canada. For example, we discussed veterans houses. We spent days arguing about it. The government hedged this way and that; "oh, it was a difficult problem; we were short of lumber; we were short of soil pipe", and everything else. The mayor of Vancouver went back and forth across the dominion; the dominion government sent wires back and forth about using the hotel Vancouver; it was owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway company, and these men, they thought, wanted to destroy it. There was that great god, private property. Then all of a sudden the ex-servicemen marched into the building and occupied it, and we had to recognize the act. After spending days here wasting our time, these men solved the question in a few minutes.

We also spent days in arguing the discharge system, how we should allot discharge points to the men overseas, and so on. The air force went on a sit-down strike, and according to *Maclean's* magazine it was this act which made the government come out with the discharge policy—not any act which was performed here, but the simple act of the men sitting down. It gives me great pride that I belonged to the air force and that I was a Joe.

Mr. MITCHELL: Was my hon. friend overseas in the air force?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I was in this country, and do not start casting aspersions because I stayed in this country.

In human society forces adjust themselves. If governing bodies do not administer laws in the interest of mankind, social forces adjust themselves just as forces do in nature. When a volcano has to blow, it blows, to relieve the pressure and adjust the equilibrium. That is what happens in human society. I have heard it stated on numberless occasions in this house that we must have laws, that we should respect them, and all that sort of thing, and lawyers here spend hours of time in expressing that point of view. Yet when a government cannot be respected because it is not administering the laws in the interest of the people, the only method open to the workers of this country is direct action. That is what it comes to, without plotting or planning just spontaneously; so do not start looking for red herrings under bushes.

I should like to deal for a moment with this spy scare. It is a very opportune thing for the government that it came at this time, because of the weakness of the speech from the throne; the resultant publicity has hidden the real issue, which is the speech itself. I look on this spy scare with a rather jaundiced look, I will frankly admit. The labour movement has had so many things happen to it; for instance, the Zinoviev letter in Britain, shortly after the first war, which put the Conservatives in power and threw labour out because they were supposed to be hooked up with a red bogey. In this country, in 1940, in Saskatchewan a man by the name of Mr. Schneider was in a concentration camp because he had sympathies with the nazis. Of course, when the federal elections came on and he was needed in the election he was released during the election to help the Liberal party, and then he went back into the concentration camp again. We also had communists running around this country sabotaging the war effort: some were thrown into gaol and some hid themselves. However, when it became politically opportune for them to come out and split the labour vote, out they came under a new name, the L.P.P., and they were legal then. Just change your name and you are legal. They served their purpose. I would say to the government, I only hope that when you release the members of this political party once again, if they do go to gaol, you do it with a little more finesse

next time. This is the kind of thing that goes on in the name of law and order; how can one respect them or reconcile such acts with the ethics by which we are supposed to be guided? I listen to fine phrases expressed in this house, but I know that when an election comes on I have to have a hatchet up my back, or I am going to "get it." The duality of the thing is what gets me; you use fine phrases here, but when an election comes you will use any weapon you can lay your hands on.

I should like to speak for a moment on the economic problems facing this country. I come from a frontier area, Skeena. Twenty-five or fifty years ago a Liberal regime would have had railroads going in there; townsites would have been laid out, land booms going on, and developments of all kinds. I should like to know what has happened to the Liberals. They have grown old. Where are the Jim Hills and the Sir Henry Thorntons? They are not with us any more. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) came to Prince Rupert years ago and he could see hotels and drydocks and shops and everything else. Well, there is a big wheat elevator there; it was built before an election, and it is empty. There is a great big drydock there, run by the Canadian National Railways, and it is empty. I have been trying since last September to get a statement from the government on that situation. Good workers have been fired, scattered all over the country, forced into the cities where unemployment is acute. Also in Prince Rupert we have plenty of houses and skilled workers but no policy. The drydock is there; the men are there and the tools are there to do the job. Had the work been done, it would have relieved the housing shortage to the south and at the same time it would have built up something for the country. The poor C.N.R! I sometimes think it is like the Missouri mule, without pride of ancestry or hope of posterity.

When you approach the government they tell you to go to the C.N.R., and when you go to the C.N.R. they tell you to go to the government. I know what is behind it. That institution exists simply as a butt for the C.P.R., so that we can spend our time criticizing the C.N.R. I post a letter in Jasper to Vancouver. The letter is taken off in Kamloops, held up a couple of hours and put on the C.P.R. That is what you call efficiency under the economy of our railway system. The same thing applies to the whole north country.

We have a railway problem across the north from Winnipeg right into the Peace River. When I was young and in my prime I went and filed on a homestead in Fort St. John. Thank goodness, I had enough sense to come out or I would still have been up there and I would have been in very poor shape. Those poor people went there and lived in sod huts in the middle of a side hill or in log shanties, through the cracks of which they could look at the scenery in all directions. They put up with that condition, half frozen, believing, as had been promised, that a railway would be built to the coast. They spent a lifetime hacking out brush and there are now hundreds of homesteads completely deserted. The life work of men and women, as well as human lives, has been sacrificed, just because of an empty political promise. That is all it meant to governments, but human lives were at stake. Some day the government will have to measure up to its responsibility.

From Prince George to Prince Rupert we have what is known as the Skeena highway. Election after election you would see men with a few picks and axes up there chopping another ten yards and then they would drop it. All of a sudden Japan entered the war and started coming down the Aleutian chain, and then the government put in steam shovels, pouring in the material, with the result that the highway went through. Thank goodness, the war lasted long enough to serve that purpose. Since that time the road has been completely plugged with snow so that nobody can use it. Between Havelton and Terrace there is a stretch of twenty miles forming a C.N.R. right of way. What happens? The dominion government picks up the whole problem in connection with the highway and hands it over to the province, saying, "There it is". Well, people cannot use that stretch because it is a C.N.R. right of way. You cannot drive trucks over it. The result is that the provincial authorities throw it back to the federal government while we are sitting in the middle looking at it.

It is absolutely useless under the present set-up. This work was done as a result of the necessities of war, and it could be used, because the people need it and would like to enjoy the benefits of it. But they cannot. It is a pity there are not more of us up there. Then we could drive trucks through, and the government would see something such as happened in connection with the ex-servicemen in Vancouver. Unfortunately, there are not enough of us and I have to make an appeal here.

To-day transportation is the whole keynote of development in the west. You talk about food going to Europe. There are millions of acres there which could be settled; but two or three years from now we might have a glut on the market and prices would fall, and my

hon. friends do not like that. Again, if we went into that development it might result in too much money being put into circulation and the banks would not like it. It is a tragic situation, and it seems that the human element is of no consequence.

There is something else to be considered. The government is spending more on larger navies, armies and so on, in a day of atomic warfare, buzz bombs and all the rest of it, but not enough attention is being paid to the economic side of it. We all know that we won this war because of our productive effort; we won the war because we smashed the productive effort of the enemy. Without decentralizing industry, in a period such as this—if the government believes in preparedness, as seemingly it does—we are building up a larger army, navy and air force, which is like hanging a voodoo sign outside a shack, and expecting that robbers will not enter, because buzz bombs can smash us overnight. And where would the armies be without supplies? This is national suicide. It is criminal negligence.

Not only for social use but to develop the natural resources of the north, we should run a highway from Atlin down behind the panhandle of Alaska to cover the ground-hog coal fields, where there is as good coal as can be obtained in Pennsylvania; also plenty of hydro-electric power. We want to see these things done, and I would urge the government to make the necessary effort so that we may have real freedom and social justice in this country.

Mr. PAUL EDMOND GAGNON (Chicoutimi) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau), who had the honour to move the address in reply to the speech from the throne, performed his task most creditably, and I take pleasure in congratulating him. I must also commend the seconder, the worthy representative of the constituency of Queens-Lunenberg (Mr. Winters) whose speech contained all the customary encomiums for the government.

The matter which now transcends all others, although it has but a relative importance and should not make parliament forget the numerous problems for which we are in duty bound to find a solution and with which it behooves us to deal at once, is the espionage matter.

The right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) on whom lies responsibility for the inquiry in that matter, deserves high commendation for the course of action he has taken. I find it difficult to understand that anyone should oppose the procedure followed in that matter, which involves a clash between spies, traitors and communists on the one hand, and the authorities on the other hand, and that such an outcry should be raised against the action of the department of Justice. Because Russians, Doukhobors and Jews are involved, we hear protests against dictatorship and totalitarianism; because people in the pay of the foulest dictatorship are implicated, gentleness and kind attentions are requested for them. As was said on Friday last by the honourable member for Labelle (Mr. Lalonde) if Canadians had been caught in the act of doing espionage work in Russia for the benefit of Canada, a firing squad would have liquidated them at once.

I feel that the Criminal Code is not stringent enough for that kind of offence, as it does not provide for a penalty sufficiently severe for the people guilty of such a felony. They should be sentenced to life imprisonment. With that thought in mind, I ask the Minister of Justice to remain firm and pitiless in his dealings with traitors. Let him be sure of the support of all citizens who, disregarding party politics and bitterness, want, once for all, to behead the communistic monster. Besides, as was recalled this afternoon by the honourable member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), much severity was shown in the past, when at the beginning of the war the decision was taken to intern Camillien Houde, mayor of Montreal and member of the provincial legislature. They did not make that much noise nor did they go to so much trouble to secure for him a fair and just trial. A French-Canadian dared tell the truth and denounce hypocrisy and blackmail, how sacrilegious! He was promptly put behind bars and denied the right of habeas corpus, the right to consult a lawyer or the privilege to see members of his family. Houde in prison and Tim Buck free. Other times, other ways. French Canadians were then considered as saboteurs, to repeat the words used by a minister of the Crown at the time of the Arvida strike; meanwhile, the citizens of my province were asked to contribute to a fund for needy Russian children The million dollars thus collected was spent here on bolshevist propaganda. Money given to feed and clothe the destitute children of the U.S.S.R. was used on revolutionary propaganda and constituted the pay of renegades and people without a country. According to newspaper reports, Gouzenko "had been amazed to find organizations in Canada during the war, which were collecting money and food for Russia. In Russia, he had never heard of this help." We have, to say the least, lacked prudence. I hope this will be a lesson to us and that henceforth we will be on the lookout. Some aliens are as

much to be feared as enemies. It might be advisable to direct to the Almighty this prayer by Louis Veuillot: "Lord, deliver me from my friends; and I will take care of my enemies". Let us be careful:

> Sovietism, wrote Father J. B. Desrosiers, of the order of St-Sulpice, doctor of theology and of philosophy, professor of moral and social sciences, of the faculty of theology of the Montreal University, is extending its influence, not only over Europe but over the rest of the world. Because it has bought against fascism and nazism, we are prone to consider it as the bulwark of democracy. However, no regime is more at variance with democracy than sovietism; of all the dictatorships, it is the most cruel. This regime, wherever it becomes established, deprives the individuals and their families of their most sacred rights, and especially of their freedom; ostensibly to increase production, it treats all the workers as if they were beasts of burden, forced to accomplish hard labour. It sacrifices the human being to the community. In order to make them supremely happy, it subjects human beings to the hardest form of slavery. They are, as it were, cudgelled into happiness and struck down when they refuse to go on.

The best defence against diffusion of communist ideas and doctrines in Canada, is fair treatment of the working people. In 1935, Father Adelard Dugré wrote the following:

> The riches of this world are a table so set that all should find a place, and sufficient food, good humour and health so as to lead a virtuous and fraternal life. What Almighty God, Father of all abhors is that some, quicker and greedier than others, should impudently pilfer the share of their comrades, who leave the table hungry and mad, looking askance at the well-fed grabbers and determined to steal their food."

Aside from this espionage question, which caused an excitement which will be short-lived, there remain all the commissions and control organizations regulating our economic life. By the looks of things, Mr. Speaker, I fear that a number of controls as well as certain war institutions may well become permanent fixtures. We must make sure that conditions do not become worse. A little butter would do no harm, as everyone will admit.

The people are complaining and not without reason, of the scarcity of clothing, the unavailability of housing accommodation and of a number of commodities indispensible to normal living; they are tired of carrying an ever increasing burden of taxes; they are averse to keeping on giving with generosity while recovering only insignificent advantages; they are opposed, and rightly so, to the new gift government intends to grant England. They believe, and I dare say they are right, that there are other and less costly means of helping Canadians. The general feeling, among taxpayers, is that we have done our share, much more than our share even, when our means are taken into account, for our dear friends overseas. The future of our children is sufficiently mortgaged as it is.

I would be remiss in my duty toward my constituents of Chicoutimi, were I to vote for the gift of a billion and a quarter to Great Britain, and I would be disgraced in the eyes of the farmers and industrial workers were I to countenance an act which is of such a nature as to increase the fiscal burden which our people already carry with such difficulty. If we undertake to tow the Empire, we shall find out that the garage is far away and that the cost of overhauling the British car is tremendous. I am opposed to the colonial-like subservience of our economy to Great Britain.

Are we wondering what to do with our millions? Let us lend part of that money to the working men so that they may build themselves suitable houses, to the farmers' sons to enable them to settle on farms, to the elderly people who are in need of a higher pensions, to the villages, cities and towns deprived of means of communication, of educational and recreational facilities. Let us cure our own ills before attempting to cure those of other nations.

Let us distribute this money among our citizens by way of loans or relief from taxation, so that they may be happier, and thus in a better position to resist the revolutionary appeals of those trouble makers and proponents of Marshal Stalin's gospel.

So long as there is in Canada a shortage of hospitals, to look after the needs of the sick, of colleges, or schools for our youth, so long as slums have not been suppressed from our towns and our rural centres, so long as there are Canadians deprived of homes, of clothing and of employment, I claim that we cannot afford to make gifts to others and that we must in the first place help our own citizens and devote our billions to more useful purposes than those which are suggested.

(Text):

Mr. D. F. BROWN (Essex West): I should like to speak on behalf of the constituency of Essex West, which comprises chiefly the city of Windsor. I also wish to associate myself with the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne and to express my appreciation of being associated with these two hon. gentlemen in the same political party.

In recent months Windsor has gone through rather dark and troubled days. We have seen dark waters. However, I am happy to say that the darkest cloud preceding the dawn has disappeared and we are again seeing daylight. Windsor's contribution to the winning of the

war is known throughout Canada. Our production of the sinews of war, tanks, trucks, automobiles, chemicals, guns and other things used in warfare is well known and contributed largely, I believe, to the overthrow of Germany. In addition, however, we have fought and won a labour war in Canada; and that war having been won, it is my opinion that now the city of Windsor is destined to become one of the leading industrial centres of the British empire.

At this point I should like to pay my humble tribute to the work of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) who has stood so loyally, so faithfully and, shall I say, so serenely behind and on top of the principles he has advocated for so many years. On behalf of the city of Windsor I wish to express to him the appreciation we feel for his efforts in our dark and troublesome days. I should like also to pay my respects to Mr. Justice Rand who, through his scholarly and learned decision in the Ford Motor dispute, has won the acclaim of people all over Canada, because, after all, that labour battle has set the pattern for all in Canada, and I think all in Canada will show their gratitude to him.

I think we have made our start toward becoming one of the greatest industrial centres of the British empire. During the last session many statements were made in this house in connection with our labour dispute; in fact on one occasion we had a motion to adjourn the house for the purpose of discussing the situation in my city. But let me say that industry has shown its faith in the city of Windsor. To-day the Ford Motor Company is building a $600,000 addition to its plant, and many other industries are constructing additions to their premises. For instance, the Packard Motor Car Company recently purchased property in Windsor on which it intends to erect a plant, and many smaller industries are coming into the city, some of which we hope will grow into large plants. In addition, the larger retail outlets of the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America have found it advantageous to purchase properties there, having in mind the erection of large retail establishments.

As I have said already, Windsor is the centre of the automobile industry of the British empire. In addition, we have some 260 industries, with scores of feeder plants supplying parts to the automobile industry. These plants employ many hundreds of men and played a great part in the winning of the war, especially as against Germany. It can also be said that we are the salt of the earth, because we are the largest producers of salt in Canada. In all probability the table salt used in British Columbia and the rock salt used in Alberta and Manitoba in connection with dairying come from my city. The chlorine for purification purposes also comes from Windsor. Caustic soda, a product of the salt industry, is used for cleansing purposes. We are the centre of the pharmaceutical industry in Canada; we have the larger pharmaceutical plants, such as Parke Davis, Sterling Products, Frederick Stearns, John Wyeth, Jamieson, and so on. Our geographical location is such that we are bounded on the north by lake St. Clair, in front by the Detroit river and on the south by lake Erie. Strange as it may seem, we are south of the city of Detroit. Essex county, comprising the constituencies of Essex East, Essex South and my own constituency of Essex West, is known as the sun parlour of Canada. We are served by water, by the busiest waterway in the world. We are served by air by both American and Canadian air lines. We have five railroads. We are also served by a tunnel from Detroit, and a bridge; and in addition we have a railroad tunnel, car ferries and so on. We have fine schools, fine churches, and we are rich in historic lore.

All these things, however, are not the reason for the greatness of this district. Our city is not made famous by its great industries, its geographical location or its fine buildings, but by the spirit of its residents in the hearts and minds of our people. I think it would best summarize the type of people we have if I were to read a reprint from the *Labour Gazette* of January, 1944, containing the decision of Mr. Justice Rand as arbitrator in the issue between the union and the Ford Motor Company. At page 4 of the reprint Mr. Justice Rand said:

> I have had an opportunity of sizing up the leadership of this union so far as it is represented by the committee of negotiation. The members are all of English-speaking origin and British citizenship. They have impressed me as being men of the stuff of which ordinary Canadians are made. With the exception of . . .

Then he mentions two individuals.

> . . . who are on leave of absence from General Motors at Oshawa as international representatives of the union, they are men with seniority in the Ford plant ranging from ten to eighteen years. They conducted themselves in negotiation with intelligence and reasonableness. I have no doubt their dominating interest is the job of those they represent in that industry, and that their object is to attain for those employees and their families a secure and self-respecting living, which seems to be the object of most Canadians. That aim is legitimate, whether or not attainment is possible.

As I have said, that summarizes the opinion of one who has rendered his decision in an impartial and disinterested way.

Like other Canadian municipalities, we have our choral societies, our theatre guilds, our art associations and our handicrafts guilds. We are no different from the rest of the Dominion of Canada.

Situated as we are, the tourist industry is of vital importance. Across the river in the states of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana and Illinois there is a total population, as of the 1941 census, of 23,488,755 persons, and there has been a considerable increase since that time. Figures furnished to me by the department show that the number of tourists from the United States entering Canada in 1938 through all ports was 17,084,525, of whom 3,497,814 entered through the port of Windsor. I do not intend to refer to the figures for the years 1939 through 1944, but the figures for 1945 show that 17,207,731 tourists entered through all ports and that 5,437,745, or almost one-third, entered through the port of Windsor.

We have many things to show those tourists who want to make short inroads into Canada, who want to stay for only a short period and travel only a short distance. Besides our fine buildings, there are many other things of interest. We have the Baby residence, the oldest building in the city, a building with a great historical background. Nothing has been done about this building by the dominion government, and I would urge the government to take whatever steps are necessary, in conjunction with the Essex county Historical Association, to see that some funds are appropriated for the restoration of this building as a point of interest for tourists.

In the adjoining constituency of Essex South at Amherstburg there is the Fort Malden museum. This point is just eighteen miles from Windsor, and this locality has tangible memories of such men as Tecumseh, Sir Isaac Brock and Colonel James Baby. I am glad to say that this building has ben restored and improved and is being used quite extensively. Many tourists visit it each year.

There is also the Point Pelee national park, situated on the most southerly point of the mainland of the Dominion of Canada. I do not propose to go into the details of this park at this time, but I should like to mention that through it pass literally thousands of birds migrating to the south. Strange to say, bees also migrate through here to southern climates as well as literally millions of butterflies. This subject would take considerable time to discuss, but suffice it to say that this park is unique in many other ways. The flora found there are found in no other part of Canada, and the same can be said of the wild life.

[Mr. Brown.]

I should also like to refer to the Jack Miner bird sanctuary which attracts tourists from the United States, Mexico and many parts of Europe. In 1906 Jack Miner started to band wild geese. He did not put a number on the bands of tin or metal which he placed on the birds he caught; he put on a verse of scripture. The birds were then freed and in the course of years they were found all over the eastern parts of the United States and Canada, as far north as Baffinland, Hudson bay and other northern posts and as far south as South America. Those scriptural verses which were found in all parts of this continent aroused considerable interest. Preachers in northern outposts preached sermons on the verses which had come to them out of the air. The natives of South America have been helped and have learned about the Dominion of Canada and the Jack Miner sanctuary through birds which have come to them out of the air. So it is my hope that as this bird sanctuary has brought literally thousands of tourists who have spent millions of dollars in the Dominion of Canada, nothing will be done either by this government or by any succeeding government to impede the work of this late and great man but rather that the work will continue with the support of the government of the day.

I said a moment ago that we in Windsor have an art association and a handicrafts association. These associations are of vital interest to our tourist business, and they are very practical. The practical nature of the art association can perhaps best be illustrated by the following incident, showing the effect which it has had on persons outside the Dominion of Canada who are desirous of seeing what Canada has to offer because of what they have seen done by the art association, also by the National Art Association and the National Gallery of Canada.

A short time ago a gentleman came to this city from India. He was asked what places he would like to see and his first request was to see the National Gallery. He was asked why he wanted to see it, and he said that he had just flown here from India and that at each stop he had found an interesting and beautiful painting of a Canadian scene, and at the bottom of each picture was the source, the National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa. So he wanted to see the national gallery. Probably if he did see it he was disappointed. I mention this because the National Gallery of Canada is of practical value to us in my constituency. It encourages the artists who will depict scenes in my own and neighbouring constituencies which will arouse interest outside the Dominion of Canada and make tourists want to see those scenes. Naturally they

will come to my constituency and, while there, will spend valuable dollars in foreign currency.

I should like to say a word about the National Gallery of Canada, an institution with which I have only recently become acquainted. I went there the other day and here are some of the things I found. The national gallery is housed in one end of the museum building, five floors of it, if you include the basement. The space was never designed for a national gallery and is hopelessly inadequate. Most of the partitions are made of wood and beaverboard, carefully disguised with painted burlap, all that the government of the day thought it could afford after the first great war. It is not fireproof; it has not even the elementary conveniences of a public building. The storage and shipping space is even worse.

I am interested in the national gallery, not because it is in Ottawa, but because I believe this work should be centred in one building under one head from which it can disseminate its work to the benefit of my constituency, and that of course applies to every constituency in the dominion.

The staff consists of the director and a crew of fifteen, all told. Yet that small group is responsible not only for the management of the national gallery in Ottawa but for the loan and educational system that covers the dominion from coast to cost. Approximately 150,000 people visit the national gallery every year, and that is a high figure for a gallery in a city of less than 200,000 population. But the really important feature of the gallerys work is that probably over a million citizens outside Ottawa have seen national gallery travelling exhibitions and received the benefit of its other extension services during the year.

I found that the national gallery had undertaken at least four major jobs during the war and successfully accomplished all of them.

First, it maintained its programme in Ottawa throughout the conflict and extended it as a morale builder, as did the national gallery in London and other public galleries nearer the firing line.

Second, it greatly increased its quota of loan exhibitions so that other Canadian cities should benefit during the stress of war.

Third, it planned and put into operation a unique project whereby the Canadian armed forces were generously supplied with pictures for the decoration of recreation rooms, messes and rest huts. These are the pictures that were seen by the gentlemen who flew here from India. More than 30,000 prints were distributed at no cost to the taxpayer, and the British forces were eventually included in the scheme, which has made Canadian art known almost around the world. The same pictures were later made available to hospitals and also to schools and other educational institutions. I need not mention that even a great many hon. members of this house have availed themselves of the opportunity of obtaining a few of the silk screens and pictures from the national gallery for decorating their offices.

Fourth, at the request of the defence council the director of the national gallery undertook to chair a committee charged with the duty of selecting and directing Canadian artists in depicting Canada's part in the war. Under this plan a number of the foremost artists were commissioned and sent to the various fronts. Their works are now arriving and will be seen in exhibitions in increasing numbers as the work develops.

Other services included the assembling and forwarding of exhibitions of Canadian arts to the United States, South America and other countries, and the arranging of return exhibitions for Canada. A system of broadcasts to schools has been established telling the story of Canadian art to young people, using small colour reproductions issued and distributed by the gallery at a nominal price.

Looking at the gallery premises and the small staff of workers, I do not know how it is accomplished. What could be done for this country if we had a gallery building worthy of Canada and a staff of, say one-tenth the size of the staff of the film board, a staff to include field workers and lecturers, as well as administrative officials. I understand the grant to the national gallery for all purposes has been about $45,000 a year throughout the war, having been reduced from a pre-war figure of $135,000. This is no way to treat an institution with such vast potentialities for vital constructive work for Canada at home and abroad.

I am not specially interested in the national gallery as an ornament to the city of Ottawa, but I am interested in the national gallery as a centre from which the benefits of art can radiate to every part of Canada, including Essex county in Ontario. A new national gallery building with adequate storage space, shipping rooms, workshops and galleries is necessary if those of us who cannot come to Ottawa are to share in the great benefits a gallery can produce. Art centres are springing up all over this country, partly as a result of the extension work already done by the national gallery but also because of the steadily advancing educational level of the people as a whole. These centres need to be wisely fostered, and only an up-to-date national gallery and a staff with vision can do the job.

I am convinced that a great deal has already been accomplished to point the way; let the gallery be given the green light.

May I revert for a moment to the Jack Miner foundation. In addition to the advertising we get in Canada through the banding of birds, most of the more worth-while publication in the United States have given voluminous space to advertise not only the Miner bird sanctuary but Canada in general. I hold in my hand a copy of the *Saturday Evening Post* of March 18, 1944, which gives in colour, advertising for the Dominion of Canada which no money can buy. I have here also a publication called the *Christian Advocate,* which I am told has a circulation of over a million readers in the United States, and which has given advertising to Canada which money cannot buy.

I am also interested from the point of view of fostering the tourist industry, in the handicraft guild. I believe that sufficient prominence and support have not been given to this practical organization which could be said to be part of the tourist business. The handicraft guild throughout the Dominion of Canada, and in particular in my own city, is instructing many of our residents in the native crafts, in the native arts of this country such as weaving, spinning, the making of ornaments of jewellery, pottery, bookbinding, woodwork and many kindred trades. I should like to see this government devote and appropriate funds to encourage these operations. Somebody has said that a dollar brought into this country by a tourist is just as valuable as a dollar's worth of wheat going out. If we would give at least some attention to this industry, which I am told is now one of the leading industries of our country, a great service would be done not only to my own constituency but to the whole of Canada.

Mr. H. R. JACKMAN (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, in the time that remains this evening I should like to address myself to what I consider to be the very great housing crisis in this country. There is a housing shortage which is a national emergency and which calls for every action which this government can take to provide a solution. If this country had been struck by a flood or an earthquake and thousands of our people had been rendered homeless, I do not think it would have taken very long or that the money would not have been forthcoming to provide sufficient homes for these distressed people. Or if on the other hand we had required more aeroplanes to beat Hitler we would certainly have produced them. We should follow the same principles and the same means of production in providing our people with decent housing accommodation.

I am reminded of 1939, prior to the war, when unemployment was rife in this country, when in my own riding of Rosedale in Toronto no fewer than 10,000 people out of a population of 65,000 were forced to accept relief, and yet a Liberal government, which was then in power, did nothing to alleviate this hardship. If one went about the riding and inquired of these people who could not find work despite their ability and willingness, one learned that in many instances they were craftsmen from the building trades—bricklayers, carpenters, plumbers, painters, decorators, et cetera—because there was virtually no housebuilding or construction going on at that time. It was commonly referred to as the key-log of the depression jam. The Liberal government at that time did not have the foresight to give these men jobs, nor did it do anything to alleviate the housing shortage. That shortage has been piling up ever since, because in 1940 we found ourselves engaged in a world war and we could not at one and the same time carry on both a munitions industry on a great scale and remedy, or even keep up with, the immediate demands for housing.

Hansard records how His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, to which I have the honour to belong, urged upon the government by every means possible to make the greatest contribution that Canada could in the line of material production. With some prodding continuously, the government did so, and the people of Canada made a great contribution both on the man-power front and on the material front. But now that we have come to the year 1946, one would think this government would have learned something from the war effort, would have learned how things which are necessary and urgent are put into motion. We find, however, that the lessons of the war, which were before the government and before all those who wished to read those lessons in books by Keynes and other authors, all those lessons which were turned to such advantage during the period from 1939 to 1945, have been promptly discarded by the government, and even though controls remain in force we find that the government is doing nothing of a constructive nature, certainly not on any worth-while scale, in connection with the deplorable housing shortage which this country faces.

It is hardly necessary to point out the need for housing. Much of the talk we hear is casual and some of it specific. We hear of advertisements such as the one that appeared in the daily papers of Toronto of a man with

a three-roomed apartment to rent. He received no fewer than 500 applications. There are at the present time 5,000 applications filed with the citizen's registry of the welfare bureau in Toronto for accommodation of any kind whatsoever.

I recall the case of a major in the dental corps who was evicted. That man is willing to pay $70 a month. He has a family of four, his wife having a heart condition. He could find no accommodation, and he was obliged to go to Malton where temporary accommodation is available for a limited number.

The problem is not, as it may have been in years gone by, one of inability to pay for decent accommodation. Employment is good and so are wages. And this condition is not confined to the lower income brackets. The welfare department in Toronto reports 400 applicants willing to pay from $65 to $125 a month for any kind of accommodation, because they are desperate, and many of them are veterans of this war.

What are the stories of human suffering that lie behind these cold statistics? Yesterday, Sunday, I had occasion to visit some of these houses where conditions of overcrowding exist, and I found in one three-storey building, a large house, one room that contained one bed for three persons and another bed for two—a shocking condition in this day and age and in this Dominion of Canada. Altogether that house, admittedly a large one, contained fifty-three people, some of them veterans of the last war. It had one bath with a cold water-tap only, and some of the tenants said they did not use it because it was too dirty, while others said they did not use it because they had to cart their own hot water to it. In the house there were three toilets. This place had been condemned by the fire department. The insurance companies will not insure the possessions of the tenants, and about the place you will see six or eight large fire-extinguishers, because the place is a veritable fire hazard. There is no mail-box in the building, and the postman will not leave any mail because the children get at it and the postal authorities cannot guarantee delivery. The result is that the tenants have to go to Front street, a mile and a half away, in order to get their mail.

Such are the conditions in Toronto in this year 1946 when we are supposed to have a fairly high standard of living. In the same building there was a three and a half roomed apartment on the third floor with no bath, toilet or mail-box, the rental being $25 a month. In the basement, which was fixed up to shelter a grandmother, a mother, a daughter of seventeen and two boys of eleven and six, the rental was $18 a month.

None of these people want to live in such quarters but it is the only roof they can find to cover their heads. In my own riding I was given the address of another place, a six-roomed house, really a cottage, sixty or seventy years old, very low, the average room being ten feet by twelve feet. Three families are quartered in this small place, and altogether it houses twenty-one people, with one bathroom.

Such are the housing conditions which this government has taken so little means to rectify. One could go on endlessly with other examples—eight or ten people living in one room, mixed sexes—three semi-detached houses, thirty-nine rooms and every room containing a family. The houses are condemned by the health authorities for good and sufficient reasons. The inspectors will make their reports, but what can they do? If these Canadians are evicted their lot is even worse than before.

There has been sent to Malton to the barrack quarters 100 families, and another 114 families have been sent from Toronto to Little Norway at Toronto island. Notwithstanding the frequent visits of health inspectors and social workers, one can well imagine the physical and moral dangers if such shocking congestion continues. It will lead to the breaking up of homes, absence of family life, and other evils. And what must be the opinion of the returned soldier who comes home to his wife and two kiddies to find such conditions as I have mentioned? It is a far cry from that of the last war when we were told that there would be homes fit for heroes to live in.

In the speech from the throne there is reference to housing, and it is said that the demand exceeds the supply. Those are words which are hardly likely to bring about any solution or to lead the people of Canada to believe that the government has any real recognition of the crisis which housing presents in Canada to-day. Surely the action of the veterans in Vancouver, when they seized the hotel, would lead the government to know that the demand exceeded the supply.

There was a time when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), according to the biographies which have been written about him, was a social service worker or at least was cognizant of social conditions in the country. I recall he once visited a factory where they made matches and where the sulphur fumes caused an industrial disease, and he

brought about means whereby that condition was rectified. I may say to him now that there are more ways than one of losing one's health and self-respect in this country of ours.

Where to-day is the social conscience of the Liberal party? The Progressive Conservatives believe that such conditions should not be tolerated, that no stone should be left unturned to force this government to take adequate action to remedy this housing crisis. I was not active in public life during the worst days of the depression, but when I learned of the conditions that existed I wondered that the people ever stood for them, and I wonder to-day why the people of Canada, in such large numbers, stand for the housing conditions that now prevail. I am quite sure that if they had any kind of leadership many of them would not stand for conditions like that when on every hand they see people who are not only comfortably well off and well housed, but able to acquire other possessions, some of which may be fairly necessary but certainly not of the same relative importance as a decent house over one's head.

What I have said is the personal side of the problem. How many times must these conditions be multiplied to encompass the housing shortage which fails to move the government to action? The pictures I have given may not be representative of all the housing shortage in Canada. They are true of parts of Toronto and I know they are true of parts of the capital city of this country. They are probably general.

I wish to point out another aspect of this problem. Yesterday I called at a house. A veteran answered the door. He and his wife live there; the wife is expecting a child shortly. They have one room and the joint use of a kitchen. They pay $30 a month for that. In these days that sum is enough to provide that veteran and family with a house, not just a room and the joint use of a kitchen. For the most part the people are able to pay for decent accommodation, but that accommodation is not available and very little is being done to provide it for them.

As I have mentioned, there was a pre-war housing shortage. There was unemployment and there was a shortage of houses. It became worse during the war. There was no planning for the existing shortage, and perhaps for good reasons, because we could not make munitions and houses at the same time. But how the government expects to take care of a growing country and of returned soldiers whose families in the meantime had doubled up with in-laws and others, I do not know. What did the government expect to do with 800,000 men and women returning from the armed services? How were they to be housed when there was an acute shortage already?

How great is the housing crisis? In the spring of 1944 the advisory committee on housing and community planning estimated a shortage of 600,000 family units. The government made no preparation for large-scale building. It offered insufficient inducements after the war to war workers who had come from the smaller centres to the larger ones to return to their original abode. As quoted last Friday by my colleague, the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), Brigadier Storms, now general manager of Housing Enterprises Limited, said in a published statement on March 14 last, that there are 375,000 families in Canada who are involuntarily doubled up because of the housing shortage. In addition to this, although there may be some duplication, the Curtis report of three years ago estimated 300,000 sub-standard dwellings in Canada, and I can point to many sub-standard dwellings in my own riding. The need is colossal; it is urgent. The housing crisis constitutes a national emergency of the first order.

Last year the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) estimated that 39,000 new dwelling units were built and 5,000 reconverted. That is an estimate, and many consider that it is substantially in excess of the actual number of houses which were provided. But even if we take it at its face value it is not enough, for it will never solve the problem which faces this country.

The economic system can be made to break the back of this housing shortage, but it will not be done by letting bad enough alone. An indignant people will not stand for it.

The government has never denied the responsibility for the housing crisis in Canada. No fewer than three agencies of the government have helped to muddle the problem, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation or its antecedent; Wartime Housing, and recently the Department of Veterans Affairs. Mr. H. C. Nichols, the retiring president of the Canadian Construction Association, stated on January 14 of this year that the capacity of the building industry in Canada to-day is 30,000 houses per annum, which is hardly enough to keep up with the current wear and tear without attacking the 375,000 backlog of needed houses.

What are the possibilities of solution at the government's present rate of progress? Obviously the people of Canada will not be decently housed in the near future.

In the face of this tremendous housing shortage there were 263,000 people reported

as unemployed at the end of February, 1946. It seems almost incredible that we should at one and the same time have a housing shortage of such dimensions and 263,000 people on the unemployed rolls. I should like to ask the minister how many men are being trained for the construction industry in the Department of Labour's training schools? The Minister of Reconstruction said he was alarmed at the rate of expansion of industry in Canada. May I ask, is all industry expanding and what industry is entitled to a higher priority than housing, and what expansion have we to show in that field? The Minister of Reconstruction says he is alarmed at the rate of expansion, and yet we find that housing is apparently relegated to a secondary position.

All mercantile housing, with only the most pressing exceptions, and theatre construction should be eliminated until the housing crisis is over. The house might be interested in knowing that the dwelling which I described in some detail with fifty-three people in it is to be torn down presently if a building permit is issued by the city, which it has not issued so far, and in its place is to be erected a motion-picture theatre. Certainly in this day we must have some idea of what comes first, and surely housing comes ahead of more amusement centres.

The figures given by the Minister of Reconstruction on the export of lumber only indicate that in the face of the need for domestic building more lumber should be retained at home. We are on a new domestic standard as compared with the pre-war years. In my riding one-third of the people badly need more of the necessities of life; another third need more of the good things of life, and the remaining third would not refuse a higher standard of living. With a national income now increased from three and a half billion to eight or nine billion dollars, and the price level not excessively out of line with what it was before the war, the whole question of production for export and domestic consumption should be examined. We are trying to export to the whole world not only as a measure of temporary and urgent relief, but in order to build up future trade. If we do not retain some of our exports we may find that our people will have to do without housing permanently. Instead of exporting unemployment, we are importing shortages and doing our level best to make our own people have a lower standard of living.

Take, for example, the figures for the newsprint industry, which means that more and more men are being used to cut pulp wood who could be cutting lumber, and these figures have been showing a steady expansion. Surely Canadian newsprint, which is an industry with which I am familiar and in which I am interested, was not severely dealt with during the war in comparison with that of other countries, and yet we find to-day that it is able to expand its exports and use men to cut down wood for pulp; whereas these same men could be used for producing more lumber in this country. Where is the control? Where is the direction which this government should exercise to meet the essential needs of our people?

What else should the government do to solve this crisis? I suggest and urge that they should adjust wage ceilings. Building materials were not considered a war necessity, and the wages of workers in those industries were held at virtually peace-time levels. If you look at the figures for bricklayers, for instance, you will find that they were held pretty much at their peace-time level. The result was that men in that industry left for war-time occupations, where wage rates were higher. Now that war industry is over, there is little inclination on their part to go back to the building industry, even at wage rates which are slightly higher than those in effect when they left that industry, and which are substantially below those which obtained in war industry.

Wartime Housing priorities disrupted the building industry. Small builders and private owners found that they could not get the materials they required because of the priorities which the government, under Wartime Housing placed upon the lumber and building supplies industries. There has been a shortage of building supplies not only because of the wage ceilings but because of the price ceilings. We must treat the national housing emergency as a crisis and allow a reasonable increase in wages so that more workers will be attracted into that field. More of those unemployed workers who to-day are looking for work must be taught how to engage in the building trades in order to render an essential and worthwhile service to their fellow Canadians. That was the practice we followed in connection with war industry. Peace-time occupations were frozen; wages could not be increased. But when it came to aeroplane factories, munitions factories and so on, wage levels were advanced. Workers flowed into those higher paid jobs, naturally, and we did a thoroughly commendable job when it came to munitions. Now we must use the same tactics, the same principles if we are to solve this housing crisis which is upon our doorstep at the present time.

Let me offer another suggestion into which I believe the government should look. During the war not only had we to pay higher wages

to attract workers to war industries; we also found it necessary to build more war plants, and we allowed private builders the privilege of writing off the cost of those war additions over a short period of years, on the basis that after the war they would not be useful for the particular purpose for which they were built. Now I recommend that the government allow manufacturers of building supplies to create additions to their factories to meet this emergency, which may last for five years. It may last longer than that, but I do not see how it can last for less. Then the government should allow the owners of these industries to write off that excess capacity during the period of the crisis.

As an emergency measure I should like to recommend that the government grant first mortgage building loans at a rate as low at two per cent if necessary. If wages in the building industries are increased in order to get more workers, and if the cost of building supplies rise, we do not want our people and particularly our veterans to have to buy houses at inflated values. One of the greatest factors in the cost of a house is the cost of money. To-day the government is borrowing at 2¾ per cent per annum, and to meet this crisis it could well afford to lend money on first mortgage loans on new houses at a rate as low as two per cent. That would go a long way toward absorbing any additional cost brought about by the emergency measures I have suggested. Possibly the government should even consider subsidizing new construction. Buildings and houses are being subsidized in Great Britain in order to meet the acute shortage there, and our people, particularly in the low-income brackets, must be allowed to have decent shelter over their heads. If because of the wage rates in this country it should become necessary to subsidize building, then the government should do so.

Then I believe the government should withdraw from the field of actual construction and cease its interference with private builders. If the government wishes to maintain supervision, then let private industry do the building and, if necessary, purchase the complete housing units from the builders, who understand the business and can get things done.

There is not time to go into the matter of local taxation, which has made housing unprofitable for both individual owners and landlords. I shall say only this, that Wartime Housing has not proved as efficient, from the many examples which have come to our notice, as construction by private builders. The wartime prices and trade board is also one of the evils at the root of this jam we are facing to-day. That board cannot know everyone's business and how businesses are interdependent. There are shortages of furnaces, because furnaces may not be sold at high enough prices. Therefore houses cannot be completed. Or it may be a shortage of soil pipe, or of porcelain insulators, which are examples that have been brought to my notice. Wartime Housing certainly is not in as good a position to get skilled help as are private contractors, many of whom have had the same men working with them for long periods of years. Instead of wrecking industry, the government should learn how to utilize it.

[Mr. Jackman.]

Building tradesmen should be given an incentive to work holidays and overtime; but if they are to have from thirty to fifty per cent of their extra wages taken in taxation they will not work more than the straight forty-hour week. I well recall the memorable words of a C.C.F. member in regard to his constituent, who was a mixed farmer and who found that he was being taxed on the extra cream he was able to obtain by working before breakfast in the morning and milking the cows after dinner at night, and who said, "I'll not milk cows for Ilsley." So he got rid of his herd. Human nature being what it is, I say it is folly to make laws which fly in the face of increased production. There is plenty of capital for investment in buildings; and with more take-home pay not only can workers produce more, but more workers will join the building trades.

The Liberal government has become a big, cumbersome nuisance. It is preventing Canadians from using their natural ability to look after their own needs. The war with Germany has now been over for nearly ten months and the Japanese war for nearly seven months, but the controllers still want to control. If the government will only give the horse its head we can rely on Canadian workers and Canadian industry to supply our housing requirements. If there is one thing we owe our returning veterans it is decent homes for themselves and their families. That is the prime duty of any government. The people expect some government planning and some direction as long as controls remain in force. Let the government make it possible for our people, our economic system and our democracy to deliver the goods.

On motion of Mr. Dorion the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, March 26, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern) presented the first report of the special committee on veterans affairs and moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Before the report is concurred in, sir, may I have just a word? I wish to say that the mover of this report is most helpful to his colleagues, and I wish to thank him on behalf of all the veterans he has assisted when their cases were referred to him.

Motion agreed to.

FOOD

UNDERSTANDINGS REACHED IN DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN BRITISH AND CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, last week I stated to the house that within a few days a report would be made both in this house and in the House of Commons in Great Britain with regard to the agreements reached for the supplying of food from Canada to Great Britain. That statement is being made in the British house to-day, and I am therefore making it here.

Supplies of food from Canada to the United Kingdom. Joint announcement of understandings reached in discussions between representatives of the United Kingdom and of Canada at the Ministry of Food, London, January, 1946.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce and I, with officials of our departments, visited the United Kingdom in January and had discussions with Sir Ben Smith, the United Kingdom Minister of Food, and officials of the ministry of food regarding British requirements and Canadian supplies of the major foodstuffs. The discussions took account of the recent announcement of the United Kingdom government policy in regard to home agricultural production and of the long-term prospects regarding supplies of the different foodstuffs.

2. This exchange of views has resulted in understandings being reached between the British Ministry of Food and the meat and dairy boards of the dominion Department of Agriculture on matters which are set out below and are now being put into the form of agreements to be signed on behalf of both governments.

3. Bacon and ham. The United Kingdom is prepared to purchase the maximum supplies which Canada can provide in 1946, 1947 and 1948. Canada has agreed to do its utmost to maintain these supplies at the highest possible level.

4. It was agreed that the present contract for the calendar year 1946 should be extended to cover the import of a minimum of 350 million pounds into the United Kingdom in 1947 and 400 million pounds in 1948. The contract price for the balance of 1946 and for 1947 will be raised to $25 per 100 pounds f.o.b. seaboard for grade A Wiltshires. For 1948 the price will be not less than the current contract price of $22.50, same basis, and will be subject to later review.

5. It was agreed to have further discussions before January, 1947, to consider the possibility of assessing the prospective requirements of the United Kingdom for 1949 and of negotiating a contract for that year. The new price for bacon means an increase of approximately $3 per hog in price. The order in council of 1944 established a premium of $3 on A's and $2 on B's per hog until six months after the war. The premium is to be decreased by $1 to $2 on A's and $1 on B's per hog. This will provide for a net increase of $2 per hog in price and premium combined.

6. Cheese. The present contract for the supply of 125 million pounds of cheese to the United Kingdom each year expires on 31st March, 1947. It was agreed that this should be extended to 31st March, 1948, at the same prices. The contract should cover 125 million pounds.

7. An extension of the contract to cover the season ending 31st March, 1949, has also been agreed with prices to be fixed at a later date, and to this end the United Kingdom and Canadian representatives will review the arrangements before January, 1947.

8. Evaporated milk. It was agreed that a contract at current basic prices should be concluded to cover a minimum of 600,000 cases per annum for the two seasons ending 31st March, 1947 and 1948.

9. Roller dried skim milk powder. It was agreed that the United Kingdom should purchase 3,000 tons from the 1946 production of roller dried skim milk powder.

10. Eggs. The United Kingdom desires to obtain increased quantities of Canadian shell eggs during the months from October to April inclusive, and more especially during the months from October to December inclusive. Owing to difficulties in handling supplies in the United Kingdom during the summer months Canada was requested to cease ship-

ments of shell eggs by 1st May each year diverting the summer surplus to the production of frozen melange and/or sugar dried eggs.

11. It was agreed that the current contract which expires on December 31, 1946, should be extended to cover the supply to the United Kingdom of 1,750,000 cases of shell eggs and 5,000 tons of dried eggs in 1947 at the current basic prices for the shell eggs.

12. The United Kingdom has agreed to furnish to Canada by the autumn of 1946 (preferably by October) an indication of the requirements of eggs in shell and dried or frozen form during 1948.

13. Meat. In order to maintain the wartime carcass meat ration, the United Kingdom will require all the beef and mutton which Canada can spare in 1946 and, so far as can be foreseen at present, in 1947 and probably in 1948. It was agreed to continue discussions of the extension of the current contract to cover supplies for 1947.

14. The United Kingdom will be ready to purchase all the hog casings which Canada can provide up to 1948. Offals and tongues will also be required and these will be the subject of further discussions.

15. The United Kingdom requested an increase in the export in carcass form of meat suitable for sausage manufacture.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO ASSIST MR. SPEAKER IN REVISION OF STANDING ORDERS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a special committee consisting of Messrs. Adamson, Gladstone, Glen, Golding, Hansell, McGarry, Jean, MacInnis, Pouliot, Smith (Calgary West) and Stirling be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in revising the standing orders of the house with a view to simplify, accelerate and expedite its business, and to report to the house during the present session.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the close of the last session, on December 17, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) asked whether it was intended to set up at this session the committee on the orders and rules of the house. My hon. friend the Minister of Veterans Affairs, (Mr. Mackenzie), who was leading the house at the time, replied—*Hansard*, page 3716

It is the intention to set up that committee as soon as possible after the new session is convened.

The motion which is before the house at the moment is for the purpose of setting up that committee as soon as possible. I would not bring forward this motion at this time if it were likely to be debated. I understand, however, it is the wish of the house to have this committee established as soon as possible, and that the motion will meet with general acceptance. The personnel of the committee is, I understand, the same as that of the committee last year, with one exchange, by agreement.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL FLAG

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER AND REPORT ON SUITABLE DESIGN

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That in the opinion of this house, it is expedient that Canada possess a distinctive national flag and that a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be appointed to consider and report upon a suitable design for such a flag;

That Messrs. Beaudoin, Blanchette, Castleden, Emmerson, Gingues, Gladstone, Hackett, Hansell, Harris (Grey-Bruce), Herridge, LaCroix, Lafontaine, Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario), MacNicol, Martin, Matthews (Brandon), McCulloch (Pictou), McIvor, Reid, Smith (Calgary West), Stanfield, Stirling, Thatcher, Warren, Zaplitny, be members of such committee on the part of this house;

That standing order 65 of the House of Commons be suspended in relation thereto;

That the said committee have power to send for persons, papers and records to aid in the discharge of its functions; and

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform their honours that the House of Commons has appointed this committee and to request their honours to appoint members of the Senate to act thereon with the members of the House of Commons as a joint committee of both houses.

He said: In the speech from the throne at the close of the last session, the following paragraph appeared—*Hansard*, page 3755:

My ministers were gratified at the approval given to the proposal that Canada should possess a distinctive national flag. At the next session, they will propose that the select committee of both houses be reconstituted in order to complete the task of considering a suitable design for a Canadian flag.

The motion I am now presenting is to implement that undertaking as given in the speech from the throne. The same remarks I made on the previous motion apply in presenting this motion. I understand that the house is likely to approve it unanimously and will not desire any debate upon it at this time.

Motion agreed to.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE

DATE OF REOPENING—PARTICULARS OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR CADETS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. A. KIDD (Kingston City): May I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence (Army)? It has to do with the Royal Military College at Kingston. Will the minister kindly inform the house when the Royal Military College at Kingston will be opened? How many cadets will be permitted to register in the first class? When will instructions be available as to the academic qualifications required?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. KIDD: This is asked in view of the fact that so many parents and ex-cadets across Canada are most anxious to make plans for their sons who will this year reach the age when a decision is necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The question should be put on the order paper.

COAL

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Is the Minister of Reconstruction in a position to indicate when we may expect a report from the royal commission which is inquiring into the coal industry in Canada?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I received notice of the question and communicated with Mr. Justice Carroll, chairman of the commission, whose reply is as follows:

> With reference to the inquiry from a member of the house, the commission is not in a position at this time to say just when its report will be completed.
>
> As you know, we are making a comprehensive study of all the facts pertaining to the coal industry, both in respect to the production of coal, its distribution and its utilization. Studies are being conducted by a number of experts on a variety of subjects and some of these reports have not yet been received.
>
> May I assure you that the commission and its staff are doing everything possible to expedite the early submission of the report.

WAR ASSETS CORPORATION

POLICY AS TO SALES OF EQUIPMENT TO VETERANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Reconstruction, having to do with a change of policy by War Assets Corporation with respect to sales of equipment to veterans. Will the minister be so good as to tell the house what considerations prompted this change? Is he prepared to reconsider the question with a view to reversing the policy to its former status?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): That is too complicated a question for one to answer at this time without some preparation. I have promised the chairman of the committee on veterans affairs to attend a meeting of the committee with an officer of the War Assets Corporation and discuss the policy with the committee. Perhaps that will meet the situation.

UNITED NATIONS

MEETING OF SECURITY COUNCIL—OBSERVERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): May I direct a question to the Prime Minister in his capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs. I note that the newspaper reports to-day convey the information that the first two rows of audience seats at the meeting of the united nations security council in New York yesterday were occupied by observers and companions from fifty-one united nations. I should like to ask whether, in Canada's behalf, there was an official or an unofficial observer there looking after the interests of this country and, if so, who that observer was.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I shall have to answer the question a little later. Had the hon. member given me notice of his question I should have been in a position to tell him who the observer is.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does the Prime Minister mean to-day?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will give the answer to-day, yes, a little later, if the hon. member so desires.

Mr. POULIOT: Do you believe in it?

[*Later:*]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might answer a question that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) asked at an earlier stage of the sitting. He asked who was the observer for Canada at the meeting of the security council in New York. At the time I was not sure whether Mr. Pearson, our ambassador, would be present. He hopes to be present at some of the meetings. I find, however, that he was not present yesterday, but Mr. Charles Ritchie, who is counsellor of the External Affairs Department, was present as an observer for Canada.

CIVIL AVIATION

UNITED STATES AIR BASE AT CLEARWATER LAKE, MANITOBA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. RONALD MOORE (Churchill): In view of the fact that the Canadian government has taken over the large United States air base at Clearwater lake, Manitoba, would the Minister of Transport reconsider the announced intention to abandon this air base, since its use for commercial flying will be of vital importance to northern development?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I believe the hon. member intended to address his question to me. I received notice of it and have the following reply:

The Pas airport is not being abandoned but will be put on a reduced basis. Sufficient funds have been included in the air services estimates for 1946-47 to provide for such work as is necessary to prevent runways and buildings from deteriorating and at the same time keep the runways in reasonably good condition and fit for the anticipated civil traffic.

Meteorological services wil continue to be available. The radio range will be off the air, but equipment left intact and kept in such condition that it may be recommissioned within a short time after the necessary staff has been sent in.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

The house resumed from Monday, March 25, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fernand Viau for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. FREDERIC DORION (Charlevoix-Saguenay) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I understand that, according to a well established custom which, as it were, has become a rule of this house, the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne affords to every member an opportunity to state his views on the various problems.

(Text):

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must point out to hon. members that, owing to the noise in the chamber, it is impossible to hear the hon. member who is speaking.

Mr. DORION: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I suppose it was because I was speaking in French that my colleagues started to leave the chamber. I submit that it is not only my right but my duty as well, for the first time this session, to address the chair in my own language.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

(Translation): It should nevertheless be remembered that on the conclusion of this debate we shall all have to vote. We now have before us three motions. The first one on which we shall have to vote is the one moved by the honourable member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), leader of the C.C.F. party. I feel that I am not mistaken in saying that, for the first time since I have the honour to sit in this house, we have in that motion a definite and clear statement of the whole doctrine on which is based the policy of that party. The first part of the motion reads as follows:

> We respectfully submit, however, that in the opinion of this house, Your Excellency's advisers in their reliance on private enterprise have failed to propose the comprehensive national planning which the present emergency demands;

That is a blame, a condemnation not about the conduct or the policy of the government, but about the confidence which the government holds toward private enterprise. It is, as I said a few moments ago, a clear and definite statement of the whole doctrine on which that party's policy is based.

I have already had occasion, since I have become a member of this house, to support by my vote and my words many of the reforms advocated by the C.C.F. party, but when it comes to voting on such a clear-cut statement of principles, I have no hesitation in opposing such a motion, because I still have confidence in the economic system under which we are living, notwithstanding its flaws.

I realize that such a system sometimes gives rise to abuses, however, an administration which is vigilant and conscious of its responsibilities can stamp out such abuses and there is no call to eliminate or overthrow our economic system under the pretext that is not perfect. It would be equivalent to killing a man while trying to cure him. This is why I feel it to be my duty to oppose this amendment by my vote.

Then we will be called upon to vote on the motion of the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Bracken), leader of the Progressive Conservative party. The amendment, considered independently of everything else, contains a condemnation, or rather a censure of the present government, with which I probably could agree because I think most of its grounds are well taken. For instance, in the first paragraph, the administration is blamed for having:

> Failed to meet the needs of veterans and workers by planning reconversion so as to avoid unemployment and dislocation;

When I think that unemployment has already become extensive; when I realize that in Quebec, for example, thousands of persons

are unable to find jobs, I am inclined to agree with this condemnation of the government's policy.

The fourth assertion of this motion is the following:

Failed to relieve the tax burden particularly on low income groups.

As in the case of any motion, it is imperative that not only the wording itself be taken into account, but also the preamble on which the motion has been based. In the speech of the leader of the oppostiion, introducing his motion, I find that he wishes to remove the effects of the evil he mentions, while stating that he approves of the causes of this same evil. Here is a statement I quote from his speech in the house, when he was speaking about the loan we are going to grant Great Britain:

These figures total an annual payment exceeding $50 million for each of the next few years.

If we intend to reduce taxation and give work to our people, it is impossible, at the same time, to increase the tax burden by the important amount mentioned by the leader of the opposition. In view of the arguments brought out in support of the amendment of which I have just spoken, I do not believe I could logically and fairly vote for that motion.

Indeed, I am not afraid to state, at this moment, that this amendment is nothing but a motion of want of confidence; but I have no reasons to vote against the present administration, knowing, at the same time, that my vote cannot be interpreted as an approval of the whole government policy.

Mr. Speaker, a third vote will be taken on the main motion, if we are called upon to vote, because it often happens that the main motion is carried without a recorded vote. Now, rightly or wrongly, but I rather think it is wrongly, a vote in favour of the address in reply to the speech from the throne is sometimes considered as implying approval of all the bills announced in the speech from the throne. I recognize that in the one which we are now considering, there are projects that should be supported, and there are some with which I, for one, am in complete agreement, as for instance, the redistribution bill which I advocated during the session held last year, as well as the definition of Canadian citizenship. On the other hand there are other measures which I cannot support. Thus, a paragraph of the speech from the throne reads as follows:

You will also be asked to make provision for the permanent armed forces, to the composition of which much consideration has been given.

Obviously, we have not yet been informed about the consideration given to that matter. We do not know what is involved. Neither do we know how many soldiers will be included in those permanent forces, or the manner in which it is proposed to maintain them. Consequently, I cannot blindly support that paragraph in the speech from the throne.

There is another paragraph which I cannot endorse. It reads as follows:

At this session you will be asked to approve an agreement recently concluded for a loan to the United Kingdom which will help maintain the British market for Canadian food products and other exports.

Therefore, this endorses the loan we intend to grant to the United Kingdom.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not wish to discuss this matter thoroughly at the present time since it will crop up again during this session.

Mr. LALONDE: Hear! Hear!

Mr. DORION: For the time being, I shall only say that after the war years we have just gone through, our people did not expect such a policy. During the war, it was said that patience was needed and we ourselves, at times, had to explain to our constituents that they must await the end of the armed conflict for various public works which they had long been requesting, because they urgently required them. In view of the situation arising out of the loan, and the obligations it will entail and considering that no important public works are announced, it is greatly to be feared that the projects planned for the past few years will not be carried out.

When I think of the numerous villages in the Charlevoix-Saguenay constituency which are now threatened with complete annihilation by the rising tides of the sea which every year sweep away a further portion of the shore, the danger is so imminent that the next storm might literally wipe these villages off the map. These Canadians, I say, have the right to demand that the government carry out the public works projects needed to protect their property.

Considering also the inadequate means of communication on the North Shore of the St. Lawrence which make it impossible for the inhabitants of that district to live a decent life, I claim that these people are fully entitled to insist that the government spend part of the public monies on improving their communications system, rather than using that money to pay the interest on loans made by ourselves to other countries. I think of the gallant

inhabitants of Ile-aux-Coudres who, living some sixty miles from Quebec City, are completely isolated from the rest of the world for approximately six months every year, because they have no wharves which could be used the year round.

About two years ago a group of citizens of Ile-aux-Coudres tried to cross the river to take a seriously ill man to the hospital, and I remember that they did their utmost in a small boat through floating ice to get him to the mainland where he could have obtained the required medical attention, but the man died because the weather prevented them from reaching the mainland before it was too late. If the people of Ile-aux-Coudres had suitable wharves they could organize a year round ferry service to the mainland.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I contend that before paying millions every year on account of the loan made to another country, our leaders should show the people that they are ready to undertake the public works which are sorely needed.

For that reason I must inform you that should a vote be called on the main motion I would have to vote against it.

There is also another matter about which nearly all those who have taken part in the present debate have spoken; I mean that matter of espionage of which I intend to say a few words.

First of all, I must say that I agree, with all those who have condemned the procedure followed in this case, in that I have deep respect for magna charta, which has been brought out with a view to proving that it had been violated by the government in acting the way it did in the arrest of the individuals whose names have now been revealed. However, Mr. Speaker, because I have deep respect and sincere admiration for the magna charta and because I want it to continue to protect our rights and liberties, I contend that the government has acted wisely.

The government acted the way it did in making the arrests precisely to prevent the sabotage of the magna charta. In my opinion the saying, "desperate ills call for desperate remedies," remains true. I am quite sure that the magna charta would have contained clauses pertaining to sabotage and treason had the possibility of such acts been forseseen at the time. Therefore, in view of the situation brought to light by the report of the commissioners, and especially by the inquest under way in Montreal, I contend that nobody should hesitate to approve the attitude of the government and particularly that of the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) in the matter.

When, for instance, I see such items as that published in *Saturday Night* of March 23, and written by Willes Chitty, I wonder if one can be serious in making such statements. I shall read two sentences of that article.

(Text):

> Yet Canada tolerates, with scarce a voice raised in protest, the sweeping away with a stroke of the pen all the fruits of the struggle of the British peoples for freedom and democracy. . . .
>
> So, perhaps, having said all this very badly, we may sum up our indictment if as it ought to be—but never will be—laid against the war criminals at home. In our eyes, much as we despise the treason those now charged and yet to be charged with the contemptible crime of espionage, the crimes committed in the name of freedom by the bureaucrat and politician are far more heinous.

(Translation): The publication of such articles in an important and highly respectable newspaper does not constitute a frank and honest discussion of the important matter at hand. Besides, one could find to-day in our gaols hundreds of individuals who, notwithstanding the protection granted under our laws, and under the magna charta, of which so much has been said, are held in prison before they have been sentenced, even before they have been accused; everyone knows that any man who is arrested is held in jail until his arraignment before a judge, who decides whether or not to grant bail, and even when the latter is granted, it very often happens that the required amount of cash cannot be raised and handed to the cler kof the court, in which case the man must remain in prison for weeks and even months. Very often the man is acquitted because the evidence is insufficient and does not warrant a trial.

If the principle invoked to blame the government and accuse them of having transgressed the provision of the magna charta were carried to its extreme—which seems to have been the desire of some people in the past few days—such cases of detention would no longer be possible and no one could be kept in jail under circumstances such as those I have mentioned.

That is why, I believe, such an unjustified storm was raised. I was very much surprised to hear those who had no right to protest voice the strongest objections.

I remember very well that last fall, when the government presented a motion—bill 15, it was—to extend the War Measures Act, some hon. members were opposed to granting such wide powers to the government; and

everyone recalls also how my motion to have the bill set aside could not be voted on for lack of support.

Is the government to be blamed if, having secured the necessary powers to enact P.C. 6444 of October 6, 1945, they invoked those very powers to act as they have done in this spy probe?

Mr. Speaker, if the government and more particularly the Minister of Justice are to be commended for the way they have dealt with this matter, we must not forget that our present difficulties are nevertheless due to neglect on the part of the government.

I cannot but recall the obvious sympathy which has existed in recent years between the liberal party and the communist party in Canada.

Mr. LALONDE: That is not so good.

Mr. DORION: I remember that after the 1935 elections, when the liberal party was returned to power, one of its first steps was to repeal section 98 of the Criminal Code. Perhaps that section did not constitute a sure means of preventing what is happening to-day but surely it was a serious obstacle to the dissemination of communistic propaganda. I remember also that in 1937-1938 the Quebec provincial government, then led by the hon. Maurice Duplessis, had the Padlock Act passed by the Legislative Assembly. How vehemently have the members of the liberal party protested against that law. It was claimed then that the Hon. Maurice Duplessis was acting like a dictator. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it was another means of preventing the dissemination of subversive and communist ideas.

Mr. LALONDE: Did it succeed in preventing it?

Mr. DORION: This marked sympathy between the liberal and communist parties became even more pronounced during the last general election. In a review published by the communist party, in July, 1944, there was an article by Fred Rose, the hon. member for Cartier, from which I quote the following:

> Ten days ago, Tim Buck, national leader of the Labor-Progressive party, submitted to the labour movement and to the country a project for the coalition of liberal, agricultural and labour forces, with a view to solving essential national problems.

And a little further:

> I have supported the speech from the throne outlining the programme of the King government for 1944. It definitely implied the adherence of Canada to the Teheran agreements, and announced a comprehensive programme of social reforms and plans for the post-war period. In regard to all major questions, that speech met practically all the requirements and immediate aims of the labour movement. It behooves the labour movement to cooperate with the liberals and with all patriotic forces in the struggle for the implementation of those plans. During the debate I advocated a union of all liberal and labour forces, to form the nucleus of national unity, to hasten the implementation of the plans submitted and to ensure their fulfilment.

Mr. LALONDE: Was this agreement approved by the liberal party?

Mr. DORION: I say to the hon. member for Labelle that I know that one day the communist party offered to cooperate with the C.C.F. party, but the latter immediately rejected the offer. I have never heard that the leaders of the liberal party had rejected such an offer of cooperation by the communist party.

Mr. MARIER: The right hon. the Prime Minister has done so.

Mr. DORION: Mr. Speaker, not only have the government displayed this measure of sympathy which I have mentioned, but through their negligence and their laisser faire attitudes, they have allowed the dissemination of communist ideas.

Mr. LALONDE: There was the Padlock Act to prevent that.

Mr. DORION: There was the Padlock Act, but if it was not applied by the Attorney General of the province, it is because, in 1939, the Liberal party was in power. It is probably the reason why the Act was not enforced.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, this laisser faire attitude was favourable to the steady dissemination of communist ideologies. I recall, for instance, that after the death of Louis Francoeur, a commentator of the C.B.C. on the French network, and a respectable man who enjoyed the esteem of his fellow-citizens, on several occasions his successors have expressed views echoing the communistic doctrine and they had thus instilled that communist poison into our homes. Although some prominent men have called the attention of the authorities to the unabated campaign of propoganda carried on by communists, the government did not deem it proper to take action.

I have here *Le Droit* of May 31, 1944, and I find the following on the first page:

> The Communists Are Very Active in Canada, says Mr. Kirkconnell
>
> Montreal, May 30 (CP).—Mr. Watson Kirkconnell, of Hamilton, Ont., stated yesterday before the annual meeting of the Royal Society of Canada, held at the University of Montreal, that "in so far as the communists in Canada

are concerned, the dissolution of the Comintern has been followed by an unparalleled renewal of activity.

"Instead of calmly disbanding, he said, the Communist party, under its new name of Labor-progressive, has launched a campaign in its own country."

It is clearly demonstrated today.

A violent Marx-Lenin propaganda campaign is flooding Canada at the present time, he said.

Although the Labor-progressive party, whose national leader is Tim Buck, of Toronto, publicly professes to be on good terms with capitalism and although it dares blame the C.C.F. for its socialist tendencies, at the same time, it distributes revolutionary literature all through Canada, said Mr. Kirkconnell.

Mr. LALONDE: What about the padlock legislation of Hon. Maurice Duplessis?

Mr. DORION: There is more, Mr. Speaker. Not only has the present government allowed this propaganda, but I claim that they have even encouraged it by certain official publications. Here is one entitled *Chronique ouvriere,* French, and *The Labour Facts,* in English, and the preamble of the first number, dated February 15, 1944, states very plainly what it is all about:

Monthly information service on the part played by labour in the war effort, supplied to the Canadian labour press by the Wartime Information Board, Ottawa.

This is indeed a government organization.

All the following information may be copied or reprinted according to the needs of the various newspapers.

This first number of February 14, 1944, contains the following:

Canadian-Soviet Exchange of Labour Information

All the Canadian labour unions earnestly welcome the suggestion of the labour representatives at the national council for Canadian-Soviet friendship, who have proposed an exchange of questions and answers between the labour unions of both countries. The project has been approved by both the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada and the Canadian Trade Congress.

And a little farther on:

Representative groups are organizing local committees in a certain number of communities. Through the national council and these local committees, the labour unions may obtain Soviet films and photos illustrating scenes of current life in the Soviet union, posters displayed in factories, books and publications on various aspects of Soviet activities.

This is quoted from a federal government official publication of February, 1944. From another issue, dated June 15, 1944, I quote the following excerpt:

USSR Workers Learn More About The Canadian War Effort

The workers of the USSR are getting a better perspective of the Canadian labour movement and the part it plays in the current war. Through the national council for Canadian-Soviet friendship, organized with the object of promoting better relations between the two countries, the Canadian labour unions are entering directly in relation with the corresponding unions in the USSR.

And again:

Besides organizing this exchange of communications between the labour movements in both countries, the national council supplies the unions of our country with authorized speakers, films, photos and literature on the Soviet union.

This again is to be found in a federal government official publication.

I therefore contend, Mr. Speaker, that the government is responsible for the situation with which we are faced nowadays; to my mind, the government, in order to satisfy the current demands of our people, will have to go further than the inquiry now in progress and will have to do more than prosecute only a few individuals. A thorough investigation into the various departments of the federal administration is imperative, since it is obvious that the ramifications of the organization brought to light recently are far more widespread than those which have been uncovered so far. The people will be satisfied with nothing less than a comprehensive investigation which will make it possible for the government to sweep away everything which smacks of communism and communistic propaganda. I am confident that after such a clean-up, and I hope the present government will perform the task thoroughly, life in our country will once again be worth living.

Mr. GEORGES H. HEON (Argenteuil): Mr. Speaker, following a commendable custom, I wish to use his mother tongue, for which he no doubt holds a deep attachment, to congratulate the honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau) for the fluent delivery and the clearness of expression with which he has moved the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

Mr. LALONDE: Hear. hear.

Mr. HEON: My honourable friend has had the thoughtfulness of expressing to his compatriots from Quebec the gratitude of our western brothers for the help given to the western French radio station. There is much that could be said about that project which is so worthy, so truly Canadian, and so essential, and about the obstacles it has encountered among certain well-known elements whose true motives are easy to discern.

For the present, I shall merely emphasize that old Quebec, which ever "remembers", is not unaware of the true situation in which our French-speaking compatriots from other provinces find themselves, and that, in the

words of the old ballad "It always thinks of it and never forgets". Finally, and this will be my last word on this subject, so long as our compatriots can rely on the enlightened patriotism of distinguished men, and I may mention such names as Baudoux, Yelle, d'Eschambault, Beauchemin, de Margerie, Joyal, Denis, Paimchaud, Lacerte, Bernier, Beaubien, Marcoux and many others, there will be every reason to hope and rejoice.

(Text):

I fully subscribe, Mr. Speaker, to the traditional congratulations heaped upon the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address for the able and dignified way in which they acquitted themselves of their not inconsiderable task. The leaders of the various groups in this house must also be complimented upon the distinction and ability with which they discussed, and in some cases refrained from discussing, the grave issues and problems mentioned in the speech from the throne and with which this house must of necessity be confronted during the present session.

The speech from the throne reveals a sad truth in the following excerpt:

> The turmoil which has followed in the wake of war has created new problems for governments in all parts of the globe. The world is full of unrest. Hunger, privation and suffering have become the lot of millions.

To all the peoples of occupied countries who during the war listened, often at the risk of death, at their secret radios to our pledge that if they would believe in the righteousness of our cause and help us defeat the common foe, "all the men in all the lands would live out their lives in freedom from fear and want," these enunciations of fact are far from encouraging. Yet it cannot be otherwise. For six anguished years the nations of the world have literally drenched the earth with blood, drained their resources and reserves to the last ounce, sacrificed the finest of their youth, destroyed their places of worship, their institutions of learning, their hospitals, their museums, their manufactures and their crops. The supreme cruelty lies in the fact that those least responsible for such a shameful condition in the affairs of men, the women and children of these destitute lands, will suffer the most and pay the highest price. They may well ask themselves, as we all should, if that is really what our much-vaunted Christian civilization has brought us to, twenty centuries after the Sermon on the Mount.

Shall we, as after the first world war, remain drunk with the wine of victory, return to our egoistical complacencies and forget the price paid, or shall we restore and permanently re-establish throughout a terrified world those tenets of the Christian doctrine without which an enduring peace can never be signed, much less adhered to?

The answer lies with every one of us, and on this answer will depend whether we practice—and whether the oppressed nations will believe that we practise—what we preach when we say we are the champions of Christianity and freedom; or whether we have been and are prostituting these words to achieve our own selfish ends.

The masses of Poland, the Baltic states, the Balkans, Indonesia, India, Egypt, China and Iran must not be allowed to believe that the war has been fought for the supremacy of one of five imperialisms, or for the securing of "sanitary cordons" between one great power and another, or for oil for the lamps of the Kremlin, or for battleships, nor for the privilege of making cannons instead of butter, or for the liberty of spreading anti-Christian and totalitarian ideologies, or for creating powerful fifth columns, but solely for the maintenance of moral principles, liberty and decency in every part of the world.

We have been assured that Canada has emerged from the war with its international prestige greatly enhanced, and it is apparent that through our proposed commitments we have taken a deep plunge in international affairs. I am one of those who believe in truth, simplicity and frankness in the realm of external affairs. Our policy should, in the words of the distinguished internationalist Harold Nicholson, be as follows:

> Leaders in democratic countries should by all means in their power refrain from policies which are difficult to explain openly and in detail. The public understands principles, whereas it does not understand manoeuvres: and a foreign policy based upon ascertainable and avowable principles is more likely to recommend the ordinary citizen's consent, than one based in any respect upon ingenuity and adventure.

This citation should be given a place of honour in all the foreign offices of the united nations, particularly the big three, and more particularly among the Big Three in the following order, in view of its importance to themselves and the immediate necessity of allaying growing fear and distrust in their ulterior motives: the Bear, the Lion and the Eagle.

Peter Howard, the eminent author, has admirably defined the only foreign policy which can honestly and permanently be adopted by the Big Three, if world peace is to become something more than a pipe dream:

> The great powers must educate themselves to the conception that ther duty is to serve mankind rather than dominate it.

A newspaper clipping sent to me by a friend at Harvard, whose authorship I cannot establish, puts the question brutally but thoroughly thus:

> We don't need pious, well-meant preachments which only confuse further the present confusion. We want an honest, clear-cut answer to the question: On what grounds should permissions be allowed to others which we denied to Hitler? Efficient, working agreements must be reached . . . but on what terms? And at what price? We are dead against robbery, rape and murder whether by the Wehrmacht or by others. We condemn brutal absorption of small, helpless nations by Hitler or by anyone else.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, since Wendell Willkie's "One World" has come to be, since the atomic age is with us, Canada must play its part in world affairs, a part commensurate with its immediate means and essential needs, and within the margin of its own domestic security and welfare. As much as we must, through Christian charity, our duty to humanity, and self-protection, render help to others, we also have to discharge our duties towards our fellow-Canadians. There is a limit past which a nation of 12,000,000 people, boasting a national debt of $16 billion which must continue to increase with our contemplated commitments, cannot go. We must remember that a Canada whose citizens would be saddled with a back-breaking national debt, and ever-increasing taxes, thereby becoming discontented, would be a direct liability to the United Nations, and could not therefore render the help and services which are now pledged and expected from it. As compared with our good neighbour to the south, who is one of the Big Three, and apparently the biggest of them, we have undertaken a tremendous burden of international financing and obligations: on the proposed loan to Britain we are 3·5 times more generous than the United States of America. If the great republic wants to equal our contribution in ratio of population and dollar for dollar, it should lend $12,250 million without interest. For our friends to the south of us, who love to establish world records, this is one to shoot at! ! !

Apropos of the British loan, Mr. Speaker, I must candidly admit that I have not found amongst my constituents, nor in my province, and particularly amongst the farming and lower-income groups, that degree of enthusiasm which has become evident in certain quarters. To these of my fellow citizens who are not acquainted with the intricacies of cyclical financing, international obligations, and world responsibilities, and who are mainly concerned with making both ends meet in their own little family budget after income taxes have been computed and deducted, the proposed loan is more than a question mark.

I believe that on this proposed loan, as in any other important item of the country's policy, particularly foreign policy, the government should take this House and the country into its confidence. It is not the privilege of the rank-and-file Canadian to have access to the secret files of the ministry of External Affairs or the ministry of finance, nor has he the time or the training to study the curvaceous trends of international intrigues or politics. The popular saying, "no taxation without representation" should be extended to "no taxation without explanation", so that every Canadian will know in advance what is expected of him and will then be free to determine where his true course lies.

Perhaps if Canadians were told the true situation in Great Britain, its appalling financial position, its declining world trade, and the importance of maintaining, within the European sphere, sympathy and goodwill, the answer might be quite different. Why not put the cards on the table? Marshal Stalin has, without any scruples, in his answer to Mr. Churchill's speech. Mr. Bevin has, in answer to Vishinsky's accusation. Let that be the rule the whole way through!

Personally, and I owe it to my constituents, I am awaiting the explanation of the sponsor of the British loan bill before I form a definite opinion. I want to be shown that this loan will be to the best interests of Canada and world peace, that it will help convince the majority of the nations of Europe that they must choose between democracy and another regime, and that it will provide markets for our products and furnish work and wages to Canadians. But by all means let us have the truth, the whole truth, on this measure. Canadians love truth, but they hate half truths and deliberate lies.

On this proposed loan, I should like to quote an excerpt from an article by Henry Clay in the April 1946 issue of *Foreign Affairs*:

> The problem is the long-term problem which will still face the United Kingdom when the transition from war to peace has been completed—the problem of establishing a balance in external relations. The proposed loan itself is likely to be exhausted before the transition is complete, but the conditions attached to it will continue to have effect. By ruling out any policy of tying exports with imports bilaterally they will deprive British exports of a certain support they enjoyed in the thirties. Taken with article eight, section four of the Bretton Woods agreement, they subject British monetary policy once more to the requirements of convertibility which will compel a prompter balancing of imports than was necessary when sterling was inconvertible.

On the whole, then, the effect of the agreement is more to postpone than to ease this long-term problem of Britain's.

In all of these international issues one very important principle must not be forgotten: Canada is not in a more advantageous but rather a less disadvantageous situation than some other countries. It is a fact that we have not been invaded, nor have we been stamped with the immediate horrors of war. This is wholly due to the grace of God, our geographical situation, the valour of our arms, and the scientific certainty that planes must sacrifice distance to bomb loads. If we had been geographically situated where Poland is, who is there in the house to say that an eagle would not have struck us in the breast and a bear in the back? Let us not lose the sense of real perspective. We are not as badly off as some other nations; that is self-evident, and thank God for it: our territory has not been riddled, nor have our women and children known the fear of a heeled and ruthless enemy knocking at the front door. Thank God for that! We are not in the humiliating and demoralizing position of having to count on the generosity of other peoples for food, clothing or credits, nor are we, through immediate exigencies and physical needs, unfortunately forced to forget national pride and international prestige. Thank God for that!

But all these situations do not make our own position one whit better than it really is. Our war veterans full and successful rehabilitation is not yet achieved, and one has only to visit, as I do, the various branches of our veterans' associations to realize that. Our housing problem remains unsolved; one has only to visit any city or town in Canada to become convinced of that. Unemployment is too high for comfort, and it is not a feature of our economy that we can truly boast of. Our industrial reconversion from war to peace lags, and one has only to enter any store to find out the discouraging shortage of consumer goods. Finally, let one glance at the income tax schedules, and he will readily grasp what our financial burdens are. It is not unfair to say, then, that although we are not as badly off as some other countries, we still have plenty to do to improve our own situation, and the Canadian people will expect us to do so immediately.

Another great issue is occupying the minds of our people through the shocking revelations of the Taschereau-Kellock commission. Personally I feel that too much wrongful publicity is being given to the affair and to those involved. There has been such an orgy of pictures of the accused, portrayed in delightful and affectionate poses with their wives, that one would almost be led to think that some of the accused have hired Hollywood press agents. There is a grave danger that the ends of justice may not be served; and those of us here in the legal profession will easily understand what I have in mind. The accused have not yet been tried, and the twelve men who will decide their fate remain to be selected. With this flood of publicity it will not be easy to select jurymen who have not formed an opinion, and the defence will have an opportunity of challenging almost everyone on the jury panel. Further, the accused have not yet been found guilty, and my years of experience as Crown prosecutor have taught me to expect the unexpected verdict from the twelve "tried and true" men. With the flowing headlines and imaginative stories that are being circulated, the accused who may be acquitted will proclaim themselves martyrs to the cause of the proletariat, whilst those who may be found guilty will loudly proclaim that they were the victims of prejudice and persecution. Some restraint is in order; once the verdict is rendered, there will be time to come to conclusions and tell the Canadian people all that should be told on this highly disturbing matter.

If I may have your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by giving briefly my opinion on the contentious question of a Canadian flag. The various polls conducted amongst all sections of our people, and particularly our armed forces, have shown that an absolute majority deems it a matter of national pride that Canada should have a flag which it can truly call its own. The difficulty arises however in the choice of a proper, logical and true design, and the various sections of our people have expressed widely-divergent views. Some have shed abundant tears over the prospect that the union jack might be withdrawn from the design; others have championed the cause of the fleur-de-lis, but almost all have shown a particular inclination for the maple leaf.

I humbly submit that our true status within the Commonwealth suggests an honourable and satisfactory compromise. It is not the union jack which binds the peoples of the Commonwealth together, much less the fleur-de-lis. It is the allegiance to a common and revered crown which has given unity and strength through peace and war. It is our loyalty to the crown which has inspired us to take up arms and fight the good fight. Let it again be the crown that will bind all Canadians, of whatever origin they may be, together under a flag for which they will be proud to live, work and die. The most rabid nationalist

and the most fervent imperialist alike will proclaim their allegiance to the king of Canada.

I am not versed in heraldics, but I feel that a flag of sober colouring with a proud and large maple leaf in the middle, in the centre of which would be imprinted a large and distinctive crown, would meet with universal respect and approval.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): A week or more ago I spoke in this house and at the conclusion of my remarks moved an amendment to the address in reply to the speech from the throne. In that amendment, among other things, I criticized the agricultural policy of the government. A day or two later the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) spoke for the government and discussed some of the suggestions I had made; and he stated the present policy of the government. In the midst of his remarks he made one statement which indicated that I was taking a different view now, being a politician, from that which I had taken some years ago when I did not suffer from the disadvantages of that classification; and he indicated further that I was correct in the earlier days but that being in my present position, I am wrong now. In view of these statements, and in view of the importance of agricultural production in these days in Canada, as well as in the world, I felt it my duty to take up some of the time of the house this afternoon to deal with this particular matter.

My amendment to the address in reply to the speech from the throne, among other things, declared that the government had "failed to adjust their agricultural production plans to meet the altered conditions of the world's demands." In that address I said:

> The wheat acreage of western Canada can be increased by nearly four million acres by going back to the percentage of summer-fallow that was used prior to the time we started paying people not to grow wheat. We do not need to reduce the acreage that is being used for feed crops for animals.

In what I shall say this afternoon I shall deal chiefly with wheat, because under these circumstances it is of major importance in the world's food economy. I shall touch briefly on dairy products, and even more briefly say a word about the general position of agriculture in the Canadian economy.

Further on in that address I said:

> The acreage in fallow under pre-war conditions would be about fifteen or sixteen million. By going back to that amount of summer-fallow we can get three or four million acres more on which to grow wheat, which would give us thirty or forty million bushels; and in this way we will do much more to help correct famine conditions in Britain or somewhere else than will be accomplished by all the effort to save food—though I am not discouraging the government in that policy.

And I added this:

> Wheat farmers need to be allowed to get more of the world price if they are to seed three or four million acres of this land which will otherwise lie fallow this year, if they are to decrease the amount of fallow land from 19·4 million acres to about 16 million acres. All they have to do is, instead of summer-fallowing a hundred acres, to summer-fallow eighty and use the other twenty for crop.

The Minister of Agriculture has taken issue with this position. He defends the governments' policy of encouraging the summer-fallowing of some twenty million acres out of sixty or sixty-one million acres now under cultivation for cereal crops in western Canada, as contrasted with the use of a little less than sixteen millions for this purpose before the war. That is the general position.

To those not familiar with the practice of summer-fallowing, let me say that it is a practice that is developed for the conservation of moisture in farming areas with low rainfall. In western Canada last year, and for a few years previously, nearly twenty million out of approximately sixty million acres under cultivation for cereal crops in those three prairie lay fallow for the purpose of conserving moisture.

I wonder if the members of the house appreciate the extent of territory twenty million acres represents? I have here figures for the total improved farm acreage in each of the provinces of Canada. The nearly twenty million acres lying idle out there represent twenty-six times the total improved farm acreage in Prince Edward Island, twenty-four times the total improved farm acreage in Nova Scotia, sixteen times the total improved farm acreage in New Brunswick, twice the improved farm acreage of Quebec, fifty per cent more than the improved farm acreage of Ontario, twice as much as in Manitoba, over half as much as the improved total acreage in Saskatchewan, nearly as much as the total improved acreage in Alberta, and more than twenty times the total improved farm acreage in British Columbia.

I give these comparisons to show the extent of the territory which now lies idle. The question before this parliament and the Canadian people is whether it is wise to continue that proportion of land now lying idle when the world needs cereals for food, or whether it would not be wiser to reduce it to the neighbourhood of sixteen million acres; in other words, to summer-fallow four acres or a little more where we formerly summer-fallowed five.

In defending the government's position the Minister of Agriculture charged me with having one set of views on matters of agricultural policy when I was supposed to be an expert in that field, and another set of views now that I have become, to use his term, "a politician". He made clear that the views I formerly held were sound, and that the government, of which he is a member, was now following them in so far as this particular aspect of agriculture is concerned. He sought to leave with the house the impression that, being a politician, I had departed from my earlier sound views and that what I had to say now on this issue was not to be taken seriously.

I am speaking to this house to-day for two reasons. First, I want to answer the wholly unfounded charge that, as an agriculturist, I spoke one way in earlier days, and that now, being a politician, I speak another way. Second, I think it necessary in the nation's interest to expose the fallacies of some of the government's agricultural policies, particularly those with respect to wheat and dairy products. In doing this, I shall analyse the minister's address, answer his baseless charges with his own words, and show from the reports of his own department and the records of the government's bureau of statistics that his policy deserves censure and not commendation at this time, and that it should be altered to help meet the present emergency.

The minister in his address, apart from the several side issues he brought in, attempted to do three main things.

(1) He attempted to discredit the proposal I advanced that, in this time of food crisis, the summer-fallow acreage of western Canada might be safely reduced from 19,400,000 acres to about 15,800,000, and that an additional 3,600,000 acres be thus made available for seeding to wheat—an additional acreage five times the total of the improved land in the Province of Prince Edward Island. He represented this suggestion as being the view of "a politician" and that it differed from the views I held as an agriculturist in earlier days.

(2) The minister attempted to show that the increased production of farm products since 1940 was due to the government's policy of increasing the percentage of summer-fallow from about twenty-eight per cent shortly before the war to some thirty-three per cent in the years following 1940. To put it another way, he was critical of and rejected the suggestion that the acreage of bare summer-fallow in western Canada should in this emergency be reduced from the 19,400,000 acres proposed by the government to something less than 16,000,000 acres, or to be more specific, 15,800,000 acres. He saw no virtue in adding, say 3,600,000 acres that would thus be made available to the limited objective of 23,400,000 odd acres suggested by the government for wheat for this year.

(3) The minister's third main point was that the government in 1943 switched its policy from one of encouraging live stock production to one of encouraging a greater production of wheat. To use his own words:

> We did not wait until everyone over in Europe was shouting for more food before we changed our policy from one of encouraging the intensive production of meat and dairy products to one of increasing the production of wheat.

I propose to deal with these three main points the minister sought to establish. I shall deal also with several other misleading and incorrect statements he made. And I shall conclude my remarks with some general observations on the relationship of agriculture to the general economy of this country.

Let me deal first very briefly with the minister's main points. He attempted to throw discredit upon me by representing that I preached one agricultural doctrine thirty years ago and that I preach another now. In this connection I propose to show that he misquoted what I said in 1916 by omitting essential parts of what I did say. I am not saying that the minister did it deliberately; I am quite sure he would not do that. I shall show that what I said in those early years, and which the minister applauded as being sound practice for the farmers in the west, is exactly the same view I advance to-day, a view which he now says is both unwise and "political."

In connection with the minister's second main point, namely, that the government's policy of maintaining a higher than normal acreage of summer-fallow will increase the total production of wheat and other cereals, I shall show (1) that the policy of the government in this respect is not one that will increase total production but rather will decrease it; (2) that reducing the acreage of crops sown and increasing the acreage of land left summer-fallow beyond the percentage of pre-war days is a policy of decreasing production and not one of increasing production.

As for the minister's third main point, namely, that the government changed its views in 1943 from encouraging live stock production to encouraging wheat production, I shall show that the government's policies in this respect have been quite the opposite to what the minister now says they have been. I shall show that the recommendations of his own department similarly disprove his present contention.

I shall deal with the minister's comments on these matters in the order in which he referred to them in his address a few days ago. But first I wish to recall various incidents of the last few months.

First, the government held an agricultural objectives conference with the provinces in December last, at which it recommended no substantial change from the agricultural and food production policies of the preceding year.

Second, for a month or more, including February of this year, the minister visited Britain and parts of the continent; yet on his return he made no revision of the food production plans already decided upon.

Third, after waiting for many weeks for the government to come forward with a more realistic plan for meeting the emergency, I made a statement on March 8 proposing a programme of increased prices for certain agricultural commodities, particularly butter and wheat. In that statement I criticized the government for its inaction under the widespread conditions of food shortage in Britain, and famine and malnutrition in Europe and Asia.

Fourth, six days after my statement a belated announcement appeared in the speech from the throne that the government at last was taking cognizance of the situation.

Fifth, eight days after my criticism, viz. on Sunday, March 17—I see the Prime Minister smiling—and only one day before my address on the speech from the throne was to take place, the Prime Minister issued a hurried statement to the press concerning what was described as the government's plan to save more food and to export more of what we already have.

This sequence of events showed clearly the justification for the motion of censure I moved on the eighteenth instant. Then followed on the nineteenth the minister's defence to which I have referred.

I come now to the details of the minister's defence of the government in its failure to take appropriate action during this crisis. As I said, the minister's first effort was an attempt to belittle the views I expressed, by trying to show that one of them was different from a view I held and expressed thirty years ago, and again twenty-seven years ago.

In this connection he not only misinterpreted but misrepresented what I had to say. I repeat that I do not say he did it deliberately; nevertheless it had that effect. He omitted certain lines which were essential to his own understanding of the matter as well as the understanding of all those to whom he spoke or who might read his address. For instance, he read extracts from a bulletin which in 1919 while Professor of Field Husbandry at the University of Saskatchewan, I prepared for the Saskatchewan department of agriculture. The bulletin was entitled "The Summer-Fallow." It emphasized the necessity in dry areas of letting land lie idle or in "fallow" once in every two or three or four or five years, depending upon the climatic and soil conditions of the area concerned. After reading one portion of this bulletin the minister said:

> I am quite sure that the leader of the opposition will still agree that it is a good definition of what we mean by summer-fallowing. I would agree with it also.

Had he quoted other portions of that bulletin he would have obtained a clearer view of my conception of the place of summer-fallow in western Canadian agriculture. Instead, the minister proceeded to read from an article of mine prepared in 1915 and issued in 1916, entitled, "The Saskatchewan Crop Growers' Plan in War time." This article was published in "The Agricultural War Book", called "Production and Thrift," a publication issued by the dominion government in the war year 1916. The minister read three paragraphs from this article and then omitted three, one of which was essential to a proper understanding of the subject discussed. The consequence was that he not only led himself into a series of errors but completely misled this house and anyone who might read this portion of his address. The paragraph he omitted was as follows:

> We produced 10,543,796 acres of grain in 1915. We fallowed 2,043,841 acres of land and "broke" 729,553 acres of virgin prairie.

That was a total of 13,317,190 acres of land. This paragraph clearly shows that in 1915 over 13,000,000 acres of land were then in cultivation chiefly for the production of cereals. Having omitted to read this paragraph in my article the minister then proceeded to read another paragraph further on in it, as follows:

> Of the 10,500,000 odd acres that were cropped this year—

Referring to 1915.

> —very little has received any preparation for next year's crop. Under ordinary circumstances at least 3,500,000 acres of this land should be fallowed.

That is where the minister's idea of 33 per cent in fallow came from. But, Mr. Speaker, the 33 per cent of the land in crop in the year referred to was not 33 per cent of the total land in cultivation but only 26 per cent. Having omitted the pertinent paragraph I mentioned, the minister then proceeded as follows, in referring to the paragraph just quoted:

It will be noted that figure is very close to the figure stated by the leader of the opposition yesterday, being the government's idea of the proportion of the land which should be summer-fallowed.

That is in reference to the proportion of one-third. Then he continued:

But now that he speaks as leader of the opposition he thinks that figure should be lowered.

What I said thirty years ago, Mr. Speaker, was that one-third of the land in crop the previous year should be summer-fallowed, but one-third of the land in crop the previous year turns out to be only 26 per cent of the total acreage, not 33 per cent. This is where the minister's error crept in. What I said in 1916 was clear and specific. It was that of the 10,500,000 odd acres that had been in crop one year, 3,500,000 acres should be summer-fallowed the following year. That means nothing more or less than that one-third of the land in Saskatchewan that had borne a crop one year should be fallowed the next year. It does not mean that one-third of the total land under cultivation for cereals should be summer-fallowed every year, or that one-third of the land in the other prairie provinces should be summer-fallowed every year. Had the paragraph that was omitted by the minister been included in what he read it would have been apparent that there were 13,317,000 acres under cultivation and that 3,500,000 acres recommended to be summer-fallowed was not 33 per cent of that total but only 26 per cent.

From what I have said it will be clear to all that what I stated in 1916 is not different from what I said last week but, on the contrary, is almost exactly the same. I suggested in 1916, when discussing Saskatchewan conditions, not that 33 per cent of all cultivated land should be summer-fallowed but rather 33 per cent of only what had been in crop the previous year. This worked out in 1916 to be 26 per cent of the total cultivated land; and that is practically what I suggested a week ago as being desirable, having in mind the critical food situation facing the world to-day. But the government has succeeded in raising the percentage of land lying fallow in the prairie provinces from some 22 per cent in the twenties and some 28 per cent in the thirties up to 33½ per cent during the four years after it started paying people to put land into summer-fallow and not grow wheat. These high percentages in summer-fallow to-day do not arise because farmers think it is wise policy but because this government in two of those years paid farmers nearly $30,000,000. to increase summer-fallow, and because it spent another $20,000,000 to pay farmers to grow coarse grains instead of wheat. If 26 per cent only of the land were summer-fallowed instead of 33 per cent it would mean that some 15,800,000 acres only would be left uncropped rather than 19,400,000 acres, as proposed by the government. As I have said, this would leave 3,600,000 additional acres available for wheat, without in any way interfering with the government's present plans for the production of feed grains.

As hon. members will observe, this percentage of summer-fallow, 26 per cent, is exactly the same as I proposed thirty years ago in an article which the minister commended very highly. It is the same percentage that in the crisis of to-day I suggested to the government might be used now. This is the percentage of summer-fallow which would enable 3,600,000 more acres to be sown to wheat without reducing the percentage of fallow below that of the average of the fifteen pre-war years, and without reducing the acreage proposed by the government for coarse grains.

After reading further from my article of 1916 in the dominion government's "Agricultural War Book", the minister says, of what I had written:

That is sound policy, sound advice. It is just as sound in the year 1946 as it was in the year 1916, in fact, more so, because the land of western Canada to-day is thirty years older in cultivation than it was away back in 1916. We are in a position to-day where I believe the proper policy to follow is the policy that was indicated by the leader of the opposition during the period of the last war when similar demands were being made upon us as are being made now. They are demands for production over more than one year.

The minister thus commended my policy of thirty years ago. My suggestion of to-day is the same as it was then. I have never criticized farmers in some areas for fallowing half of their land. In some places in western Canada I would do it myself. I have done it on one of my farms. But under different conditions, a different rotation gives better results. All I am saying is that under these conditions of to-day we could get along with twenty per cent less summer-fallow than we have had in these recent war years. Farmers summer-fallowed more then because they were paid for two years by the government to do so. We can get an increased acreage to-day without reducing the percentage of summer-fallow below the amount the farmers themselves used before they were bonused by the government to change to another system. But the minister condemns that policy to-day because it is "political". Hon. members will know what conclusion to draw.

I come now to the second major point the Minister of Agriculture has sought to establish, namely, that by summer-fallowing 19·4 million acres out of 61 millions now under cultivation in western Canada, a larger production will be secured than if only, say, 15,800,000 acres were summer-fallowed. To put it another way, his contention is that with 41,500,000 acres in crop and 19,400,000 not in crop, (summer-fallow), there will be a greater production than if 45,100,000 acres are in crop and only 15,800,000 not in crop.

That is the problem the Canadian farmer is facing. That is the problem we face here in deciding what attitude we shall take with respect to encouraging them in their production plans.

As evidence in support of his theory, the minister referred to the average production of wheat in the years 1935 to 1939 when the percentage of land in fallow in the prairie provinces was about 28½ per cent, and compared it with the production in the years 1940 and 1944 when the average in fallow was about 32½ per cent. To use the minister's words:

The result was this—

referring to wheat.

—the average crop from 1935 to 1939 was 312,000,000 bushels and the average from 1940 to 1944 was 426,000,000 bushels.

That is his argument. He says, Let us summer-fallow more than before the war; let us leave more land idle—even under these critical conditions. A little further down he said:

I am suggesting that we did follow that policy of greatly increasing summer-fallowing and we got the best results we have had in the whole history of Saskatchewan.

In other words, the minister gives all credit for this increased production to the fact that in the latter period there were over 19 million acres per year in summer-fallow and a little less than 22 millions in wheat, whereas in the earlier period there were four million acres less in summer-fallow and about three million acres more in wheat. My answer is that there is no justification whatever for accepting such a theory on the evidence given. The fact is that in the more productive period of 1940-44 there was not only slightly more fallowed land and slightly less cropped land, but there was more favourable weather, there was no major attack from wheat rust, no extensive losses from insects such as grasshoppers and cut-worms, and the varieties of wheat grown were more productive than those available in the preceding period.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Let me give some details. In the 1935-39 period the rainfall averaged 16 per cent less than in the later period. In two years, 1936 and 1937, the sum of the rainfall in the two growing seasons was an inch less than in the one growing season of 1942. One year 1937 was the driest year ever known in the history of the west. In that year I believe Saskatchewan averaged only 2½ bushels of wheat, and large areas produced nothing. Considerable areas, even under summer-fallow, produced nothing. In two years of the 1935-39 period there was a rust epidemic which reduced the production by 160,000,000 bushels; in two years there was serious damage from cut-worms and other insects—grasshoppers, wire worms and saw fly causing a reduction of over 200,000,000 bushels. In one year, 1937, in July, the temperature reached 113 degrees in the shade, an almost all-time record for the prairie region. Whenever the temperature exceeds 100 degrees in the shade for any length of time, out there it means serious consequences to the wheat crop.

In 1942, on the other hand, the yield of wheat was more than three times the yield of 1937, and two and a half times the yield of 1936.

The fault with the minister is that he takes a given position, and then seeks superficial evidence to bolster it up. In this case he gives ne credit whatever to nature. He takes it all unto himself and to the government, for no other reason than that in one period heavier yields were obtained than in another. I have never before from the lips of any responsible minister heard such a nervy attempt to take unto himself and the government all credit for the weather, and for the relative absence of unfavourable conditions.

The simple fact is that the average yield of wheat in western Canada over a period of years practically always exceeds fifty per cent of the yield of wheat sown on summer-fallow. This means that in all the wheat-growing region of Canada, outside very limited areas where the fifty-fifty plan of fallow and wheat is advisable, the total production will be increased in those rotation systems which crop two-thirds of the land each year or three-quarters of the land each year rather than in those which crop only one-half of it each year.

This does not mean that it is always less economical to follow the two-year fallow system. There are some very dry areas where this should never be departed from even in an emergency, and there are other areas where it may be more economical than any longer rotation; but the fact remains that on the average of the areas where wheat is now

grown a greater total yield per farm is obtained where the land is cropped two years out of three, or three out of four, than where it is cropped only one year out of two.

All the facts of science and experimental tests go to indicate that the total production would have been considerably greater during the 1940-1944 period than it was had 25,000,000 acres a year been sown rather than the 22,000,000 that were sown.

To further bolster up his contention, the minister instances also the greater yield of oats and barley in the 1940-1944 period as compared with the 1935-1939 period. What he does not tell us here also is that the rainfall was less in the earlier period, that the acreage was less, that the damage form disease and insects was greater, and that nearly all of the oats and barley was grown, not on fallowed land, but on second, third and fourth crop land.

To climax his argument the minister says:

> If we had had the increase only in grain production it could be argued that by that policy you do not get more food than by following the other policy.

He supplements this statement by asserting that larger deliveries of hogs were made, more cattle were shipped, and more eggs and dairy products produced. Why he should advance this as an argument to bolster up his case seems incomprehensible. With 6,000,000 acres more of crop land in use in the war period, what other result could have been expected? With better pasturage from increased rains, a bigger acreage of feed crops, and the use even of wheat for live stock consumption, no other result could possibly have been expected.

The minister then follows with the ridiculous argument that this live stock production is an "addition" to these enormous amounts of grain. The obvious fact is that we do not have a double gain when we have large amounts of feed grains and a large live stock production. We can have either one or the other, but not both. Feed grains are consumed where live stock is produced. That is the price we pay for live stock. Obviously, when the acreage sown to feed grains and the acreage used for pasture and hay are all increased, the live stock must necessarily also be increased.

The minister says that by greatly increasing summer-fallow in 1940-1944, he got the best results that had ever been obtained in the whole history of Saskatchewan. The reason he gives for those good results I have shown to be erroneous.

There was another period in the history of the west when equally good acreage yields and better total results were obtained and the summer-fallow land was not then thirty-three per cent but only a little more than twenty-two per cent. It was in the period 1924-1928. In that period the seasonal rainfall was almost one-half inch less than in the 1940-1944 period. In the period, 1924-1928 wheat in the prairie provinces averaged 18·7 bushels per acre, as compared with 18·9 bushels in the 1940-1944 period. Oats yielded 31·5 bushels as compared with 33·8 bushels; barley, 26·8 bushels as compared with 26·8 bushels; rye, 16·7 bushels as compared with 13·9 bushels, and flax, 8·6 bushels as compared with 7·4 bushels. Yet in that period, 1924-1928, the area of summer-fallow was only 22½ per cent as compared with 32½ per cent in the later period. Had the lower summer-fallow percentage of the 1924-1928 period been used in the 1940-1944 period with its heavier rainfall, the total production in the later period, large as it was, would have been increased by whatever amount the five or six million extra acres would have yielded—an amount of approximately 50,000,000 bushels a year.

To conclude the discussion on this particular point, let me repeat two additional observations made by the minister. He says:

> That, Mr. Speaker, should be sufficient reason for believing that the wheat policy my hon. friend (Mr. Bracken) advocated back in 1916 was right. The policy advocated again in 1919 was just as right, and the only reason he is wrong now is that he is speaking politically instead of as an agriculturist.

I accept the compliment that I was right in 1916 and 1919, and from what I have said the house and the country both will agree that my position now is the same as then, and that the minister's policy, having changed from what he said was right, must therefore now be wrong.

His other comment was this:

> I submit again that I prefer to suggest to the farmers of western Canada that they accept the government's policy in connection with acreage in western Canada at the present time rather than the politically considered policy of the leader of the opposition.

From what I have said the house will know, and I trust the country will know, what value to place upon this gratuitous comment.

I come now to the third major point the minister attempted to make, namely, that the government switched its policy of encouraging live stock production up to 1943, and from that time on encouraged wheat production.

To quote the minister:

> That policy was carried on until the fall of 1943 and then a change was made.

A little further on he says:

So in 1943 we changed our attitude in the matter of production. We did not go to the conferences at that time and say "don't increase your wheat acreage any further".

Further on he says:

In other words, we believe that, up to date, we have followed a right policy in asking our people to produce greater quantities of wheat during the last two years than they produced previously.

Then he says:

We did not wait until everyone over in Europe was shouting for more food before we changed our policy from one of encouraging the intensive production of meat and dairy products to one of increasing the production of wheat.

That was the minister's story when he spoke to us last week. In this he assumes all virtue for such heavy production of wheat as we have had during the last three years.

I propose now to show that the record tells a wholly different story.

The dominion Department of Agriculture for several years past has held an "objectives conference" for Canadian agriculture when it attempts to plan for the following crop year. At these conferences the dominion department puts forward its views with respect to what acreages should be utilized for the production of different farm products, and what the objectives shoud be for other lines of production. Such a conference was held preceding the 1944 crop season; another was held preceding the 1945 crop season, and still another was held preceding the 1946 crop season.

Let us see what the minister had to say with respect to the production of wheat on each of these occasions. On page 4 of the departmental publication covering the objectives for 1944, there occurs this statement:

The minister stressed the need for maintaining a food tonnage output through 1944 and not only for the duration of the war but in the relief period to follow. Production of meat and other live stock products was particularly stressed, and undue optimism with respect to immediate improvement in wheat marketing prospects, the minister warned, was unwarranted.

I ask you: Does that look like encouraging wheat production, as the minister said a week ago?

On page 7 of the same publication of the minister's own department there appears this statement:

When speaking at the conference in support of the recommendation that no increase in wheat, acreage in Canada be encouraged for 1944, the dominion Minister of Agriculture cited the extent of remaining wheat surpluses and expressed the view that an average crop in 1944 on the same acreage as was planted in 1943 would provide Canada with sufficient wheat to meet the highest possible demand in the next two years.

Therefore the safest course of action would be to maintain present output of coarse grains and keep summer-fallow acreage at a high level so as to be in a position to produce more wheat if and when later required without further aggravating the present surplus position.

In these circumstances the objective for wheat in 1944 calls for 17·5 million acres, or approximately the same area sown in each province in 1943. On the basis of long-time average yields, this would result in a crop of about 280,000,000 bushels.

What happened? Was the minister encouraging wheat production then? The minister recommended 17,500,000 acres for 1944. The farmers planted 23,300,000 acres. The minister's department estimated a yield of 280,000,000 bushels for 1944. The actual production was 417,000,000 bushels. The minister did not encourage either a greater acreage or a greater production of wheat that year. The farmers nevertheless sowed nearly six million additional acres and produced 137,000,000 bushels more wheat than his department estimated for.

There is the record—the minister taking credit for increasing wheat production since 1943, and the evidence of his own statements to the contrary in each of the years then and since. There can be no other conclusion than that for such increase in acreage and in production as we have had in these last three years, the farmers of Canada and not the minister and not the government deserve the whole credit.

Turning now to the agricultural programme advanced by the minister's department for the 1945 crop season, what do we find respecting the production of wheat? On page 5 of the department's agricultural programme publication for 1945, in a foreword by the Hon. James G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture, appear these statements:

The agricultural programme for Canada in 1945 again emphasizes the production of live stock and dairy products.

Further down he says:

While a continued heavy demand for live stock products means indirectly a good market for oats and barley, the outlook for wheat, on the other hand, is less certain.

And a little further down he adds:

Taking these various factors into consideration and recognizing that we have reached, or are very near, the peak of production with available acreage and man-power, it seems desirable to divert as much land and labour to the production of feed grains as the production of live stock products will require. Accordingly, the programme outlined in this report suggests that in 1945 the area devoted to wheat be 20,700,000 acres in the prairie provinces, and a total of 21,5000,000 for all of Canada. This

would represent an acreage slightly less than was seeded in 1944. The remainder of the acreage devoted to grain in 1944 should go into oats and barley, leaving the area in summer-fallow approximately unchanged.

Does that look like changing his plans and encouraging wheat production?

On page 7 of the same departmental document there appears this statement:

In his opening address to conference delegates, the Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. James G. Gardiner, made particular reference to meats, dairy products and wheat.

An a little further on in the same paragraph:

Dairy production should be maintained at maximum levels but in the case of wheat, the supply is in excess of the anticipated demand for at least another crop year and no increase in production is advised.

This statement the minister's department reports him as having made with respect to last year's wheat crop. Can anyone interpret that as meaning that the minister had changed his policy and was encouraging wheat production?

The report of the "objectives conference" for the 1946 season, as well, indicates again that the government does not ask for any increase in the wheat acreage.

In 1944 the farmers did not accept his advice. They seeded 6,000,000 extra acres and produced 137,000,000 extra bushels.

In 1945 also the farmers did not accept his advice. Instead of seeding 21,500,000 acres, they seeded 23,400,000 acres.

And now in 1946 again he advocates no change in acreage for wheat even though the world is facing the greatest food shortage in the history of our time.

A week ago the minister said he was encouraging wheat production during these last three years. From what I have quoted of his attitude at the three conferences mentioned it will be clear that his attitude was quite the contrary.

I come now to the consideration of other views with respect to this matter. In referring to the statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a week ago Sunday, I shall not quote my own views but those of a newspaper that is a very close and intimate friend and admirer of the government, the Winnipeg *Free Press*. This is what it says:

To many people in Canada, this contribution to solving the crisis will seem somewhat inadequate, the reductions in civilian supplies trifling and the general "do-nothing" directive to the farmers a counsel of selfishness.

This is from the Winnipeg *Free Press* of March 22. It continues:

But, admitting these things and giving them full weight, the fact of world famine remains. Wheat is what will save human life and wheat alone; and without permanently damaging our soil or the long-run prospects of our export markets, more wheat can safely be sown.

A little further on:

In the circumstances Mr. Gardiner's attack on Mr. Bracken in the House of Commons on Tuesday was unfair. Mr. Bracken had urged the use of summer-fallow. Mr. Gardiner retorted that Mr. Bracken, when he taught agricultural science in 1916 took another view, and that he was now only playing politics. What Mr. Gardiner is playing we really do not know; but we fancy that if he were living in Europe on 800 calories a day, he would be glad enough of another slice of bread.

It concludes the editorial in this way:

How can we justify our present course either to ourselves or to mankind? We have, relatively speaking, everything. We have a daily diet unsurpassed by any other nation in all the wide world. We luxuriate in food. We squander it lavishly. There is a world famine, and what do we do? We reduce the amount of grain for whisky-making by half. We cut down our flour consumption by one-tenth. We do not permit any collections of money for the purchase of food because it may cause some inconvenience somewhere or other. We ought to be ashamed.

Those are not my words; those are the words of the Winnipeg *Free Press* referring to the policies outlined by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture.

I come now to the statement made yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon). He said:

There is some wheat being held on farms in western Canada, principally due to the present levels of income tax combined with the uncertainty of yields from the new crop to be harvested in 1946.

Then further on he says:

With this objective in mind the government has made an arrangement whereby wheat, which producers may not have intended to deliver at the present time, can be marketed and sold over the next three months, with cash settlement made at any time the producer may choose in 1946, 1947 or 1948.

That is a half-way policy. It will help to get out some of the wheat that is being held back for the reasons the minister gives, but it will not bring it all out. These farmers were concerned, not alone with their income tax on possibly heavy crops in a single year but with the price of wheat next year and the year after that. With the world price nearly $2 a bushel and this government requiring Canadian wheat to be sold at no more than $1.55 on the world market to Britain, a little more to some of the other small countries, and only $1.25 at home, I have no doubt that many of these men are expecting higher prices in the future and may be holding back wheat in order to take advantage of that. The minister may get some deliveries with his new plan but he will not get all. He can get delivery of all if he will do one of two things. Let him either

increase the price—or take his controls off wheat and allow the world price—or let him tell the farmers definitely that they will not in later years be allowed any higher price than he is allowing then to receive to-day. As long as there is a prospect of their getting a higher price later they will be tempted to hold the wheat back. I suggest that the remedy is to take some of the restrictions off and let the wheat be sold at least up to $1.80, if not at the present world market price.

I wish now to refer briefly to the dairy situation, to which I also made reference the other day. About three years ago the government established subsidies for dairy products, which subsidies have remained substantially fixed ever since except for seasonal changes. The result is that gross returns to producers of dairy products have remained fixed for the past three years, with one or two minor exceptions. Yet during the period when dairy returns were relatively fixed, dairy farmers' costs have been steadily rising. In western Canada feed costs have risen some forty per cent and farm wages have gone up fifty per cent. In eastern Canada feed prices, since December, 1942, have risen eleven per cent and farm wages have risen twenty-five per cent or more. Good farm labour is difficult to hire, and the result is that dairy production all along the line is decreasing rapidly. The turn came eighteen months ago, in the prairie region, when milk production started to decline. In this area the decline has been going on for eighteen months with no sign of a let-up. In eastern Canada the decline started six months ago and is gaining momentum. All lines of dairy production are falling—cheese, butter and concentrated milk products—and at the same time that production is falling the demand is increasing.

We now have 600,000 more people in Canada than a year ago. At the end of this year there will be another 200,000 more people in Canada than at present. Yet the government sits placidly by and does not seem to realize that price determines production. There is only one way to prevent the decline in dairy production from developing into a real crisis in the next twelve months, and that is to increase the return to dairy producers now.

The government has taken upon itself the functions of the free-price market. It controls the financial returns to producers through subsidies and price ceilings. If the decline in production is to be stemmed and turned into increasing production, the dairy farmers must have higher returns. The dairy products price and subsidy schedules need immediately to be drastically revised to provide increased returns to dairy farmers. Under the present dairy products prices, farmers will not continue to milk cows under conditions of dear and scarce labour, high feed costs, and the price of dairy products out of line with beef cattle prices.

I wish to thank the house for its attention. I will not take time to summarize what I have said. Most of the points I have tried to make the members will understand and, I hope, agree with.

As for the position of agriculture generally, let me conclude with these brief words. Agriculture has never had a square deal except in war. It has never had even an approach to a square deal during the life of the present government until the last three years. It is now entering upon a period of declining production under the government's restrictive policies: price ceilings discouraging production, income tax denying wages to certain members of farm families, failure to get labour back on the farm, farmers' costs mounting, failure to keep farm prices up to mounting farm costs. In general, farmers fear a return to the conditions prior to 1943, when one-third or one-quarter of the Canadian people living on farms never got anything approaching that proportion of the nation's income.

I wish to leave on the record a statement showing the cost of things farmers buy compared with prices of Canadian farm products. It is a table of figures, perhaps the house will permit me to put it on *Hansard*:

Index Numbers of Cost of Things that Farmers Buy and Prices of Canadian Farm Products*

1926-29=100

	Cost of things that farmers buy	Prices of Canadian farm products	Prices of Canadian farm products (adjusted)**
1935	77·4	62·9	....
1936	78·5	68·8	....
1937	83·6	86·3	....
1938	81·4	72·9	....
1939	79·5	63·7	....
1940	80·6	66·5	67·8
1941	91·3	75·6	79·4
1942	99·7	81·7	87·8
1943	104·3	95·0	101·5
1944	106·0	101·9	108·0
1945	107·3	104·4	109·6

* Index numbers from Dominion Bureau of Statistics converted to base period 1926-29=100.

** Price index of farm prices adjusted upward for agricultural price subsidies, W.A.R., P.F.I., wheat participation certificates 1940-41-42—and free freight subsidies.

Upward adjustments for each year as follows: 1940—2 per cent; 1941—5 per cent; 1942—7·5 per cent; 1943—6·8 per cent; 1944—6 per cent; 1945—5 per cent.

I should like to impress upon the house what these figures mean. They mean that except for the last three years, prices of farm products, including subsidies, have never, since before the war started as almost never in the history of the past, approached the level of the cost of things that farmers have to buy. The black line that hon. members see on the diagram I have here shows the cost of things farmers have had to buy from 1935 until the present time. The red line shows the average price of farm products. The latter was always lower until the last three years, except in one period 1937 when there was a wheat failure in the west. The price of wheat went sky-high for those days and thus brought the average farm price for that year above the price what farmers had to buy.

That is the position of agriculture in the Canadian economy. If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason more than any other that I find myself in the position I am in to-day. I realized that position—the inequity which agriculture had always had to bear. It is clear from this table and from the chart that during the eleven years reported, like all the years preceding, agriculture has never had a square deal until the last three years.

The provincial governments cannot correct these conditions; the dominion government can. I supported this governement for twenty years. On its agricultural and certain other policies including this very wheat price situation I differed with them, and so when the party I lead, in its platform in 1942, determined to try to get a square deal for agriculture and to start by raising the initial price of wheat from 90 cents to $1.25 I came with them.

The record for agriculture is that, except occasionally in war years, the price of things the farmers have to buy has always been away higher than the price of things the farmers have to sell. In general, farmers fear a return to conditions prior to 1943, when one-third or one-quarter of the Canadian people living on farms never got anything approaching that proportion of the nation's income.

I suggest that the government relax its price ceiling restrictions on farm products; that it remove such restrictions as limit the production of food, and, in some cases, perpetuate scarcity. Let it tell its price ceiling controllers to raise the ceiling limits on needed farm products, and let production increase to feed ourselves, to sell to the world and to help keep the hungry from starving.

In the meantime I would change the stupid policy which keeps the price of our export wheat forty or fifty cents below the world price, and either fix it at $1.80 instead of $1.55, or let the world price prevail until the shortage is corrected. I would increase at once the price of at least one dairy product, namely, butter. I would say to farmers: summer-fallow only four acres where you summer-fallowed five acres before; sow seven acres where you had planned to sow six acres, and thus make available thirty or forty million bushels of wheat, food enough to feed the whole population of Britain for at least a month.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that the main amendment should receive the support of the house.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): It was the intention of the members of this group to try to shorten this debate. That was our intention until this afternoon. When this debate opened, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) rose in his place and informed the house that as far as he and his party were concerned they were prepared to shorten the debate and to facilitate the work of the house in order that we might get down to specific items and try to do something about the pressing problems before us. Although he made that announcement he proceeded to tell us that he himself did not intend to carry it out. At that time he occupied fully two hours of the time of the house, and even then we were prepared to go along.

Mr. TUSTIN: The hon. member's party has had the highest percentage of speakers taking part in this debate.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The hon. member's party was the first to break the arrangement.

Mr. COLDWELL: We have taken three hours.

Mr. GILLIS: I do not mind the interruptions; they do not know any better. We were quite prepared to take the vote this afternoon, but we find ourselves in this position. The leader of the opposition takes the floor again and expects the members of this house who have something to say to provide him with an audience while he goes over the country on two or three more expeditions. So far as I am concerned—

Mr. GRAYDON: The hon. member is defending the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner).

Mr. COLDWELL: We shall tell you.

Mr. GILLIS: I am criticizing the man who asked the members of this house to try to facilitate the work and shorten the debate. Certainly he did not set a good example. That is why I am on my feet at this time exercising my right as a member of the house—

Mr. GRAYDON: That is not a good enough reason.

Mr. COLDWELL: It is a good reason.

Mr. GRAYDON: No.

Mr. GILLIS: —and make some contribution to the debate. I am going to deal with the subject matter that I rose to discuss.

Unlike the leader of the opposition I am going to try to be as brief and explicit as possible. I am not going to try to cover the whole country, Europe and all those other matters that have been gone over. Since 1940 I have sat in this house many times listening to the debates, and I have questioned whether many of the people who have been in public office for the last twenty-five or thirty years mean anything when they rise and make a statement. In viewing them at close range, and being in close association with them and listening to their statements and their taking another course within fifteen minutes, the wonder to me is that we still have a country, because their statements do not mean very much. I am thinking of the statements made a few moments ago by the leader of the opposition. I am not an agriculturist; I have read something about agriculture. I know something about the record of public men in this country for the last twenty-five or thirty years, and I cannot reconcile the statements made by the leader of the opposition this afternoon with the fact that in 1940 he was on the platform with the Prime Minister of this country (Mr. Mackenzie King) advocating Liberal policies and defending the very things that he condemned this afternoon. It leaves the ordinary layman in a kind of quandary. Do they mean anything? Will the statements made this afternoon hold good next year? Will the leader of the present opposition be a Liberal next year, a Conservative, a Progressive Conservative, or what tag is going to be on him? Will he stand up to the pronouncements made this afternoon? When a person makes a statement I believe he should mean it; he should follow it through. If the policies and principles announced in 1940 were good at that time I have not seen anything happen that should change them. It is exactly the same situation.

To get back to the speech from the throne, I wish to join with other hon. members in paying my tribute to the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. They made an excellent presentation of a bad case. I particularly wish to compliment the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg. Sitting here and listening to him making a statement, I thought it was statesmanlike, but during the course of his discussion I wondered whether I belonged to the same province or not, having in mind particularly his defence of the policies of the government in matters of rehabilitation, employment, prosperity and all the things that mean something in the everday life of the people of that province. I certainly could not accept his statement with regard to the way the policies of the government are working out at the present time.

I wish to say a few words about unemployment, because in the speech made by the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) he might lead the house and the country to believe that the 263,000 unemployed in this country at the present time—those are the registered unemployed; there are many not registered—were just a seasonal matter, and that most of these people would be out of work under ordinary circumstances at this season of the year. I wish to assure the minister and the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg that unemployment in Nova Scotia is not a seasonal matter. It is something that has been there for many years, something that will develop into a permanent situation unless steps are taken to correct it. I should like to draw the attention of the minister and the government to a statement made by one of their own officials, as carried by the Halifax *Herald* within the last couple of weeks. The statement was made by Mr. Michael Dwyer, who is at present regional director of selective service for the maritime provinces. He certainly did not say that the unemployment problem in Nova Scotia is a seasonal matter. He made the startling statement that some 60,000 will be seeking jobs by June of this year. I am going to read just a short extract from the newspaper report, in order that it may be on record for the minister to read and check up with his own officials, as to the problem in that province.

Mr. Michael Dwyer, who is the maritime selective service director and former minister of mines, declared in an address to members of the Halifax Commercial Club, that 60,000 Nova Scotians will be unemployed by June of this year. This number will be without work even though all wartime factories were to be reopened and employment made available as in 1939, which was considered to be the province's top year. Mr. Dwyer also revealed an unpleasant fact when he said that an average of 15,000 young people each year leave this province in order to seek employment elsewhere.

I should like to focus the attention of the minister on this point. In 1939, when war broke out, there were thousands of young men in the mining districts and rural districts throughout Nova Scotia who never in their lives had the right to a job. They went into the services. While the war was being fought there was no expansion of industry in Nova Scotia or the maritimes generally. During the course of the war a few war plants were created, but immediately upon the cessation of hostilities those plants were closed. As I say, many of these young men who donned the uniform in 1939 and 1940 never had the right to a job; and despite all the promises made by the government that they were building a brave new world, and that these young men would come back to all the things they did not have in the thirties, everyone of these men is coming back to exactly what he left in 1939. There is nothing for them except their gratuities; to live off them as long as they can and then, when the gratuities are gone, to find themselves exactly where they started in 1939, after fighting one of the worst wars in the history of this world. So that in reality the gratuity is not something given for service rendered; it is merely an interim payment of relief until such time as they go back on the regular relief rolls. That is about the only way to classify it.

The situation in that province requires that something should be done immediately. It is not good enough for the minister to rise in his place in the house and be optimistic about the picture, depending upon something happening. Something should be done at once. There are many things that can be done. For example, there is the strait of Canso project. The facts, figures and everything have been gone into; it has been discussed in this house in season and out of season. Back in 1942 the reconstruction committee recommended it, and it should have been commenced. If that one project alone had been started a year or so ago it would have taken the edge off the unemployment problem, temporarily at least; it would have been something for two or three years, and would have given us an opportunity to look around and see what else could be done. Many public works projects could be commenced in that province. Money has been appropriated for them; the contracts have been let, but still nothing is done.

The question of materials has been raised. We are told they cannot get the materials. Why not? I have an opinion on that point, and I am going to state it. Every speech that comes from the opposition ranks here is directed to the removal of price controls and the elimination of the excess profits tax. In my opinion, the manufacturers and those who supply materials in this country to-day, whether it be lumber, shirts, socks—which you cannot buy—are on a sit-down strike, exerting pressure on the government to have these controls removed. That is my honest opinion. Go back to 1939; were not the same methods employed then? A bill was passed in this house writing in a profit limitation on war contracts. That statute was suspended by order in council, and when the Minister of Munitions and Supply was questioned as to why that had been done he told the house quite frankly that for months he had tried to let war contracts to the industrialists of this country, when our backs were to the wall and we required more materials, but he could not get them to accept war contracts until the profits limitation was removed. In my opinion, the same thing is going on to-day. In the field of housing you are not going to have houses built for the same reason. I believe the shortages in this country are artificially created. I believe the manufacturers are using the same methods they used in 1939, by withholding materials, creating unemployment, and having everyone sing the swan song with all controls, hoping for their removal and the removal of the excess profits tax. When that is done, in my opinion there will be no difficulty in getting materials in this country, and the things necessary to start our economy rolling in the right direction to supply peace-time needs. Personally I hope the government has sufficient back-bone to examine that problem realistically, because as a worker who suffered during and after the last war I know that if price controls are removed to-day and we are thrown into the hands of free enterprise as we were in the thirties, the people of this country are in for a terrific licking during the next few years.

I mention that just because someone has to face up to it, and the government must accept their share of responsibility. During the war the government planned their economy. They allocated their materials; they fixed their prices and directed the whole economy of this country for war purposes. As soon as the war ended, however, they said that free enterprise was going to do the job, so they sat back and passed it over. Now no one is carrying the ball, because the other fellows are sitting back and doing everything they can to embarrass the government, because they want to get back to the place where they can extract the savings the people built up during the war, and get the prices they want for everything. This procedure of shadow-boxing with the problem of building houses and

of supplying the necessities of life is not enough. The government is not facing up to the problem.

The official opposition, in my opinion, are simply the agents of the big industrialists, and are being used as pressure groups in the house in order to force the government to relax controls, so that industry may have unrestricted opportunities in the future to exploit the people.

What do the big fellows behind the scenes think about all this? An editorial which appeared in the *Labour News* of December 24, 1945, would give some indication. This is the official organ of the workers' educational association, a well-informed organization. This editorial quotes from the upper strata behind the scenes and, so that we may have a better understanding of the people with whom we are dealing, I shall read what is stated here.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Where was it published?

Mr. GILLIS: In Toronto.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That explains it.

Mr. GILLIS: This is a well-informed organization, comments of which are often quoted in the house. The editorial quotes these words of William L. Kleitz, vice-president of the Guaranty Trust Company.

> I think that depressions are inevitable under the free enterprise system and that the best we can hope to do is to limit their depth and their duration.

Here is another good one, quoting the New York chamber of commerce:

> Depressions are the price we pay for freedom.

Here is another good one, quoting John W. Scoville, former chief economist for the Chrysler Corporation:

> If the people living in slums don't like them, let them move out. Some people like to live in one-room shacks. There is no solution to this problem. Certainly industry doesn't intend to attempt the impossible. . . . One of the worst of current fallacies is that everyone has the right to a job.

And another good one, quoting Walter Lippmann:

> The underlying fact is—to put it bluntly—that in reaction against the consequences of excess employment there is a patent desire in the great middle mass of the people for enough unemployment to reestablish their lost bargaining position and to restore industrial discipline. This reaction is particularly strong, of course, wherever the war has changed the relative bargaining power of negro and other racial minorities. . . . The attitude of employers . . . is in substance that they must not and need not make bad bargains now since they will be able to make better bargains later on. For a little later on, there will be more men than there are jobs, and there will also be no more price ceilings.

These are the people who want the removal of price controls. These are the people who want to have wages frozen, so that they may keep standards low and build the ranks of the unemployed to the point where there will be three men for every job. That is their basic philosophy—the philosophy of free enterprise. These are the people to whom the government is catering at the present time, and for whom it is removing controls from the very necessities of life, to a point where in Canada to-day the dollar has lost about fourteen per cent of its purchasing power—and all this since the cessation of hostilities.

So that at the present time the trend is downward. Income is of no use to anyone, if someone else is allowed to take it from him by back-door methods, or in the ways proposed by those gentlemen whose opinions I have just placed on record, and for whom the official opposition are, in my opinion, acting as a pressure group in the house, to get back the sort of thing we had in the thirties.

I should like now to say only a few words to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). On several occasions in the house he has expressed his complete belief in cooperation between labour and management, and he has expressed approval of the setting up of industrial councils, and all that sort of thing.

It is all very well for the minister to speak in that way in the house. However, I would draw to his attention a matter of some concern at the present time. The steel industry in this country for some time has been seeking an agreement. I know the plant in Sydney has been trying to renew its wage agreement for the past two years. They have been patient, and are still patient. The steel companies of Canada have taken the position that they must have an increase in the price of steel. According to last Thursday's issue of the *Financial Post,* a delegation from the steel companies waited on Mr. Donald Gordon, at which time Mr. Gordon informed them that there would be an increase in the price of steel, and that such increase included a provision for an adjustment of wage rates in the steel industry, for the benefit of employees of steel companies.

When he was questioned as to the extent of the increase he replied that the steel workers would go to the employers for purposes of bargaining. The position is that while representatives of the government will meet with the steel companies and will make available to them certain subsidies so as to increase prices, the steel workers' unions are not permitted to take part in these arrangements.

Money is given to the steel companies. The unions are placed in a position where they must bargain with employers, and pass through all the ramifications of war labour boards, and all that sort of thing. The position is absolutely unfair. I believe that when public funds are being used to subsidize an organization for certain purposes, all who are interested in or concerned with the arrangement should be called in for purposes of consultation.

I suggest that the Minister of Labour should consider calling together the steel workers' union, a great national organization, which embraces the whole of Canada from coast to coast. Officials of that organization should be called to meet with officials from the steel companies. They should be permitted to sit down together to find out exactly what can be done by way of cooperation to improve not only the industry but the working conditions of employees in the industry.

I leave these thoughts with the minister because I believe that, despite his expressions in the house respecting cooperation between management and labour, he has failed to follow through when dealing with these organizations. The steel situation is a glaring example of this fact.

I should like to conclude by stating that at the last session of parliament the leader of this group placed before the government six simple proposals, none of which would cost very much to apply, certainly not nearly as much money as many of the boards functioning to-day which are cluttering up and confusing further already confused issues. I suggest that the government should carefully consider these proposals, the first of which was as follows:

(1) That there be a lay-off or severance pay to provide twenty-five dollars per week for all displaced workers until they are reemployed.

That applies to war-workers and service personnel. And then:

(2) That discharged veterans be paid full pay and allowances until reinstatement in civilian life with the same minimum of twenty-five dollars a week.

The government is wasting much more money than that to-day in administrative costs. Then:

(3) That in order to maintain the purchasing power of Canadian farmers floor prices for agriculture be extended and continued.

(4) That we have legislation to protect workers' and farmers' equities in their homes and to prevent evictions and foreclosures.

Many people who accepted obligations by taking homes during the war, now find themselves unemployed. They are now faced with the possibility of losing those homes. Then:

(5) That immediate action be taken to raise wages in industries frozen at sub-standard levels.

(6) An extensive public low-rental housing programme which will provide both large-scale employment and urgently needed homes.

As I said a minute ago, if this simple programme were followed out, and if some of the money put into boards across the country to-day—boards that are tangling and twisting things, because of their red tape—were spent on this type of programme, we would have something worth while done in the country. We would have done a job which is not being done to-day.

Another thing that should be done and done immediately—and this matter comes within the purview of the Department of the Minister of Labour—is that at this session of the house the government should, in my opinion, fix for everybody in this country a basic minimum income below which no one should be permitted to work. That, I think, is fundamental. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I had to take this amount of time but you can blame it on the leader of the opposition.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. V. GRANT (Kings): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to throw any bouquets at this late stage of the debate, but after reading the speech of the Tory member for Queens (Mr. McLure) I decided that I would have to make a few remarks. In congratulating the mover of the address (Mr. Viau), the hon. member for Queens praised him for his excellent French, but he did not compliment him on his English. I wish to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Queens is about as well qualified as I am to congratulate anybody on their French, and I am not qualified to do that. He did not congratulate him on his English, and I now take the opportunity of doing so for Prince Edward Island. I wish also now, since I am complimenting people, to congratulate the seconder (Mr. Winters), because, for one reason, he is a maritimer, and secondly, because he looks like my own boys, and he did an excellent job. I am not going into details.

I cannot agree with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) in his idea of shortening up debates in this house. I do not speak much myself: I have not been in very good health lately but I am all right to-night. The

leader of the opposition did not set a good example, because he read two long essays on how to shorten the debate.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Do not read yours.

Mr. GRANT: I do not intend to read mine. I have never done so.

Mr. BROOKS: You have never spoken.

Mr. GRANT: I have only a few guiding notes. The interrupter across the way reminds me of a little story. It was the time the Tories were in power here, during the last two years of the Tory regime.

Mr. TUSTIN: How about the tunnel?

Mr. GRANT: Coming up to the House of Commons, members would be asked for nickels and dimes by people who were hungry. That was in the last two hungry years of the Bennett regime.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): And when your leader said, "not a five-cent piece."

Mr. GRANT: A member was coming up here one day and, on meeting one of these boys to whom he was accustomed to giving a quarter, he automatically put his hand in his pocket to get a coin, but when he got near the fellow he noticed his face was all blackened up. He said, "Are you the man I generally give a quarter to?" The man said, "yes". The member said, "What has happened to you?" The man said, "To tell you the truth, mister, I was talking when I should have been listening." And what I have to say to my hon. friend across the way is, he should be listening instead of talking.

The leader of the opposition wishes to hasten things. He is somewhat like his friend Mr. Drew; he is watching which way the wind blows, and then at an opportune moment he trims his sails accordingly. I happened to go to church on Sunday. There was a mission going on, and when the time came for the sermon and the preacher stepped into the pulpit I saw that he was a young man from my own home parish, a missionary. He got talking about this business of hastening. Everybody, he said, is hastening to do this, that and the other thing—hastening to get up, hastening to get a cup of coffee, hastening to get to work; they are hastening to catch everything and have no time for prayer, and "finally", he said, "they will be hastening to catch the hearse." I thought the remark was very apt.

Between 1935 and 1945 the Conservative party had no representative from Prince Edward Island in this house, and they appointed a man from York-Sunbury by the name of R. B. Hanson to look after the Tory interests of the island. He did so with a vengeance. He complained bitterly and continuously about the transportation, he kept it up day and night, and then, when anything would be gotten for the island—which he knew nothing at all about—he would claim that it was on account of his speeches that we got something for the island. Now the hon. member for Queens is taking Mr. Hanson's place, but I tell you one thing, sir, he can never fill Mr. Hanson's shoes, because he could not be so contemptible.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That would not be said if he were sitting in the house.

Mr. GRANT: During the last election campaign Mr. Hanson came over to speak in my constituency, and he spoke at Souris.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Which Souris?

Mr. GRANT: Prince Edward Island. I will say this, that my opponent was a gentleman, and he made, I understand, a splendid speech, but Mr. Hanson when he rose to make his speech said he could not understand the mentality of the people of Kings in voting for a man like Doctor Grant. He said that to look at him across the floor of the house was enough for anybody. And there was an old gentleman in the hall who told the candidate, "Mr. MacPhee, you made a lovely speech to-night, but your friend Mr. Hanson made a lot of votes for Doctor Grant." I did not hear anything about this at the time. I became sick two weeks before the election was over and I did not hear this story until months afterwards, because I was in the hospital.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Incommunicado.

Mr. GRANT: I was telling my wife about it, that he had said that to look at me across the floor of the house was enough for anybody. So she said, "Look, dear, don't mind the old toad; your looks are the best of you."

I wish now to come to another matter. These are pretty light matters I have to deal with to-night, because I am answering the Tory member for Queens. I come to the question of Prince Edward Island being left off the map of Canada. I understand the hon. member insinuated that it was the fault of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon). But there is a history to this, and I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, why my opponent considered it a bad omen. In 1935, when R. B. Bennett held on to office to the last minute he decided to change the name

of the Tory party to the Reform party. No one listened to him very much because most people intended to vote against him anyhow, no matter what he called the party. He issued a booklet about the size of that, with a blue cover on it, and on that cover there was a map of the Dominion of Canada and Prince Edward Island was not on that map. My hon. friend remembers that joke because I blazoned it all over the country, and he himself at that time was defeated most disastrously. He almost lost his deposit. That is why he thinks it is a bad omen for Prince Edward Island to be off the map. As one of the daily papers said to-day, however, it is not necessary for Prince Edward Island to be on the map. Prince Edward Island is so well and favourably known all over the world that it is not necessary for it to be on the map at all.

I have to call my hon. friend, "the Tory member for Queens" because Queens is a dual constituency and I do not know whether he or the other member is the senior member. He was here from 1930 to 1935 and was then defeated; the other member came in in 1937, and now I do not know which of them is the senior member. Therefore I shall have to call my hon. friend the Tory member for Queens. This gentleman sat in this house for five years, almost six years, under the Bennett administration and was never known to raise his voice in the interests of transportation.

Mr. McLURE: Oh, yes.

Mr. GRANT: Hold on now; I will tell you. During that time two branch railway lines in my own constituency were closed entirely, scuttled by the Bennett government, and mail routes were established over those lines, but the Tory member for Queens never objected to that. The railwaymen's pay was cut 10 per cent or more; even the poor sectionmen's pay was cut, and the pay of civil servants was cut down; but the Tory member for Queens never objected, not a bit. He crawled before the feet of Lord Bennett and it was a hard job for him because he is pretty stout, like some of his colleagues.

We know why Bennett stayed on the gold standard. I am not an expert on these matters, but it was simply to enrich his millionaire friends. Although a poor man could not borrow $25 from a bank during those five years, there were more millionaires made in Canada than during any other five years since confederation, and a million people were on relief at the end of it. Do you know, Mr. Speaker why the Tory member for Queens is always called to order? He does not know the rules of this house and he is called to order every time he opens his mouth, and why? Not because he is a Tory; not at all. Our Speakers are more favourable to Conservatives, as far as assigning rooms is concerned anyway. He was here for five years and yet he does not know the rules of the house. He did nothing during those five years—nobody did anything but Bennett—and now he comes back into the house after an absence of ten years, during which time he should have been studying the rules of the house, and he knows nothing. Those are the facts.

Mr. GRAYDON: Do not run down Prince Edward Island.

Mr. GRANT: There are not many Tories in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. GRAYDON: The by-elections in the province do not show that.

Mr. GRANT: I shall have to tell another story and it will be a better one the next time. I am not through yet. I wish to point out another thing to the Tory member for Queens, and I am sorry to have to say it right here: he should thank the Liberals for the fact that he is sitting in this house to-day. Queens county is a dual constituency, or a twin constituency, but the two Liberal candidates were not twins. That is why he is sitting over there. We know all about it in the island, and I warned them about it, but as between the two Liberals it was a case of the survival of the fittest and that is the truth.

An hon. MEMBER: He is the fittest.

Mr. GRANT: I am talking about the Liberals.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member who has the floor to address himself to the Chair, and to hon. gentlemen who are interrupting I would appeal for order.

Mr. GRANT: My hon. friend the member for Queens is a friendly, nice fellow. He is all right. But he said that in the speech from the throne there was no provision for the jobless. I do not think a Tory member sitting there, who sat in this house from 1930 to 1935, should ever mention the word "jobless", and I do not see where the jobless are in our province. There are no jobless in our province. We are looking for help in our province and the hon. member knows it. There may be some young men home from the army, but are they in want? No; they are getting out-of-work benefits, which amounts to a good day's pay for them.

Mr. FRASER: They are still jobless.

Mr. GRANT: But they are not starving as they were when the Tories were in power. The people of Prince Edward Island did not starve while Bennett was in power, for this reason: They grew a good bit of stuff but they could not sell it and they had to eat it all. Prince Edward Island is God's own country. We have no Japs, no Social Credit, very few C.C.F.—

Mrs. STRUM: There will be more after a while.

Mr. GRANT:—and not too many Conservatives. Like his predecessor, R. B. Hanson, the hon. member for Queens takes credit for any grants that are made for Prince Edward Island. He says, "I made fine speeches last year and I got the whole lot." Well, the car ferry was under construction before he was ever nominated. Grants for the piers, amounting to $5 million, were all decided on before he was ever nominated to run in an election. The grants to the hospitals were decided on by the committee on hospitalization before he was nominated.

An hon. MEMBER: Which party?

Mr. GRANT: What party was in power in the last ten years? Why, the Liberal party, of course. We have been in power since 1935. All these things were ready before the hon. member ever came into the house. He also complains that we are not encouraging tourist traffic to the island. I should like to know how much he and his party encouraged tourist traffic to Prince Edward Island. Why, they did not have one piece of machinery for doing it. Since the Liberals came into power we have set up a tourist bureau. It is well equipped and under a good manager, and is advertising Prince Edward Island all over the world. That has been done only since the Liberals came into power.

Mr. FRASER: Pretty weak.

Mr. GRANT: Not too weak. The hon. member for Queens complains that they are charging freight rates on the car ferry. He quotes the dominion-provincial agreement which says there should not be freight rates. I think he wants everybody to get passes, if one can judge from the way he talks. He quotes the agreement with the Dominion of Canada, which says:

> That the Dominion of Canada shall assume and defray all the charges for the efficient steam service—

Mr. Speaker, they do not assume the freight charges; they assume the charges for the ships and the running of them for the conveyance of mails and passengers. It does not mention freight, but freight came in afterwards. There were no automobiles at that time, of course. I continue:

> . . . to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the dominion, winter and summer . . .

An hon. MEMBER: You cannot read very well.

Mr. GRANT: I cannot read as well as the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken). I continue:

> . . . thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial railway and the railway system of the dominion, and such other charges as may be incident to and connected with the services which by the British North America Act of 1867 appertain to the general government and as are or may be allowed to the other provinces.

Does it say in this quotation, Mr. Speaker, that the dominion government is to pay the freight rates? Let me go a little further and show my hon. friend's lack of knowledge of how things are going. He quotes himself. He quotes the questions he asked the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier), and this is one of the questions:

> I want the Minister of Transport to set the rate himself.

The minister replied that he could not do it. The hon. member for Queens should know that during the time his own party was in power the railway was operated by a board of railway commissioners. It was run by the board of transport commissioners just as it is to-day. The minister had no power, but he asked this question and he thought he was doing something. He then went on to say:

> Does the minister tell this committee that he has no authority over rates?

He should have known that the minister has no authority over rates. Why did he not know that? The minister told him that he had not, and he then asked:

> Does the minister mean by that, that the government cannot set the rates?

The minister, of course, said "no". It shows that the hon. member has had no interest in the welfare of his province or of Canada, or he would have known these things. If he did not learn between 1930 and 1935 he is too old to learn now.

He mentioned a name in this house that I have not heard a Tory member mention since I came here. He mentioned the name of R. B. Bennett. I have not heard that name mentioned by the Conservatives in this house since 1935; they are ashamed to do it. He said that Mr. R. B. Bennett made a survey of the cases and that he would do so-and-so. He then said that his leader had made a survey and that he had practical experience.

I should like to know what practical experience the leader of the opposition would have of the case. I have crossed there since I was a boy and I have no practical experience. The hon. member said that his leader would fulfil the terms of confederation—that if he had been elected he would have done it. That means that since last year he would have done the whole thing which all parties have been doing their best trying to do since confederation. Had this great man, who is now leading the opposition, got into power he would have done it in a year. If he should get in power to-morrow they would throw him out the window within twenty-four hours. We know that; his policies are not their policies.

He advocated a super highway from Borden to Charlottetown. He should be the last man to speak about highways, because the only highway built on Prince Edward Island, except one short one, was built by the Liberals. The one the Conservatives built fell to pieces. My hon. friend knows that and cannot deny it. It was no good. They did not have it properly engineered and drained, and it fell to pieces and has been a nuisance ever since. The Liberal government built hundreds of miles of highway throughout the province. What did the Tory party do for Prince Edward Island? How many potato warehouses did the Tory party build for Prince Edward Island? Not one. The Liberals built three in my constituency.

An hon. MEMBER: No wonder you got elected.

Mr. GRANT: If my hon. friend was a Liberal he would get as much as I get, but he could not get it from the Tories.

I wish to thank the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier) for what he has done. The Liberal party has built six boat harbours for the fishermen in Kings since 1935. That is more than has ever been done since confederation by all Tory parties. We are going to build two more this year. My hon. friend's speech is all baloney. What did the Tories ever build? After the Tory party was in power for five years, every wharf in my constituency was fenced off. The only wharf that was not fenced off was the one used by Hon. J. A. Macdonald, a Tory member. The remainder were all fenced off for want of repair, and had danger signs placed on them. We have since put all the wharves in good repair. They closed two branch railway lines in my constituency and my hon. friend never raised his voice against it. He now makes this famous speech at a time when the people are prosperous. The fishermen are prosperous and do not know what to do with their money. A fisherman and his son can go out and bank a thousand dollars a week. I saw it happen right in my own constituency, and under this Liberal government. When my hon. friend's party was in power the fishermen were starving and they would do nothing for them. As soon as we got into power we established the fishermen's loan board, to lend money to the fishermen to build new boats and we built fish houses for them. This has all happened since 1935. The fishermen were getting prosperous before war began.

I congratulate the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) on what he said. The Tory party are not over there for the good of the people. My private opinion is this: communism is the number one menace to Canada and Toryism is the number two menace.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered and well answered the Tory member for Queens. I have told him how he got here, and he should be thankful. I want now to say this. We all wish for peace; we hope for peace, and I for one, as perhaps one of the oldest men in the house, do not believe we are going to have any more wars. Let me conclude with the words of Robby Burns:

> For a' that, an' a' that,
> It's coming yet for a' that,
> That Man to Man, the world o'er,
> Shall brothers be for a' that.

Mr. JOHN T. HACKETT (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, there is an area in southeastern Quebec which in its interests represents very fully the entire dominion. There we find a completely balanced population. There are industrial centres in which factories have grown up and where manufacturing prospers. The countryside is devoted to farming, and almost entirely to that type of farming known as dairying.

Dairying is in danger of extermination; I wish to direct a few words to the house on that subject. At this time I need not inform the house that I am opposed to controls. I am an impenitent opponent of controls; if, however, we are to have controls I ask that they be applied in such a way as to do the least damage possible. The control of butter prices is threatening the dairying industry. At the present time the ceiling price of butter is thirty-four and a fraction cents a pound. There is a bonus or subsidy of ten cents a pound, which brings the maximum price received by the producer up to forty-four and a fraction cents a pound. The farmers find that this price, when considered in conjunction with the cost of operating their farms, buying what is necessary to feed their herds and engage help

when it can be found, is totally inadequate, with the result—and this is the tragedy—that the herds are being sold across the international border into the United States. There is an embargo on beef cattle; they may not be exported at the present time. This embargo, however, does not apply to dairy cattle. Within the last few months something like ten thousand head have gone across the border into the United States.

Despite the shortage of butter; despite the demand for butter, we find that there has been a marked drop in the portion of the total milk production devoted to the production of butter. In 1941 something like 52·15 per cent of the milk produced was devoted to the making of butter. But in 1945 the proportion of milk used for making butter had dropped to 46·08 per cent, and that drop has been increasingly pronounced since the beginning of this year. Therefore I am going to ask those who control prices, and determine what the farmer shall receive for his sole marketable product in that part of Canada, to lift ceiling prices under those controls sufficiently to permit the farmers to make a livelihood from the exploitation of their herds, so that they will not be forced to sell their herds, as they have been forced to do during the past couple of years and especially during the last few months, when the cost of labour and supplies essential to the manufacture of butter has greatly increased.

I may confide in you, Mr. Speaker, that if I had my way I would overnight abolish all controls affecting farm produce. I have heard it said that in that event butter might go to 75 cents a pound. Some people have said that it might even go to $1 a pound. Well, if it did, it would be one occasion when the farmer received something in the nature of equity for his continuous efforts. Within the recollection of all of us the farmer has sold his butter for 20 cents a pound and less; and if perchance he should find a short market for this commodity which would yield him a return that would make its production profitable to him, I submit that it would be an unusual experience and a very welcome one to him. The farmer resents controls. The farmer is the nearest thing we have to a representative of free enterprise; he is an extreme individualist, who depends upon his own efforts and his own enterprise in and out of season. We sometimes hear it said at election time that the farmer is the back-bone of the country. That back-bone has had to bear very many burdens of adversity and, one would almost think, of ill will from the present administration. When one sees the pernicious effect of these policies one cannot but deplore the fact that at the present time farming is subjected to these controls. If the controls on farm produce were lifted or abolished, prices of farm produce and of butter in particular, would increase and herds now being sold for export would be retained at home. We are eating the seed corn, and if we carry that story to its conclusion there are bound to follow consequences which will be prejudicial to the country at large.

At this stage in the debate I am not going to discuss other problems which, with propriety, might be debated at this time. I believe thoroughly, however, there is not an hon. member within sound of my voice representing a rural constituency—with the possible exception of those belonging to the C.C.F. party, who believe in regimentation, in controls and price fixing—who would not welcome relief from these controls on farm products.

I doubt if there is a farming constituency which does not look forward to the day when free enterprise will again be established, when the farmer will be able to sell his commodities at market prices and buy the implements he requires, without the let and approval of someone who does not understand his needs and who frequently is unsympathetic to his requests.

Mr. RENE HAMEL (Saint Maurice-Lafléche) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, when the last session opened in September last, the war against Japan had just ended a few weeks before and the air was still filled with the echoing joy of victory. Perhaps at that time no one would have ventured to throw a discordant note in those rejoicings. But to-day, six months after our last enemy has surrendered, this short-lived joy has given way to unemployment, with its accompanying ills, anxiety and fear.

The present session will allow the government to figure our losses and our gains of the past six years of war. Our liabilities in this catastrophe are known, at least in part. The material cost, spread among all the families in the country, amounts to approximately $7,600 or $19,000,000,000 for the country as a whole. Our losses exceed 90,000 casualties, without taking the wounded into account, that is to say more than 20 per cent of all empire casualties. Add to that the dislocation of so many homes, a stupendous increase of criminality, physical and moral sufferings breeding discontent among the people, and a deep scission between the two main racial groups in the country. Cana-

dians have not accepted such sacrifices to be rewarded by a few medals and congratulations, the only apparent results at the moment.

Through progressive legislation we must dispel this dangerous impression. But we do not wish to delay the present debate. Let me only define our attitude on the two main problems which have been discussed since the beginning of the session.

As regards communism, we believe and always have believed that this theory is radically opposed to our religious principles, our national traditions and our philosophical conception of the human person. In order to protect the people from the menace of this so-called mystic of our time, verbal attacks will remain powerless so long as living conditions among the working classes are not in keeping with the economic possibilities of our immense and rich country, so long as drastic means are not taken to make financially possible what is physically and materially possible.

As for the financial agreements of which the approval has been announced, we cannot endorse them. This gift of more than $425,000,000, this loan bearing no interest and no guarantees of 1¼ billions of dollars seems to us untimely and unfair, at this time when the low-wage earner is overburdened with excessive taxes, when the Canadian head of a family may not borrow to build himself a home at less than 4½ per cent interest, when a large proportion of veterans are still without decent shelter. And for this last reason particularly, we shall vote against the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

(Text):

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended speaking in this debate; however, I shall take this opportunity to make only a few remarks. First I shall speak concerning the speech from the throne, and then I shall offer a few general observations as to our economic position as I see it at the present time.

From the speech from the throne I read this:

> It is only in the light of the world situation that all our problems can be seen in true perspective. The future of our own and of every country depends upon succes in the task of world reconstruction and the establishment of an enduring peace. Many of the measures you will be called upon to consider at the present session will be concerned with this wider aspect of human affairs.

With this I agree and, I am sure, all hon. members agree. We can build social security in Canada only on the foundation of international peace, and that is the base upon which it must be built.

In my opinion to-day we must view every changing situation in this fluid world with understanding, and it is in that connection I wish to make a few remarks concerning the present espionage situation. I am sure every humanitarian deplores the necessity for the maintenance by governments of secret services. I think every decent person dislikes and hates such under-handed practice. But that is the kind of world in which we are living, and the kind of world we must hasten to change.

Regardless of what was said some days ago by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) about supranational organizations, I maintain and, I am sure many others in all parties maintain that the only way we can rid the world of suspicion, misunderstanding—and hence, espionage—is by building a united nations organization and, through it, when the time is ripe, a world government.

I was interested to read quite recently in the Vancouver *Sun* of the resolution passed by the annual convention of the British Columbia command of the Canadian Legion. On March 19 last, at its meeting in Vancouver, it passed a resolution to this effect. They urged that Canada take a leading part in establishing a post-war world policy and asked the dominion government to call upon the nations of the world to organize the united nations organization into a supranational government, first to establish world law; second, to maintain peace; third to administer justice in accordance with world law, and, fourth, that a world government be democratically elected by powers great and small upon an equitable basis. I think that represents a very wide section of opinion in British Columbia and shows the trend of thought in one of the most prominent sections of the Canadian Legion in Canada in, should I say, the best province in Canada.

I think this is a time in the world's history when we have to use understanding and exercise patience and tolerance. I am not here to defend everything that has been done by the Soviet Union or everything that has been done by any government, but I do ask the members of this house to consider the twenty-five years of misunderstandings that we went through after the last war and the lies and misinformation and propaganda that were given to the people in this and other countries. We have fought a hard war, and I am not underestimating the difficulties of the present situation. There are many obstacles to be overcome, but I am asking for a fair, tolerant and understanding approach to the situation.

When it comes to the subject of espionage, the headlines in the papers would make one think that the Soviet Union was the only country in the world to practise espionage. But I should like to quote what Mr. Ernest Bevin, the present minister of foreign affairs in the British government, wrote in May, 1933:

There are British spies just as there are Russian spies and German spies and French spies. There is not a nation that has a clean record in this respect. In this year's estimates you will find £180,000 for "secret service." Nobody is allowed to know how it is spent, or where it goes. Parliament may not discuss it; the auditor general may not ask about it. It is for espionage and any other dirty work which governments dare not avow.

Mr. Bevin continued:

There are civil service posts which people "in the know" know quite well to be just camouflage for men whose real job is "intelligence." But I suppose that to mention any of them would be to bring down all the terrors of the Official Secrets Act on one's head—like Compton Mackenzie.

The political correspondent of the *People* wrote in April 30, 1930:

The Chancellor of the Exchequer has set aside £180,000 to be spent on the British secret service this year.

The secret service is divided into two main wings. There are the secret agents who work at home—under the special branch of Scotland Yard. And there are those who scour the continents of Europe and Asia, under the control of Sir Robert (now Lord) Vansittart, the cool, masterly head of the foreign office.

Connected with most of the British embassies in foreign capitals there is a woman who can be relied upon to ferret out secrets from the agents of foreign powers whenever these are needed . . .

But apart from the regular full-time members of the service, there are a number of part-time agents. These are engaged, most of their time, in their professional capacities as bankers, financiers, heads of industry, or members of the armed forces.

With regard to this whole situation I shall say nothing more, but I should like to read from a general order issued recently by a United States officer commanding to his troops as it shows balance and a realistic approach to the present situation:

Wuerzburg, Germany, March 11—(AP)—American troops in Wuerzburg were warned by their commanding officer to-day to refrain from criticizing the Soviet Union to the German people.

Order to Command

Lt. Col. Frank Ebey of Venice, Calif., issued this order to his command, the 203rd Anti-Aircraft Battalion:

It has been brought to my attention that the morale of the civilian population of Wuerzburg has been raised as a result of a speech in the United States by a British politician, relative to our ally, the Russian people.

I have heard certain military personnel express agreement with these policies in the presence of German frauleins.

This practice must stop immediately.

The Soviet government is an ally of the U.S.A., and you are individually and collectively representatives of our government. I will not tolerate any disparaging remarks against our allies to the German people. This does not violate your right of free speech among yourselves.

I do not hate the German people. My policy in regard to dancing and social gatherings should indicate that fact to you. But I can't forget that the sun will always set upon the grave of some American soldier. From Pearl Harbour and Bataan to the Elbe, your buddies are lying dead because of the nazi party and the evil machinations of Hitler and his gang. Don't let your fraulein's opinion influence you. She has been raised in an atmosphere of hatred and intolerance of all nations on earth except the master race we have just whipped.

Millions of Russian soldiers and civilians died to save our skins. Just remember that. If your propaganda causes you to hate the Russians, stop and think—they died for you, too. If you want to think again, encouraging these frauleins to think we hate Russia is a good way to get things going.

Those were the good old days, yes? Standing in half-tracks all day in the bitter cold, dirty, hungry and tired; firing off the line of departure; making river crossings and sweating out barrages. It is cold in Russia, remember that.

I am not a pinko or a red. But the Russians are our allies. They have guts, and by God I never want to fight again. Think it over. You have been warned.

I cannot overlook the statement made last evening by the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Jaques) when he was referring to the Spanish government and Franco. I am quite sure that the remarks he made expressed his personal opinion and not the opinion of many members of his party. The hon. member for Wetaskiwin had this to say with regard to the Spanish government:

They did not do anything to us.

Well, this is what the governments of the United States, Great Britain and France in an official declaration, supplemented by fifteen documents out of 800 captured in Germany, accuse the Spanish fascist dictatorship of:

1. Of being part of the nazi fascist internationale plotting against the United States.

2. Of planning to seize Gibraltar, fight Britain and other allies.

3. Of fuelling nazi submarines and ships. This action resulted in the death of many United States sailors and merchant seamen.

4. Franco promised Hitler "that his fight against communism, Jewry and Freemasonry would continue."

The reason why Franco did not join in the war is also explained. He wanted too much territory, food, munitions. Hitler's generals also thought Spain's entry might be a drawback.

Again, here is the official text of Franco's reply when he was asked by the United Press of the United States what would be the form of the state under a nationalist regime in Spain. Franco said:

> It will follow the structure of the totalitarian regimes, like Italy and Germany. It will adopt corporative forms, for which most of the formulas are already found in our own country, and it will destroy the liberal institutions which have poisoned the people.

Passing on, I enjoyed very much the speech of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). His analysis of the rights of the citizen was, in my opinion, and, I am sure, in the opinion of many members of this house, a masterpiece. A great deal of what he had to say represents, I am sure, the opinion of members of all parties in this house who appreciate what a treasury of safeguards we have inherited from the past.

Before proceeding to my brief comments on the speech from the throne, I must stop to congratulate the Ottawa *Citizen*. I wish that there were more papers in Canada that did the fair reporting and treated serious public issues with such tolerance and understanding as the Ottawa *Citizen* does. I do not know the editor of that paper, but I am sure that he is a man of vision, understanding and tolerance, virtues which are very necessary for newspaper editors at this time.

I am glad to see that the government intends to increase food production. I am sure that in that purpose they have the support of all people in this country. I note that the maintenance of a high level of employment and national income is a fundamental aim of government policy. I can say this, that the development of this policy is being anxiously watched throughout Canada. I have received letters from many of my constituents who write me about the rather vague terms in which the speech from the throne is written. I think in all fairness it must be somewhat vague at this time, on account of the fact that there are no final conclusions drafted as a result of the dominion-provincial conferences; but they all say that they await anxiously the development of government policy in this respect.

I certainly approve the agreement for a loan to the United Kingdom. I consider it economically sound from every point of view and in the best interests of the Canadian people.

I am very glad to know that the veterans affairs committee is again functioning. On this point I wish to say that as far as the Department of Veterans Affairs is concerned, that is the administration of the department itself, I think they have done an excellent job to date, and that any failure which has occurred has not been the fault of the veterans affairs administration, but of government policy in some directions. I hope that the situation will rapidly improve. As far as my own riding is concerned, many veterans in the city of Nelson and surrounding districts are waiting for housing accommodation; other veterans are waiting to go on the land. I am hopeful that the rearrangements concerning the housing administration in Canada will prove beneficial and successful, because there is no question about it, arrangements in the past have been ineffective to deal with current needs.

I have something to say now on a subject to which I shall refer later at somewhat greater length; and may I remark that I am not one who occupies much of the time of the house. Labour in my constituency is still waiting for a national labour code as outlined in the Regina manifesto. The farmers of my constituency, and particularly the fruit growers, are anxious to see national marketing legislation; and the veterans are anxious to get houses, or to go on the land; certainly they want to be sure of employment.

Let me now say a few things about our general position in Canada. At home, as abroad, many people view things as either black or white. I am of the opinion that there will face us in the near future many problems upon which we can get great and general agreement. I am sure many hon. members can agree together for the defence of democracy and an extension of the basis of democracy, and that there are many other immediate matters upon which we can join together and work for. I am not one who views this question from an ultra partisan point of view. I am not one who thinks that my party is all right and everybody else all wrong. It is not a question of all black or all white, as painted by some people. Supporters of the government often state that they stand for free enterprise and that the issue at this time is free enterprise versus socialism. I am going to make these few remarks to try to bring into proper perspective the situation, as I view it, which exists at the present time and in the light of which we shall have to discuss the legislation which will be brought before this house. In my opinion it is not a question of so-called free enterprise. As a matter of fact we have not free enterprise in this country at this time; we have largely monopoly enterprise; and the issue to-day in Canada, as in many other countries, is this, on whose behalf is state capitalism in the immediate future going to function? On behalf of the few or on behalf of the many?

The post-war economic pattern from England to the Soviet borders is clear. The trend is toward nationalization of key points in the economy. In Britain the Labour party was elected on a platform whose main planks were the nationalization of the Bank of England, coal, iron and steel, electricity, gas, railways, aviation and all internal transport, with a national board to control investments. In France the parties who won three-fourths of the seats in the national assembly campaigned on a very similar programme, part of which has already been fulfilled in laws covering the Bank of France and other large financial institutions. In Czechoslovakia all four political parties compaigned for nationalization of mines, heavy industry, electric power, banks and insurance companies, and this programme is rapidly being put into effect. In the United States and in Canada the period of state capitalism has clearly arrived, despite all the claims of economists and advertising psychologists whom big business hires to put science in chains for profit. The capitalist economy has never, since the early pioneer stages, operated without state aid. In the United States and in Canada, it owes its privilege and its power to incorporation rights, the tariffs, the franchises, the subsidies and the state's promotion of foreign trade and investments.

When the second world war burst upon us the production we needed in this country was too great for our big business to handle. The state had in many instances to take over the functions of the capitalist, providing the funds and markets, building plants, securing and allocating raw materials, labour supplies and so on. The highest production records in our history, which big business now claims for so-called private enterprise, were made only with the aid and under the direction of the state.

Even in the international sphere it is clear that our miscalled free enterprise can neither function nor manage our share of the international economic arrangements so sadly needed and now, to some extent, being planned. Our proposed loan to Britain, the international monetary fund, the world bank, the social and economic council of UNO, all tell the same story, the necessity for governments to make financial arrangements and the international development of state capitalism in every form. Not all the free enterprise propaganda can conceal the fact that we are moving steadily, in both the international and the national spheres, into the period known historically as state capitalism.

The immediate cause of the European trend toward nationalization is the fact that the defeat of the nazis has left Europe in economic chaos. Industrial plants have to be rebuilt, and private capital is absolutely unable to tackle the job. Those who have gone through fascist tyranny are not in a frame of mind to rebuild the power of financiers who helped Hitler to office or profited by his system; unable to accept, let alone put into effect, complete socialization. The only way at present to relieve their distress is through limited nationalization methods, or in other words, a state capitalist economy.

I wish to make this point clear. In my opinion, in the modern industrial world the only credit base strong enough to underwrite reconstruction in the world as a whole, or in Canada, is the productive labour of all the people in all countries, under public control. The greater need in Europe has hastened this development. The same trend is in evidence in the United States and in Canada. Take, for instance, the wonderful success we have had with our rubber plant at Sarnia and other state-operated plants during the war. Look at the great development of the T.V.A. and the development of the Grand Coulee dam, the Boulder dam, and other great developments which so-called free enterprise could not undertake but which were undertaken by the state in the United States and by the state in this country, and successfully prosecuted.

The world-wide extension of industry and agriculture outlined in our international declarations and obligations is rapidly making obsolete the method of private investment financing for large-scale undertakings. In addition to the compulsion of immediate needs in Europe, there is the increasing pressure of ideas expressed by socialists and democrats everywhere. There is the insistent demand for democratic processes to be expressed in economic as well as in political control.

These are inevitable measures, because anyone who studies the situation closely can see them developing and continuing to develop. These inevitable measures and developments do not inaugurate a socialist economy, despite those who shout about not lending their money to establish socialism. What is being rapidly experienced in the western section of Europe, and will inevitably develop here, is a form of state capitalism, gradually passing from state aid and regulations to state ownership and management of banks, key industries, transportation and public utilities.

This development will modify some features of our economy. It will be a modified form of capitalism. It will substitute state controls over competition and investment for our

present largely private and monopolistic controls, but capitalist income will be retained. Former owners of nationalized undertakings will be guaranteed fixed returns by the state.

This general development presents great opportunities. Historically, the final form of capitalist enterprise means that we have an opportunity of achieving a change from a capitalist to a socialist society in a peaceful and evolutionary way. The chances of success depend upon whether enough of our people are willing to join together in guiding the greatest peaceful transformation from one form of society to another in the history of mankind.

There are great dangers. If our developing state capitalism is allowed to become the economic instrument of monopoly finance capital, it will attempt to keep the economy operating by imperialistic expansion instead of serving the needs of the people by lessening profits and internal expansion.

There must be a strong demand from the people that the returns to capital in public and private enterprises be in proportion to the aid given with the risks removed by the state. For a peacful transition from capitalism to economic democracy, the following, in my opinion, are essential: First, at least ten years of peace. I am not suggesting that ten years of peace is all the peace that we shall have, but I do feel that if we can have ten years of peace we can guide intelligently the most successful evolution from capitalism to economic democracy in the history of mankind. I repeat therefore that, first, we should have at least ten years of peace. That is why, when I was campaigning, I said that the great issue before us to-day is, first, peace in the international sphere, and second, the maintenance of the democratic structure at home.

The second essential is a strong trade union movement. There is no question about it that well organized and strong trade unions are the great bulwark of democracy.

The third essential is a strong cooperative movement. Social changes are not brought about merely by written programmes, speeches and national advertising. Social changes are brought about largely on a sound and solid basis, the result of the hard work of all the people who join trade unions, cooperatives and community organizations, devoting their time and energy to the building up of democracy in the smaller spheres. These are the people who really build the fabric of democracy.

The fourth essential must be a strong farmers' movement, a strong agricultural movement. I believe it is absolutely necessary, if we are to survive this dangerous stage in our history and in the world's history, to work as far as possible for the decentralization of administration through provincial and municipal governments. I believe it is necessary for the federal administration to lay down the general policy to balance the national interests, particularly with regard to exports in the larger sphere of planning. If we are to maintain the democratic structure we must have decentralization. We have to get the administration in the hands of the people through provincial and municipal governments, credit unions, cooperatives and all such organs of the people themselves.

Finally, I think it is necessary to have a programme to provide the opportunity for this peaceful development, and in conclusion I should like to say this. Of all the parties in this house, this is the only one that has a programme which has been considered in logical relation to the development of society at home and abroad. A study of the Regina manifesto and national programme of the C.C.F. in relation to present economic developments at home and abroad will indicate that these programmes are designed to meet the needs of the Canadian people at this time. Any person who gives intelligent study to the history of the development of economies abroad and of our own economy at home under present conditions, and who reads the Regina manifesto and the national programme of the C.C.F. party, will realize that the people who drafted that manifesto and that programme did so with an understanding and appreciation of Canadian conditions, Canadian historical background and Canadian psychology, and with a full understanding of a programme that would meet the needs of our people.

Mr. DAVID GOURD (Chapleau) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, you will allow me first, in my maiden speech in this house, to congratulate you on the consistent efficiency with which you have been discharging the duties of your high office.

I also join my distinguished colleagues in congratulating the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Viau), the mover of the Address in reply to the speech from the throne, and the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Winters), the seconder, for the eloquent and detailed manner in which they told us what the government intend to do during the present session.

Certain important and difficult problems will be submitted to us, especially as regards the new loan which appears to embody very favourable arrangements and generous conditions for the United Kingdom. While keeping an eye on our tremendous national debt,

we still realize the advantage of a further extraordinary effort on the part of Canada to control its foreign markets, for we must not forget that our country must export at least 40 per cent of its total production. We must have buyers and Great Britain is still our best customer. It is with this in mind that we must make it possible for her to buy our goods and, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the reorganization of our trade with England might result in keeping all classes of our people gainfully employed. I realize that this is the only means of preventing the disastrous unemployment situation that prevailed after the war of 1914-18.

Before speaking of the beautiful and immense northern part of the province of Quebec, I may be allowed to commend two others of my colleagues, the hon. members for Wright (Mr. Raymond) and Prescott (Mr. Bertrand), for having suggested that Canada should send a diplomatic representative to the vatican, acknowledged as the greatest centre of Christianity in the world. The cooperation of a Canadian representative would help the few other ambassadors to contribute to the realization of enduring peace under the enlightened guidance of the holy father.

I wish also to congratulate the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Arsenault) for his clear, accurate, and sincere statement on the Canadian flag, which should be distinctive and acceptable to all Canadians.

Now, I come to the constituency of Chapleau, which I have the honour of representing and which is included in the Abitibi district, this large expanse of fertile land, well adapted to farming and stretching from Senneterre, in the east, to La Reine, in the west, on the Ontario boundary. In this region only a strip of land has been opened so far and settled by farmers, but it could extend to the north as far as lake Matagami, on the fiftieth and a half degree of latitude, about a hundred miles north of Amos, the county seat. In this large territory could be established a hundred farming parishes on fertile land which could supply the lumber and pulpwood so much in demand in this country. It would also contribute to the opening of mines, for mineral ores are to be found throughout the district.

The development of the north country would bring there a considerable number of people, which would relieve congestion in cities and help prevent unemployment, because the population cannot possibly be concentrated in large centres. In order to carry out the development of northern Quebec, it would also be necessary that the dominion government should come to an agreement with the provincial authorities with a view to drawing up a comprehensive plan. There should be built a railway line, starting from the Canadian National line, either from Senneterre Junction or elsewhere, and leading northwesterly to lake Matagami and northeasterly to Chibougamou, which would help the development of water powers and facilitate the erection of a paper mill at lake Matagami. I should like to emphasize the fact that much gold, copper and other ores are to be found in the Chibougamou area. To facilitate the transportation of engineers and of the numerous mining prospectors, there should be established an air line from Montreal, with airports at Val d'Or, Amos and Noranda, from which district that line would continue on to Toronto, which now has air communications with North Bay and Ottawa. The route I suggest is several hundred miles shorter.

The governments concerned should also extend a dirt road as far as James bay covering a distance of 150 to 175 miles; this would help to bring about the above mentioned developments.

I might add that the federal government should also assist the provincial government in building highways and dredging certain rivers both of which are essential factors in the development of mines bringing in revenue which contributes to the prosperity of the country. All these projects should be included in post-war planning.

I will not conclude without outlining the income that might be derived from the implementation of these projects. Here are authentic figures relating to the tiny section already developed. In 1944, we harvested in the Abitibi district $25,150 worth of wheat, $472,540 worth of oats, $31,680 worth of barley, $2,261,500 worth of hay, not to mention thousands of dollars worth of buckwheat, rye, peas, beans and mixed grain. Moreover, our crop of potatoes amounted to $587,820, which does not include the income brought in by alfalfa, turnips and corn. We have also produced 1,334,209 pounds of butter, 97,747 pounds of cheese, not to mention the thousands of dollars derived from our crop of blueberries. Moreover, we sold and shipped one hundred million feet of saw lumber as well as millions of cords of pulpwood.

Neither must I forget to mention the mining of metals such as gold, copper, etc.; gold yielded a value of $42,000,000 and copper, a value of $22,000,000, these amounts being exclusive of all other minerals.

In passing, I take the occasion of suggesting to the directors of the Canadian National Railways that it is high time to improve the

railway lines which run through our district if they want to furnish travellers with suitable means of transportation as well as take care of the shipping demand arising from the various products I have just listed.

In conclusion, I beg the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) to appoint a bilingual controller of the experimental farm located at Kapuskasing, because the majority of those whom it serves are French-Canadians.

(Text:) Mr. T. J. BENTLEY (Swift Current): As a rule I do not take up a great deal of the time of the house, I had not expected to speak in this debate at all. As mentioned by some other members this afternoon it was felt that we might finish the debate fairly soon, but apparently that idea became sidetracked somewhere, and I felt that I should like to offer some of my opinions while the opportunity presented itself.

I was pleased this evening to hear the little battle going on between the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Grant) and the hon. member for Queens (Mr. McLure). It reminded me that the island was down there. I was a little surprised when the hon. member for Kings said that a map of Canada had been published that did not have Prince Edward Island on it. It is more years than I like to think of since I lived in Nova Scotia, but even back over all those years I can remember that there was a place called Prince Edward Island, so that I do not know how anyone could have forgotten it. The hon. member also said—and I hope the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier) will take this seriously—that his constituency, which must be fairly small, actually had six fish docks built there, and that he expected to get two more. That is fine. We do not envy them their fish docks. No doubt they need them, or they would not get them. But I should like the minister to consider giving us one little bridge over the South Saskatchewan river at Saskatchewan Landing, at the same time he is building fish docks in Kings.

Before I say some things that may not be so pleasant, I should like to address one or two rather nice remarks to the house. At the outset I wish to join with those who have so eloquently said farewell to the Earl of Athlone and the Princess Alice, and to extend my best regards and those of my constituents. Our people out in Swift Current are just ordinary people, but they are warm hearted and hospitable, and on their behalf they would like me to say, in our plain way, "good-bye and good luck." While the group I am with over here looks forward to the time when we shall form a government here, which will not be long, when the British North America Act and other necessary acts will be amended so that we shall have a Canadian citizen as governor general, until that time comes, with our usual Canadian hospitality we welcome to Canada the new governor general and his gracious consort.

While I am in a welcoming mood I should like to take this opportunity of inviting all those within sound of my voice, or who may take the trouble to read my remarks, to come to Swift Current this summer on the 1st and 2nd of July. We put on a good stampede there. They will find all the men wearing whiskers, and the ladies—oh, we have lovely ladies out there—

Mr. GRAYDON: Address yourself to the Prime Minister on that.

Mr. BENTLEY: Well, yes; perhaps particularly to the Prime Minister. The ladies will be dressed as in the days of old. I know the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) will tell the house they have a better show in his city, because it lasts for a week. Our stampede lasts for only two days, but I am sure it would be equal to a week at Calgary, so that we should like to have hon. members come there if they care to do so. The new synthetic rubber from the Sarnia plant will no doubt provide the necessary tires, and gasoline, while not free, is now plentiful. So that on behalf of Swift Current I extend this invitation to all hon. members here.

I should like also to extend my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. As others have said, it always pleases those of us who are veterans of either war when a veteran is singled out for some particular honour of this kind, and these veterans really did an excellent job. I think they could be called creators. It is a long time since I took a Latin lesson, but if I remember aright the word "create" is derived from the Latin word *creo,* which I believe means to make out of nothing, and they did an excellent job of making a speech out of nothing, which is practically what the speech from the throne is. The hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg, who seconded the address, is a native of my own province, and I cannot but feel that his intelligence will so guide him that when we do form the government over there, he will still be on that side of the house. I think that would be a natural evolutionary process for such a brilliant young man.

I wish also to express complete disapproval of the methods employed by the government in dealing with the investigation of Canadian men and women suspected of betraying secrets. Investigation was necessary. It would have been highly improper for a government not to have made an investigation; and if these people should be found guilty of giving away secrets or breaking their sacred word, they will have to be punished. But the practice of taking into custody men and women who have had no charges laid against them is, I believe, entirely wrong. I agree with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), the leader of our party, and with speakers from other sides of the house who have said this was a wrong thing to do. I have grown up in this country believing that, no matter what might be the imperfections in our society, at least there was one thing we could depend upon: that the process of justice which we have built up through many centuries of struggle would be kept inviolate, and that neither men nor women suspected of any crime, no matter how vicious that crime, should be held in custody unless a definite charge was brought against them. I never believed such people could be taken into custody and placed in such a position that, unless they were strong-minded persons, they might say something which would help to convict themselves. I think the government has demonstrated by this action that it has neither the ability nor the courage to safeguard the state without resorting to the practices of other governments, whom we have just spent six years of our lives defeating because they threatened to impose that sort of thing upon us. I say that this government, when faced with the task of protecting the state under democratic rules evolved through centuries of struggle, has fallen far short of the glory.

I should like to read the first paragraph of the speech from the throne:

> It is just over six months since Canada emerged from six long years of war. The turmoil which has followed in the wake of war has created new problems for governments in all parts of the globe. The world is full of unrest. Hunger, privation and suffering have become the lot of millions. Other millions are homeless, many of them in exile.

That is fine, down to that point; not very much constructive about it, but a lot of information we can get from almost any newspaper or magazine. Then the next sentence states:

> The problems which face the statesmen of every nation are formidable indeed.

In regard to Canada's contribution toward a peaceful and prosperous world, there is some truth in that statement; but in regard to our domestic problems, there should be no difficulty at all. We were not destroyed by war. We were nearly destroyed before the war by the depression, for which this government had no solution, although it was in power for four years before war broke out. In a land of abundant food, minerals and raw materials, people were hungry, cold and homeless, and those conditions would have continued under this government but for the war which, rather than the ingenuity of the government, opened for us a market which could and did consume everything we could produce. We speak of reconstruction, when in actual fact the needs of war and our ability to fill them brought about the reconstruction of our pre-war moribund economy.

I cannot associate myself with those who voice such fulsome praise for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) and the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe). The great generosity, loyalty and sincerity of Canadian men and women, appealed to by the publicity committees of the national, provincial and unit war finance committees; the hours of unpaid or ill-paid work during victory loan campaigns by humble citizens, regardless of party political affiliations, had a decisive result in filling the purse of the Minister of Finance, who in turn made available to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply all the financial requirements necessary to inspire profit-hungry industry to uncork the bottle of production. The reconstruction of Canada from hard years of humiliating poverty to a nation with everyone able to work on a payroll, and some not so able to work, was made possible by war, not by wise statesmen. It was the work of farm men and women with barnyard mud on their feet, factory boys and girls with grease behind their ears, lumberjacks with callouses on their hands, miners with grime on their faces, transport workers who kept the wheels of worn-out machinery rolling, fishermen with chapped and bleeding hands, dock workers with muscles in their backs and no spare tires on the front sides of their belts, merchant seamen who faced the seas and fought the enemy, and many of whom died, servicemen and women who fought or serviced the fighters, and scientists who discovered new processes.

These are the people who won the war. Before the war our present government was utterly incapable of formulating a programme of reconstruction, and now that the war is over, they are still incapable of making use of that tremendous productive power we have built up during the war.

Then we read another paragraph in the speech from the throne, number 5 in my copy, because I have numbered them for the sake of convenience:

> The maintenance of a high level of employment and national income is a fundamental aim of government policy.

That sounds splendid—"A high national income"; but what does the government mean by a high national income? How high is up, anyway? In the early days of the war, when the government was afraid it was not going to have the support of workers who were fed up with the kind of administration we had had, everything was promised. In those days the promise was "full employment". Then, as things settled down a little bit and industry felt itself more solid in the saddle, it became "high employment". Now it is modified to suit what I suppose the government thinks will suit the people—which it does not—and it is referred to as "a high level of employment".

I wonder why these changes were made? I wonder if it could possibly be because of some of the pronouncements by business men in this country, reference to whom was made this afternoon by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis).

I should like to read into the record two other pronouncements carried on the editorial page of the *Western Producer* of July 13, 1944. The first one is attributed to a prominent banker, and if hon. members wish to have his name they may communicate with the *Western Producer*. Perhaps that publication will tell them, but it did not tell me. This is the quotation:

> Full employment would be incompatible with the free enterprise system, which carries with it the right to a normal float of unemployed.

And the other gem, attributed to a big business man, says this:

> A corporation's efficiency is indicated by the number of men it can release from a job, not by the number of men hired.

Possibly that kind of thing has some influence with this government. Even if we get a high level of employment, what does the government mean by "high"? Is seventy per cent high? Is sixty-eight per cent high? Should it be seventy-two per cent; or what, in fact, is a "high level"? Seventy per cent is usually considered a pretty fair level when one is writing an examination in school. I think schoolteachers will agree with that.

So that if we get a high level of, let us say, seventy per cent of employment, then inversely the other thirty per cent would be—well, what would we call them? Possibly we could call them the low level of unemployment. I suppose they will sit around with patriotic fervour and sing about the glories of a country that gives seventy per cent of their brothers and sisters employment, but leaves them without it. If they sit around long enough they will get weak enough, of course, so that they will not be able to sing about it anymore. Maybe that is the way we shall get full employment—when that thirty per cent passes out from starvation.

The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Burton), who is my deskmate—and incidentally the terror of the Liberal electoral machine in that constituency—dealt very ably with agriculture in his address in this debate. He, like myself and others in this group, is in constant touch with the working farmers of the west. We know their problems just as well as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) or the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) knows them. We are not political agronomists. Our contact is right with the men and women on the farms, in their homes, in their fields, in their cattle sheds and other places where they actually perform the work of production.

It was a grand battle we witnessed here this afternoon, from one side. And no doubt other hon. gentlemen on the opposite side will come back in the near future with similar ammunition. They can quote figures from now till doomsday—and undoubtedly their figures will be correct. But whether they are put in the right place so as to give a wholly true picture is a different matter. Undoubtedly there would not be much question about the number of acres or the number of bushels produced, or about those other matters which were dealt with. But I would point out that the people who raised the wheat, oats, barley, rye, flaxseed, cattle, hogs, poultry products and dairy products are not concerned with the learned battle which takes place in this House of Commons. They are concerned with policy which produces things they require, and which makes it possible for them to make their contribution in a community to people who need what they produce. They are not interested in the whole academic discussion as to who did what back in 1919, or at some other time.

If it comes to a question of who did what, I can assure hon. members that the farmers of western Canada have suffered equally under the regimes of Tory as well as Liberal administrations.

This afternoon the leader of the opposition made a statement with which I agree wholeheartedly. He said that never has western Canada—in fact, I believe he referred to

agriculture in all Canada—had a square deal. That is a fact. And it does not require any long list of figures to support it.

When he was discussing this matter in this debate, the Minister of Agriculture said that he believed in planning. That is quite an admission to come from a source that champions free enterprise, when we consider that the free enterprise people of this country carried on such a round programme of condemnation of this group which had recommended that there be some kind of planning for national life.

I have never heard the Minister of Agriculture in this government, or the leader of the opposition or any of his followers deny that Mr. Trestrail and his group were friendly to them, nor have they denied that group in any way. I do not know whether they have given their actual blessing, but certainly their silence indicates that at least they have offered a covert blessing. So that when the minister said he believed in planning I felt most pleased, until he told us how his plans are to work out. He planned so well that even the most expert weather forecaster would not presume to compete with him.

Here is an example of the minister's planning. In the early thirties when the Tories were sitting on the government benches and the Liberals were on this side as the official opposition, he and his group proclaimed that there was nothing wrong with speculative marketing. There was no difference between the government and the official opposition, and there is no difference between them today, except that the government, having the load of responsibility, has had to accept the impact of logic and do a little planning. Otherwise there was no difference. They both agreed on speculative marketing. But at that time the Tory government had the load of responsibility, and they had to do something. We went through the world crash of 1929. When all the men and women and boys and girls who had a little extra money in 1929 and could speculate in wheat and options went broke and had no more wages or salaries or no more profits from their little businesses they disappeared as speculative buyers, and the result was that there was no longer any speculative market to make our open market system buoyant, as the phrase is. The government, charged with responsibility, were then forced by the impact of logic to introduce what they called their stabilization operations, and every taxpayer of this dominion, through the treasury, was put behind this plan of hypothecation for the sake of saving the speculative market through stabilization operations. I am not going to be too critical of that because at least the government did something to try to relieve the situation. But they got no credit for that from the present Minister of Agriculture or from his friends.

When the present minister became Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa in 1935 he proceeded to plan to do the things that he had said were necessary before he got that job. "Get rid of surpluses" was the cry, "and then we will get dollar wheat, and dollar wheat will pay your taxes." That was the great cry at that time—get rid of surpluses. How we would like to have ten times those surpluses in our bins at the present time, Mr. Speaker, so that we would be able to say to people in other parts of the world: Here is lots of wheat and lots of oats and lots of barley; and they would have been ready to pay more for it than some of the speculative markets did. I have bought barley at country elevators in western Canada for one and a half cents a bushel because the man who had it could not bother taking it back home with him and he said, "I might as well sell it for one and a half cents." Some barley had no quotations on it at all. You could buy good feed oats for eight cents a bushel, and the most you could get in some years for the best oats was from thirteen to seventeen cents a bushel.

An hon. MEMBER: So what?

Mr. BENTLEY: So what? We felt just as the hon. member for Fraser Valley would feel if his orchards were full of fruit and there was no market for it, and he was forced to sell at ten cents a box. We do not like to be in that position. We did not like it then. At no time have the western farmers liked to be in that position, no more than anybody else wants to see his means of livelihood drop to such a low level. But if we had those surpluses now, should we not be glad? But when the present Minister of Agriculture came into office in this government in 1935 he proceeded to get rid of surpluses, and his planning, along with associations and possibly some occult powers, and nature, helped him to get rid of the surplus.

The year 1937 came along and no wheat was raised. His cry had always been: Get rid of surpluses and the price of wheat will go up. So 1937 came, and no crop. He and nature had worked well together. Nature did not produce any rain and the Minister of Agriculture and the other farmers did not produce any crops. The surplus disappeared, and the price of wheat did go up to $1 a bushel.

In the spring of 1938 the minister and nature did better. By that time the farmers had to buy seed grain back at $1.45 a bushel. Yes, the price of wheat had gone up, but nobody can say that that was the way to bring prosperity to the farmers, to have them pay $1.45 a bushel for seed grain and receive sometimes only eighteen cents a bushel when they sold that wheat. That is the basis of the seed grain debt in Saskatchewan to-day.

But the Minister of Agriculture, like the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe), is nothing if not an optimist. He believed that the future was going to do something better for him and the country. He said: We have got rid of the surplus; we have $1.45 wheat, and now what we need is a crop. Nature said, O.K., we shall have a crop, and so in 1938 nature and the minister produced us a crop, not a very good crop; it did not create a very big surplus, but it was more than the market was prepared to handle, and down went the price of wheat. Instead of being looked upon as a blessing it was looked upon as a curse, instead of nature's bounty. Down went the price again and remained that way until the farmers of western Canada had to take action themselves and come here to Ottawa and petition the government for some relief. That was long after the war had started. We believe in planning, but certainly we do not appreciate the particular type of planning that brought those results. Certainly planning is necessary. All through the years I have been associated with the kind of farmers I mentioned, not political agricultural experts such as we see in the house, but the men that actually operate the tractors, the combines and the seeders. That is the kind of man that I have worked alongside; I know what they want and what they need, and they know what they want and what they need. They have farm organizations and they believe in planning. I am not suggesting that I represent those farm organizations, so let no one here try to make capital out of that. These farm organizations are distinctly non-political, but from eighteen years of association with that kind of organization I know their story; I know something of their hopes and aspirations, and I know the kind of planning which they had hoped would be done and the kind of representations which they have made to this and other governments to have that kind of planning put into operation.

Here is a report from the Saskatchewan wheat pool, which every year issues a written report. After dealing with certain things which they would like to have had but which they failed to convince the federal government to do, they go on to say in their annual report for 1941:

> The government wheat policy to date has been a policy of inflexible opposition to the recommendations of representative farm organizations.

That report was laid before the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan wheat pool in November, 1941, over two years after the war had started, and that organization, which is completely non-political, after trying in vain to have its programme accepted by the powers that be, whether Liberal, Tory or anything else, was finally forced to report back to its members that this government's policy was a policy of inflexible opposition to the recommendations of representative farm organizations. That does not look like very smart planning, if it is planning at all, having in mind the position of the organized producer.

Then there is another plan which the minister was telling us about the other day in his speech. I do not know whether he was trying to "kid" us or himself, or whether he has a great sense of humour. He introduced his acreage reduction plan. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Burton) showed here a poster which said in plain terms, "Grow less wheat and win the war", and it had on it, "By authority of the Minister of Agriculture." I cannot believe that the minister would permit those posters to be put up if he knew his name was on them and disapproved of their being shown.

Mr. GARDINER: I wrote it and put my name on it.

Mr. BENTLEY: Good; we have that admission. That is a wonderful start for another plan, "Grow less wheat and win the war". I am told that during the last war—I was not here at the time—there was a great drive put on under the slogan, "Grow more wheat and win the war". In this war it is, "Grow less wheat and win the war." There is a kind of stock joke in Saskatchewan—I do not know about the other provinces—which runs like this: In the year 1958 a child climbs on its daddy's knee and says, "Daddy, what did you do to help win world war No. 2?" And daddy says, "My son, I raised less wheat; I summer-fallowed."

Mr. GARDINER: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BENTLEY: If you do not take my time, I will; otherwise I would suggest what Mr. Speaker always tells us to do, put it on the order paper.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend spoke of a resolution passed by the Saskatchewan

wheat pool in 1941. I wonder if he would read the one which was passed at their last board meeting.

Mr. BENTLEY: I have that, but I have not time to read it to-night. We shall do so later on.

The minister said that he planned well. If he planned to reduce wheat production, why does he take credit for the fact that in 1942, following the wheat acreage reduction plan, we had the biggest crop of wheat the country ever had? Where did the plan go astray?

I have only a little time left, and there are some other things I should like to have dealt with.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENTLEY: It is all right. You will get an opportunity, and you will probably go overtime a little bit and will get the unanimous consent of the house to do so.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Go ahead.

Mr. BENTLEY: No, I will not if I can avoid doing so. I wish to mention one or two matters in connection with labour. We have, of course, in our group men who are thoroughly conversant with all labour problems, and I am not going to try to deal with those matters. But I wish to make known to the house the plight of a certain group of labour people in the west; I do not believe the same condition affects employees in the east. They are workers of the Canadian Pacific railway, and either because they wanted to strike or were inadvertently drawn into a strike away back in 1918 and 1919, they are now being laid off and retired at the age of sixty-five without the benefit of any retirement fund. I do not suppose that this government has any authority to order the C.P.R. to do anything to correct the evil. The strike happened at a time when we had a labour-hating government—which I believe was not a Liberal government—and of course a labour-hating management, or they would not have done what they did. In any event these men are in that position; and I believe that this house could, if it so desired, persuade, or instruct, or whatever this house does to the government when the house really wants something done by it, that it set up some kind of fund which would give these men the same superannuation allowances to which they would have been entitled had this condition not been applied. I suggest that this is an excellent opportunity for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to get together. The Minister of Labour could labour and produce a plan, and the Minister of Finance could exercise those marvellous qualities we are always hearing about, and finance it. Then everybody would be happy, and I believe the Canadian people generally would be glad to see these men properly taken care of. I hope the Minister of Labour will give, not only serious consideration and an investigation by some departmental employee, but actual serious departmental consideration and government official consideration in correcting the situation.

I have about exhausted my time. I am sorry I cannot see in the speech from the throne the many bright hues which have been mentioned by others. If we were a bunch of Hollywood people discussing a script that had come out, probably I would make the remark that the government had "laid an egg"; but I do not know that that would be appropriate, for an egg is an important item of food at the present time if it is fresh, and if it is not fresh there are other uses to which it may be put, notably at election times. This speech from the throne is something like what used to be done when I was a child back home on the farm. They used to find some kind of lime egg, and sometimes an old discarded white door-knob, and put it in the nest to lure the reluctant hen to come up on the nest. I think what the government has done in the speech from the throne in this. It has put the hen on a door-knob and now it hopes to hatch out a house and lot.

The house divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Coldwell), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Archibald	MacInnis
Argue	McKay
Bentley	Matthews (Kootenay East)
Bowerman	Moore
Bryce	Nicholson
Burton	Probe
Campbell	Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Castleden	Strum, Mrs.
Coldwell	Townley-Smith
Herridge	Wright
Jaenicke	Zaplitny—25.
Knight	
McCuaig	
McCullough (Assiniboia)	

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott	Bertrand (Laurier)
Arsenault	Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Ashby	Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Baker	Black (Yukon)
Barrett	Blackmore
Beaudoin	Blair
Belzile	Blanchette
Benidickson	

Boivin
Bonnier
Boucher
Bourget
Bracken
Bradette
Bradshaw
Breithaupt
Brooks
Brown
Brunelle
Case
Casselman
Charlton
Chevrier
Church
Cleaver
Cloutier
Cockeram
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Croll
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Desmond
Diefenbaker
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Dionne (Beauce)
Dorion
Douglas
Drope
Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Fair
Farquhar
Fleming
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser
Fulton
Gagnon
Gardiner
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gingues
Gladstone
Glen
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Grant
Graydon
Green
Hackett
Hallé
Hamel
Harkness
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hatfield
Hazen
Healy
Henderson
Héon
Hlynka
Hodgson
Howe
Ilsley
Isnor
Jackman
Jaques
Jean
Johnston
Jutras
Kidd
King, Mackenzie
Kuhl
Lacombe
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Lapointe
Laurendeau
Leger
Lennard
Lesage
Little
Lockhart
McCann
McCubbin
McCulloch (Pictou)
Macdonald (Halifax)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario)
McGarry
McGregor
McIlraith
McIvor
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
MacLean
McMaster
MacNaught
MacNicol
Maloney
Marier
Marquis
Marshall
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Maybank
Mayhew
Menary
Michaud
Mitchell
Mullins
Murphy
Mutch
Nixon
Parent
Pearkes
Picard
Pinard
Pouliot
Quelch
Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie)
Raymond (Wright)
Reid
Richard (Gloucester)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Robinson (Bruce)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Souris)
Rowe
St. Laurent
Senn
Shaw
Sinclair (Ontario)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Skey
Smith (Calgary West)
Smith (York North)
Stanfield
Stephenson
Stuart (Charlotte)
Stirling
Stokes
Tremblay
Tucker
Tustin
Viau
Warren
Webb
Weir
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
White (Middlesex East)
Whitman
Winkler
Winters
Wylie—182.

Mr. McLURE: I was paired with the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Langlois). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment to the amendment.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Bracken) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.:

Barrett
Black (Yukon)
Blair
Boucher
Bracken
Bradshaw
Brooks
Case
Casselman
Charlton
Church
Cockeram
Drope
Fleming
Fraser
Fulton
Graydon
Green
Hackett
Harkness
Hatfield
Hazen
Henderson
Héon
Hodgson
Jackman
Kidd
Lennard
Lockhart
McGregor
MacNicol
Menary
Murphy
Pearkes
Robinson (Bruce)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Souris)
Rowe
Senn
Skey
Smith (Calgary West)
Stephenson
Stirling
Stokes
Tustin
Webb
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
White (Middlesex East)—48.

NAYS

Messrs.:

Abbott
Archibald
Argue
Arsenault
Ashby
Baker
Beaudoin
Belzile
Benidickson
Bentley
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Blackmore
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Bourget
Bowerman
Bradette
Brown
Brunelle
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Castleden
Chevrier
Cleaver
Cloutier
Coldwell
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Croll
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Dionne (Beauce)
Dorion
Douglas

Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Fair
Farquhar
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gagnon
Gardiner
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gillis
Gingues
Gladstone
Glen
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Grant
Hallé
Hamel
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Healy
Herridge
Hlynka
Howe
Ilsley
Isnor
Jaenicke
Jean
Johnston
King, Mackenzie
Knight
Kuhl
Lacombe
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Lapointe
Laurendeau
Leger
Lesage
Little
McCann
McCuaig
McCubbin
McCulloch (Pictou)
McCullough (Assiniboia)
McGarry
McIlraith
MacInnis
McIvor
McKay
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
MacLean
Maloney
Marier
Marquis
Marshall
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Maybank
Mayhew
Michaud
Mitchell
Moore
Mullins
Mutch
Nicholson
Nixon
Parent
Picard
Pinard
Pouliot
Probe
Quelch
Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie)
Raymond (Wright)
Reid
Richard (Gloucester)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
St. Laurent
Shaw
Sinclair (Ontario)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Smith (York North)
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Stuart (Charlotte)
Strum, Mrs.
Townley-Smith
Tremblay
Tucker
Viau
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winkler
Winters
Wright
Wylie
Zaplitny—149.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

McDonald (Pontiac)	Massey
Macdonald (Brantford)	Manross
Lapalme	Aylesworth

Mr. BRIDGES: I was paired with the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): I was paired with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BREITHAUPT: I was paired with the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. JUTRAS: I was paired with the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. McNAUGHT: I was paired with the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Coyle). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. McDONALD (Parry Sound): I was paired with the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Daniel). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. DESMOND: I was paired with the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Clark). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McLURE: I was paired with the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Langlois). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I was paired with the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario). I was paired with the hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McMASTER: I was paired with the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Robinson). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, now that the votes have been taken on two amendments, one of which was moved by the Conservative party, and the other by the C.C.F., on behalf of the Social Credit group I wish to move another one, one that we consider to be essential to the welfare of the Canadian people.

Before doing so, however, I wish to make a few comments regarding the speech from the throne. I think hon. members of the C.C.F. party will appreciate the reason we could not support their amendment. It was for the very simple reason that we did not have a mandate from the people of Alberta to support the establishment of a socialist state.

Whilst the Conservative party may think there was nothing in their proposals that we could object to, let me point out that their proposals were absolutely hamstrung by their declared financial policy. I should like to remind the house of what that policy is, in part, as declared in the budget debate of last year by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell). I refer hon. members to page 1296 of *Hansard* of 1945 where the hon. member said:

> So far as expenditure is concerned we must make up our minds, based upon the best estimate we can make of the national income, how much of this income can be safely taken by the state; having made up our minds on this, we must then make a heroic effort to keep our expenditure within that amount.

That declaration, Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of this group is a policy of reaction. It recalls to mind the policies of the former minister of finance, the Hon. Charles Dunning, under whose policies from 1935 to 1939 the resources of this country were systematically sabotaged as a result of curtailing expenditures in an attempt to balance the budget. It will be recalled that during those years the minister always insisted that the only money which was available to the government was the money that they could obtain from the people's pockets, and as a consequence we allowed over half a million people to remain unemployed and a million people to be on relief. So much for the Conservative policy.

What of the government's policy in this regard? I have already referred to their pre-war deflationary policy. But the house will recall the very sudden change that took place in government policy immediately after the declaration of war. It will be recalled that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) stated soon after the declaration of the war that no financial restrictions would be allowed to impede the government's war effort, that the only limit to our war effort would be a physical one, that of the number of men and materials that were available to execute it. That declaration received the whole-hearted endorsation of the people of Canada from one end to the other and received the whole-hearted endorsation of the members of this house.

I would also remind hon. members that when we in this group from 1935 to 1939 had also made a similar declaration, a declaration of a realistic policy, namely, that whatever was physically possible and desirable should also be made financially possible, that declaration was ridiculed not only by members on the other side but by members in other parts of the house. It was not until the fear of war struck the government that they were willing to adopt what might be called a realistic policy. Well, to-day the war is over, but once again we are reverting to pre-war policies. Surely it must be quite plain that if a realistic policy is necessary and justified in order to win the war, a realistic policy should be justified in order to win the peace. I say that for this reason. Winning the war is not the ultimate objective. Winning the war is merely the first major objective that must be captured in order that we may go on to the ultimate objective, that of winning a permanent peace, a peace that will have some permanency attached to it, and the only kind of peace that can have any permanency attached to it is one that will make it possible for peoples in all countries in the world to live in the greatest degree of freedom, free from the fear of want and aggression, free to live their lives as they choose; that freedom itself covers all other freedoms. Certainly, if that is to be the objective of the world, then Canada is in an admirable position to give leadership along these lines. But I would ask, do we find that type of leadership in the speech from the throne? I think it can very well be shown that we find therein to a very large extent a repetition of those policies that were put into force not only in this country but in all the highly industrialized nations throughout the world between the two great wars and even prior to 1914.

The speech from the throne makes it quite clear that in order to maintain full employment and a high standard of living the government depends very largely upon exports, depends very largely upon a programme of foreign investment. While it must be quite clear that exporting wealth without bringing back the equivalent in the form of imports may help to maintain a programme of full employment, it must be equally clear, on the other hand, that it will not maintain the standard of living of the people at the highest level possible because, when you ship wealth out of a country without bringing back imports to a similar amount, you are bound to reduce the standard of living to the extent that you have that unbalance.

We in this group quite agree that we have a moral obligation to make available to the areas that have been made destitute by war all the goods that we can spare. We are, for example, thoroughly behind the government's proposal for a loan to Britain. But I wish to point out that this is entirely different from a programme of foreign investment as

a part of permanent government policy, for the purpose of dumping our unemployment problems on the doorstep of another nation.

On motion of Mr. Quelch the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, March 27, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE

AID TO RUSSIA—PRESS AND RADIO REPORTS OF STATEMENT OF TIM BUCK

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I was surprised to read in last night's evening papers and to hear over the radio the following statement, attributed to Tim Buck:

> The most damning fact that has come out of the spy inquiry is the fact that Mackenzie King held out on a hard-pressed ally through the most crucial days of the war.

I confess I am entirely at a loss to know in what direction I have "held out" in any way, at any time, against any ally. With respect to the U.S.S.R. I have in my hand a copy of the Canadian mutual aid board second annual report to March 31, 1945, and I should like to give the house the information it contains on aid to Russia:

Canadian mutual aid to the Soviet Union during the fiscal year 1944-45, amounted to $97,633,000, or more than three times that of the previous fiscal year. This figure covered a wide range of war munitions, raw materials and foodstuffs.

As the red armies fought their way across Europe from the east, their supply lines became longer. This factor, coupled with demolition of railways, roads, rolling stock and vehicles by the retreating Germans, presented the Russians with a gigantic transportation problem. Canadian shipments of military vehicles and steel rails have been of assistance in meeting this problem.

Canada has provided Soviet factories during the past fiscal year with industrial equipment, as well as with large quantities of raw materials for war production.

Flour, wheat, lard and rolled oats in large amounts have been sent to the Soviet Union to maintain adequate supplies for the armed forces. During the period when the richly agricultural Ukraine was under German control, Canadian grains played a substantial part in filling the gap in food supplies.

But that is not the whole story of mutual aid to Russia. Merchant vessels and ice breakers of the Soviet Union have been serviced and repaired in Canadian Pacific coast ports. This includes revictualling, provision of sailors' clothing, deck stores, and engine room stores, refuelling and generally making the ships seaworthy.

Canada has undertaken to produce minesweepers for Russia under mutual aid, and Soviet crews are being trained in Canada to man these ships.

Mutual aid sent to the Soviet Union has been acknowledged with gratitude by Soviet workers and fighting men.

Commodities shipped to the U.S.S.R. during the year 1944-45 and during the previous fiscal year:

	Fiscal Years 1943-44	1944-45	Total
Armoured Fighting Vehicles, etc.			
Universal carriers ....units	44	....	44
Valentine tank spares....sets	....	6	6
Mechanical Transport			
Workshop lorries ....units	340	1,204	1,544
Snowmobiles ....units	....	6	6
Motorcycles ....units	....	500	500
Chemicals and Explosives			
Explosives ....tons	2,404	12,676	15,080
Cranes and Hoists			
Cranemobiles ....units	....	152	152
Air hoists ....units	....	350	350
Used C.I.R. hoists ....units	....	3	3
Drum hoists ....units	....	3	3
Electrical Equipment			
Motors and controls ....sets	....	45	45
Medical Supplies			
Miscellaneous ....tons	34	....	34
Penicillin ....milliard Oxford units	....	5	5
Machine Tools			
Lathes, shapers, planers, etc....	91	370	461
Complete shell plants	....	3	3
Tools and Industrial Machinery			
Air compressors ....units	....	43	43
Tips and blanks ....tons	2	7	9

		Fiscal Years		
Miscellaneous Industrial Equipment	1943-44	1944-45	Total
Coal picks	units	....	200	200
Drillers 30"	units	....	80	80
Bronze wire cloth	feet	....	3,300	3,300
Insulators	units	....	4,350	4,350
Used conveyors	units	....	5	5
Belting	feet	....	716	716
Wire rope	feet	....	4,053	4,053
Acetylene black	tons	....	135	135
Signal Equipment				
Wireless sets	units	....	300	300
Wireless receivers	units	....	500	500
Signal cartridges	units	90,000	....	90,000
G. L. Mk. III equipment	units	....	197	197
Metals				
Aluminum ingots	tons	13,477	23,809	37,286
Cadmium	tons	104	12	116
Nickel	tons	1,510	3,063	5,173
Ferro-silicon	tons	354	3,873	4,227
Ferro-chrome	tons	....	2,742	2,742
Ferro-tungsten	tons	....	154	154
Lead	tons	10,672	9,606	20,278
Alloy steel	tons	....	4,740	4,740
Zinc	tons	....	4,985	4,985
Aluminum tubing	tons	....	151	151
Aluminum rods	tons	....	732	732
Magnesium	tons	....	421	421
Railway Equipment				
Rails	tons	13,756	43,998	57,754
Flat cars	units	....	183	183
Foodstuffs				
Wheat	tons	10,532	29,116	39,648
Flour	tons	112,230	243,883	356,113
Rolled oats	tons	....	4,548	4,548
Lard	tons	....	9,892	9,892
Seeds				
Alfalfa	tons	....	355	355
Brome grass	tons	....	89	89

Note: All tons shown are 2,000 lbs.

Following is a detailed statement of commodities shipped to the U.S.S.R. during the year 1944-45 and during the previous fiscal year. If the house would permit it, it would, I think, be valuable to have the detailed statistics placed on *Hansard* in connection with the statement I am making just now.

I deem it important to make this statement because in all probability the paragraph which I have read has been cabled to the U.S.S.R. and may be given considerable publicity in publications there. I hope that what I have just stated will be given like publicity in this country, in the U.S.S.R. and in other countries.

Expenditures in Canada during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945, and the previous years, comprise the following main categories:

	Millions of dollars		
	1943-44	1944-45	Total
Automotive equipment and mechanical transport	$ .702	$17.474	$18.176
Armoured vehicles and tanks	.617	.391	1.008
Chemicals and explosives	4.134	5.361	9.495
Guns and small arms	.011	.006	.017
Shells and ammunition	.012	.012	.024
Electrical, radio and telephone equipment	....	9.001	9.001
Lumber and heavy materials	....	2.678	2.678
Machine tools and heavy equipment	2.971	8.188	11.159
Small tools, stores and miscellaneous	....	1.382	1.382
Aluminum	6.821	9.311	16.132
Other base metals	3.951	10.100	14.051
Railway equipment	....	6.189	6.189
Freight, inland and ocean	.119	2.790	2.909
Lard	....	2.653	2.653
Wheat	.223	1.374	1.597
Flour	2.568	15.592	18.160
Rolled oats	....	.295	.295
Miscellaneous	....	.003	.003
Repairing and servicing vessels	1.142	4.843	5.985
Total expenditures	$23.281	$97.633	$120.914

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

First report of the special committee on war expenditures and economies.—Mr. Isnor.

CANADA DAY ACT

SUBSTITUTION OF WORD "CANADA" FOR WORD "DOMINION"

Mr. A. P. COTE (Matapedia-Matane) moved the first reading of bill No. 8, respecting Canada day.

Mr. GRAYDON: Explain.

Mr. COTE (Matapedia-Matane): The bill is intended to repeal the Dominion Day Act and substitute therefor a Canada Day Act. The only changes are in the title and in section 2 where the word "Canada" is substituted for the word "Dominion". The purpose served and aim pursued in introducing this bill is twofold:

First, it is for the purpose of achieving a better identification of Canada outside the country.

Second, it is to create another element conducive to a greater patriotism towards Canada by Canadians all.

In replacing the word "Dominion" by the word "Canada"—and that is all that my bill is doing to the Dominion Day Act, chapter 49 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927—it surely is a clearer way of identifying our country in a shrunken world, where at least curiosity is rapidly growing for information about us.

Now, as far as we are concerned within the limits of our country, may I be permitted to suggest that it surely is not too early to give to Canadians all a common denominator for calculating their yearly achievements and a yearly holiday to celebrate the results all over Canada.

Such a holiday will certainly not put into shade the various colours of our Canadian mosaic, shining under the sun some other days in the year; but I believe the whole pattern should go on exhibition at least once a year and under a proper appellation.

Mr. CHURCH: We have had one Canada day since confederation—Dominion day July 1.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

NAVIGABLE WATERS

APPROVAL OF WORKS CONSTRUCTED AS OF JUNE 1, 1938

Hon. ALPHONSE FOURNIER (Minister of Public Works) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 9, to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. FRASER: Explain.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): The purpose of the bill is to amend subsection 2 of section 5 of the Navigable Waters Protection Act. The section as it stands reads:

> The governor in council may approve of works constructed, or in process of construction, on the first day of June, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen, subject to the provisions of section seven hereof, and such approval shall have the same effect as approval of works to be constructed.

The only change is to substitute, for the words "first day of June, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen", the words "first day of June, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-eight".

Mr. GRAYDON: What is the purpose?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): This applies to section 7, which reads:

> The local authority, company or person proposing to construct any work in navigable waters, for which no sufficient sanction otherwise exists, may deposit the plans thereof and a description of the proposed site with the Minister of Public Works, and a duplicate of each in the office of the registrar of deeds for the district, county or province in which such work is proposed to be constructed, and may apply to the governor in council for approval thereof.

In the interval between 1918 and 1938 certain works were proceeded with. We have no authority to legalize them under the act as it stands, and this amendment seeks to cover such works as have no other sufficient sanction.

Mr. CHURCH: Has this bill been submitted to the Department of Justice, seeing that it involves boundary waters and interprovincial and international streams?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): All these bills do go to the law clerk of the house for preparation and are submitted to the Department of Justice in every case.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

APPOINTMENT OF GEORGE A. TOUCHE AND COMPANY AS AUDITORS

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 10, respecting the appointment of auditors for national railways.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is this the annual bill?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes, this is the ordinary annual bill for the appointment of auditors for the Canadian National Railways. It is the same as the bill introduced last year, with the exception that the figures "nineteen forty-six" have been inscribed instead of the figures

"nineteen forty-five." It seeks again the appointment of George A. Touche and Company.

Mr. CHURCH: How long have they been auditors?

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time

CANADIAN ARMY

PACIFIC FORCE PAY TO RADAR TECHNICIANS AND OTHER SIGNALS PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence, a copy of which I have sent to him. Is the minister yet in a position to advise the house if Pacific pay has been granted to radar technicians and other personnel of the Royal Canadian Corps of Signals who served in the Pacific theatre between July, 1944, and February, 1946?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): Personnel who enlisted in the Canadian army Pacific force and who proceeded for training or as observers to the United States or to the Pacific theatre of war received special rates of pay authorized for the Canadian army Pacific force; but personnel other than those who had enlisted in the Pacific force were not entitled to and did not receive rates of pay authorized for the Canadian army Pacific force. There is no submission at present under consideration providing for the special rates of pay for personnel other than members of the Canadian army Pacific force.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUIREMENTS OF SUGAR BEET AND OTHER SPECIALIZED PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. It has to do with the need for specialized labour in western Ontario for sugar beet growing and other specialized work. What is being done, other than releasing conscientious objectors, to make available the necessary labour for the purpose I have just mentioned? Where other labour is not available is it the intention of the government to utilize prisoners of war for this purpose as was done in previous years?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I take it my hon. friend is concerned mainly with the sugar beet situation.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL: Questions of the type of labour for the kind of work my hon. friend has in mind are under consideration at the moment. I do not know that I can add anything to that.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

The house resumed from Tuesday, March 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fernand Viau for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Just before the debate was adjourned last night I was pointing out that the speech from the throne showed that the government was depending on pre-war policies to maintain prosperity. I pointed out that whilst the policy of foreign investment might help to maintain full employment, it must on the other hand result in a reduction in the standard of living of the people.

I think we must all agree that there is nothing in the speech from the throne to inspire the people to maintain a really worth-while peace effort. I believe we all agree there is a dangerous air of complacency about it, and that attitude has already been taken in this debate by at least one minister. I have in mind especially the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe). On the other hand I do not think it can be said that that air of complacency is general throughout the country. I know that because I have spoken to many people in various walks of life and from various parts of the country. Speaking in the vernacular I find that that ain't the way they see it. They are greatly perturbed by the shape of things to come. The government is placing altogether too great dependence upon the Bretton Woods agreement to make its policies a success. I deeply regret that the government sought fit to railroad that measure through the house the way they did at the end of the last session. The house will recall that we on this side of the house spent a fair amount of time discussing it and there were loud groans from the Liberal benches. Let me warn the members of the Liberal party that unless they get off the bed of Procrustes before the screws are turned, their backbones will refuse to act and they will no longer have the power to get off.

When Mr. Rasminsky, the government's financial expert, appeared before the banking and commerce committee, he said in reply to my questions that the success of the Bretton Woods agreement would depend to a very large extent upon a change of heart on the part of the creditor nations. Both Mr. Rasminsky and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) told us that they thought that some of the main objections we were making with

regard to the Bretton Woods agreement would be covered later by trade agreements. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand proposals for expansion of world trade and employment communicated by the United States government. I understand that these proposals are to be referred later to an international conference and that they will form the basis of a discussion.

We charged that the Bretton Woods agreement had a definite pro-creditor bias. As I have already said, Mr. Rasminsky told us that the success of that agreement would depend upon a change of heart; that the objections we had raised would be found in these proposals, and that these objections would be taken care of in the trade agreement. I have carefully studied these proposals. I have read through them many times in an endeavour to find somewhere in the agreements that change of heart referred to by Mr. Rasminsky and the Minister of Finance, and I have not been able to find it anywhere. We make exactly the same charges regarding these proposals as we did against the Bretton Woods agreement, that they have a definite pro-creditor bias.

Let me read to the house one or two sections to illustrate my charges. First I shall read subsection 1 of section A of chapter 3, and then subsection 7. In subsection 1 we find the following:

> To accord to products imported from other members treatment no less favourable than that accorded to domestic products with regard to matters affecting the internal taxation and regulation of the trade in goods.

Subsection 7:

> To refrain from governmentally financed or organized boycotts or campaigns designed to discourage, directly or indirectly, importation or consumption of products of other members.

Let us imagine this situation. A certain nation has a large unfavourable balance of trade. It may be able to balance its trade with the majority of nations, but it has a serious unbalance of trade with one large creditor nation, and that creditor nation refuses to play the game—it is, as Mr. Rasminsky says, a bad creditor. The only alternative to that debtor nation is to restrict the imports from the creditor nation in order that it may be able to bring about a balance; but under these regulations it will not have the right to do so.

Under subsection 2 of section B of chapter 3 we find the following:

> Export tariffs and preferences. Export duties should be open to negotiation in the same way as import duties. Members should undertake not to impose or maintain export duties which differentiate by reference to the destinations to which the goods are exported.

[Mr. Quelch.]

Again referring to the same nation with the unfavourable balance of trade which is largely the result of the actions of one creditor nation, surely that debtor nation should be allowed to adjust the duties on exports to that nation in order to encourage exports to that creditor nation.

I now come to subsection 2 of section C, the section which is supposed to deal with the question of unbalance of trade. It reads as follows:

> 2. Restrictions to safeguard the balance of payments. Members confronted with an adverse balance of payments should be entitled to impose quantitative import restrictions as an aid to the restoration of equilibrium in the balance of payments. This provision should be operative under conditions and procedures to be agreed upon. These conditions and procedures—
>
> (d) should provide for the full application of non-discrimination in the use of such restrictions after the transitional period.

There you have the case to which I have already referred. A nation wishing to place any restriction upon the imports of any one nation is obliged to place the same restriction against all imports it may bring in from other nations even though these nations may be playing the game and balancing their exports with imports. The purpose of the Bretton Woods agreement is supposed to be to help expand trade; but I would point out that unless the creditor nations are prepared to play the game—and there is no sign of it in these proposals—the result may very well be an intensification of economic nationalism.

I want to quote from a speech by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Attlee, to show that this is exactly what is already taking place in Britain; and, remember, Britain signed the Bretton Woods agreement. I hold in my hand British *Hansard* for January 22, 1946, and I refer to column 25. Mr. Norman Smith, who I think is Labour member for Nottingham South—

> —asked the Prime Minister whether, in view of the difficulties in paying for imports, he will direct scientific research to the substitution of home-produced for imported raw materials used in British factories.

Mr. Attlee replied:

> The circumstances of war have already obliged us to do our best to substitute home-produced for imported materials within the limitations imposed by our natural resources. The government consider that these efforts should be continued both by the government and by industry, with the full support of scientific research, in such a way as will contribute effectively to the solution of our balance of payment difficulties.

So in spite of the fact that the Bretton Woods agreement has been passed, apparently Great Britain still finds it necessary to

adopt a policy of economic nationalism in order to try to solve the balance of payment difficulties; and I am very much afraid we shall find that policy followed by many other European nations—as well as nations such as Australia—which have had great difficulty in balancing their payments in the past.

One may well ask what would be the consequences of the government's supine adherence to the reactionary form of laissez-faire capitalism. I should like to quote to the house the warning that has been issued by the governor of the Bank of Canada in this regard. On page 9 of the report of the bank dated February 8, 1946, the governor refers to the present situation and states:

> At present, government outlays are still comparatively high. Time is required for demobilization, and large payments of war service gratuities and reestablishment credits are in process of being made. Moreover, our exports, which reached unprecedented volume under mutual aid, are being maintained at a high level in part by government loans to assist allied countries to rebuild their damaged economies and to secure necessary foodstuffs.

That no doubt is the reason the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply sounded so optimistic when he spoke in this house, but I should like to go on and quote the warning that Mr. Graham Towers issues:

> Looking to the future, however, there is no reason for complacency. Most of our real problems of post-war adjustment are still ahead. The backlog of demand will not be large in relation to productive capacity when industry has been fully reconverted and inventories built up to normal levels. When the time lag involved in demobilization is over, government expenditures will fall rapidly. Nor will our foreign lending to finance the purchase of Canadian goods remain indefinitely at the present level. The prevailing optimism on the North American continent is dangerous if it diverts attention from the problems which have to be faced.

I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the problems referred to there by Mr. Graham Towers are exactly the same problems that faced us between the two wars. They are the same problems that have always faced heavily industrialized nations. Those problems may be boiled down to this: the way in which we maintain an effective demand as against our production, the way in which we maintain home markets and export markets for the total production of our factories, farms and other industries. In the past, especially from 1935 to 1939, we emphasized the reason for that situation. Time and again we pointed out that owing to certain practices which are inherent in the capitalistic system, industry is not able to maintain an effective demand against its own production except in times of abnormal capital goods construction, such as you have in war time or in any newly developed country before it becomes industrialized. Therefore if your objective is to bring about the fullest possible development of your resources you are bound to be faced with one of two alternatives. Either you will have to export your surplus goods—that is, goods not surplus to the needs of the people but surplus to their ability to buy within the country—and refuse to accept imports in return; or on the other hand you will have to expand the purchasing power of the people to the point where they will be able to buy the total production of the country and the exports of other nations exchanged for your own.

It is evident that if your objective is merely full employment; if your objective is simply to put people to work, the first of these two solutions may be satisfactory. Undoubtedly by such means you could maintain full employment, if you could get other nations who were willing to maintain an unfavourable balance of trade and to go further and further into debt, indefinitely. What nations are willing to do that? None have shown their willingness in the past; but if that were the case then you could succeed in getting everybody in the country to work. But if the objective is not merely to put people to work but to maintain the highest possible standard of living the people desire, then I think everyone will agree that the first solution is not satisfactory, because when you export more wealth abroad than you bring back in return, you are bound to reduce the standard of living of the people to the extent of that unbalance.

Therefore it should be the responsibility of the government to maintain the purchasing power of the people at a level sufficiently high to enable the people to consume to the limit of their desires or their power to produce, whichever comes first. If that is done I do not think we shall need to worry about a lack of effective demand; we shall not need to worry about a lack of markets. We shall have the greatest market this country has ever seen, the market provided by satisfying the needs of the people of this country. I suggest that under such a policy we could very well grant old age pensions of $50 a month at the age of sixty. Remember, when that matter was discussed in this house it received the support of hon. members on all sides, and the sooner the government implements a policy of the kind the sooner the people will really believe the Prime Minister means what he says when he talks about a new social order. Similar pensions should be paid to all people who are physically inca-

pacitated and unable to seek gainful employment. To a certain extent we recognize that principle now so far as the blind are concerned, but there are many other classes of people who are incapacitated. I have especially in mind people who suffer so severely from arthritis and many other diseases.

Then we emphasize the fact that income tax exemption should be increased to at least $2,000 for married people and $1,200 for single people. After our action in this house, last session taking care of ourselves in a very gracious way, I think the very least we can do is pass on some similar benefits to the people of Canada. I believe all hon. members will agree when I say it is evident that people across this country, from one end to the other, are feeling that way to-day. They expect that when the budget is brought down it will provide substantial reductions on income tax to be paid by people in the lower income brackets.

We believe that parity prices for primary products should be a matter of permanent government policy. When the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) spoke in this debate he placed our stand in respect to agriculture before the house. I repeat in passing, however, merely that, owing to increasing costs and the fact that to-day wheat at Chicago is selling at about $2 a bushel, the initial payment might very well be raised from $1.25 to $1.50. We are not criticizing the government for selling wheat to Great Britain at $1.55; but we do look upon that as a sacrifice which should be borne by the people of Canada as a whole. We do not believe the government has any right to ask one class of society to stand the whole sacrifice. We believe, too, that for the next four years the floor might very well be raised from $1 to $1.25.

There are many urgent projects which could be carried out. We believe the Minister of Reconstruction is making a mistake when he postpones the day when he proposes to put these projects into operation, and for that purpose keeps them on the shelf as insurance against unemployment.

There is no doubt, for instance, that as rapidly as possible irrigation projects should be proceeded with, thereby providing farms and homes for many thousands of people. This will help maintain a demand for goods and services of various kinds.

Then there is the question of housing. While we have many housing projects which, when materials are available, undoubtedly will help people in the higher income brackets, or even those in the medium brackets, to build houses,

I believe every hon. member will agree that these housing projects will not make it possible for the people in lower income brackets to obtain houses. After all, they are the ones in whom we should be specially interested. Therefore we favour a subsidized housing programme which would make it possible for all people in all walks of life to obtain decent housing.

It is very necessary that interest rates should be substantially lower. One thing that has been puzzling to people in Canada is that while we can make interest-free loans to foreign countries, and can make loans at a rate as low as two per cent, yet we have to soak our own people about 4½ per cent for our own housing programme.

One might criticize severely the making of loans to foreign countries at two per cent, while at the same time we are charging our own soldiers who helped win the war 3½ per cent on the loans they wish to obtain. Surely they should be eligible for the same rates that we charge on loans to foreign countries.

I realize these things cannot be accomplished either under the present Conservative or Liberal financial policy, without steadily expanding debt and taxation. But let me point out that you cannot tax yourself into prosperity; you cannot borrow yourself out of debt. Therefore, as the control of the issue of money can determine the volume and nature of production, and as it is a sovereign power, we urge the establishment of a national finance commission, responsible to parliament, through the Minister of Finance, for the issue and withdrawal of all moneys in accordance with the nation's requirements, and for the administration of the monetary system in response to the will of the Canadian people. We believe that in this way and in this way alone will it be possible to maintain and develop all the resources of the people of Canada at the highest possible level, and make the resulting wealth available to the people of this country, without at the same time dragging the nation down into the mire and morass of unpayable debt.

We have been told that one of the chief reasons for our magnificent war effort was that the people were inspired by the need for victory over the enemy. I am sure all will agree that in the speech from the throne there is nothing very much to inspire people. Certainly there is no inspiration in high taxation; there is no inspiration in expanding debt. Nor is there inspiration in a steadily lowered standard of living.

Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore):

That the following be added to the said address:

"We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that Your Excellency's ministers ought to have advised Your Excellency that they would introduce in the present session, such changes in Canada's financial, economic, and political organization as would ensure the immediate establishment of a revitalized Christian democracy wherein the standard of living of all Canadians would be raised to conform with the greatly expanded capacity of Canada to produce and deliver goods and services."

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, when I rose to speak on the amendment to the amendment, which was disposed of last evening, because there had been some discussion prior to beginning my observations I neglected to pay my respects to the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address in reply. Therefore I take this opportunity to join with other hon. members who have extended their congratulations to those hon. members upon the able manner in which they presented the motion to the house.

I had not intended at that time to say anything further about agriculture in this debate. However I am sure hon. members will agree that, in view of the statements made yesterday afternoon by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) something should be said as soon as possible.

I rise to address myself to this new motion of want of confidence which has been moved by the Social Credit section of the house. First I should like to express my appreciation to hon. members in that group for the support they have given to the main matter of contention in connection with agricultural policy in Canada. In doing so perhaps I may be permitted to call attention to the fact that probably the one group in the house more dominated than any other by farm representation is the Social Credit group. Most of them are practical farmers from that section of the country we have been discussing when we have spoken about summer-fallowing and other systems of agriculture in an area which has had great difficulty in maintaining its population at a proper standard of living. For that reason I appreciate deeply the remarks which have been made, and the support which has come from that section of the house for the summer-fallow policy.

In the discussion which has taken place up to the present time I have reason to be satisfied with the position I took very early in my political experience. It was, Mr. Speaker, that never at any time would I criticize lengthy discussions in a deliberative assembly on any question which might come before such an assembly. As a matter of fact I have always thought it was a mistake to take away from private members, in a house of commons particularly, or in any deliberative body convened for the purpose of discussing public questions—and particularly when such body is composed of elected representatives—their right to express themselves freely before we pass upon public questions in order that we may learn the point of view of people coming from different sections of such a far-flung country.

So throughout the thirty-two years in which I have been in deliberative assemblies, conscientiously I have carried out the decision I reached not to criticize people for discussing at great length subjects which might come before a deliberative body such as the House of Commons. I was never more pleased at having reached that decision a long time ago and having maintained it than I was when I listened yesterday to the leader of the opposition.

In the first speech that he delivered in the house this session he called the attention of new members particularly to the fact that this was his second session in the House of Commons; that during his first session he had sat and listened and had taken in all the different activities of members in this house, and, basing his decision upon his experience of over twenty years in another place and his one year's experience in this place, he felt called upon to give some advice to all of us. He stated that he did not intend on his first appearance before the house and in giving that advice to be brief in the remarks he proposed to make. He then proceeded to give us an address lasting somewhat in the neighbourhood of two and a half hours.

I take no exception to his doing that. It was his right; it was his privilege. We expected, of course, that that privilege would be utilized on one occasion, but probably not extended to another so soon. But yesterday we had the privilege of listening again to him for an hour and a quarter. On this occasion he was attempting to answer some of the remarks I made in a speech of about an hour's duration which I delivered a week ago. In his speech he raised three different questions.

The first was as to whether or not I had deliberately misrepresented him in any of the remarks I made in my speech of a week ago. He paid me the compliment of saying that he did not think I had done it deliberately, but that likely it was because I had not given full consideration to the matter. I want to say that everything I did a week ago I did deliberately, and I did it believing I

had in my possession all the facts. An examination of the figures which were used both then and which I will use to-day bear out the position which I took a week ago.

When we were discussing this matter a week ago I read to this house the definition of summer-fallow which was given by the leader of the opposition when he was teaching agriculture in the agricultural college of the province of Saskatchewan, and said that I agreed with it. That definition was to the effect that land which is kept out of crop, not growing any crop, not growing anything so far as you can prevent it from growing anything in one year in order to store up moisture for the next, is what is generally known in western Canada as fallowed land.

Back in 1915 and 1916 and periods earlier than that, fallowed land was composed almost equally of two different classifications of land. The first was land that had never grown anything but prairie grass. That land we broke up in the latter part of May or the early part of June. We were accustomed to calling it "breaking". That land was kept from growing prairie grass or anything else for the first season after it was broken up, and then in the succeeding year it was put into crop. Usually the first year after it was broken up from prairie it was seeded to wheat. Then in the second year it was what we called backsetted and was again seeded to wheat. We put it into wheat for two years, believing that new prairie would grow wheat for two succeeding years after it was broken up. Then, under our practice of farming, usually in the third year we summer-fallowed it, kept it from growing anthing for another year in order to store up moisture.

Those are the lands that I was speaking of when I was speaking a week ago; those are the lands that the leader of the opposition was speaking of yesterday. If you take into consideration the classified lands which were broken up in 1915 along with the lands which were summer-fallowed, all the lands not producing anything for one season in order that they may produce more abundantly the next, then the figure which should have been used by me a week ago if I had used any figure at all, and I did not, was 32 per cent and not 26 per cent or 30 per cent. In other words, the policy supported in 1916 involved keeping fallow 32 per cent of the area to be cropped the following year.

Another point is raised in connection with the discussion. It is suggested that when the statement was made a week ago the leader of the opposition was dealing with a proposal which he made to reduce summer-fallowed acreage this year down to 26 per cent. That is not the fact. The fact of the matter is that the leader of the opposition did what he suggests that I do on occasion. He suggested in his speech that on occasion I take a certain position and then try to bolster it up with any information that I can find lying about. I submit to this house that is exactly what he did yesterday.

What did he do? He took certain figures which he had compiled from somewhere or other showing that we have 61,000,000 acres of cultivated land in western Canada at the present time. We have 65,000,000 acres. He first took the figure of 10,500,000 acres and then he added a figure covering breaking and summer-fallow and figured out that 3,500,000 acres was 26 per cent of that particular figure of 13,300,000 acres. He then estimated that if 19,300,000 were reduced to 15,800,000, that would provide 26 per cent of our present acreage, stated to be 61,000,000 acres. Then he started from the 15,800,000 figure and figured everything else in his speech on the basis of 26 per cent.

The mistake in that kind of reasoning is that the present acreage is not 61,000,000 acres but 65,000,000 acres. Then there is the further fact that when the leader of the opposition was speaking a week ago the figure which he used was 15,000,000 and not 15,800,000. He said that the summer-fallowed acreage of western Canada should be reduced from the 19,300,000 acres that we are proposing the farmers might have this year, down to 16,000,000 or 15,000,000. He then suggested that that would save some three or four million acres with which to produce some 30,000,000 bushels of wheat.

I submit that when the figures are righted to check the position which was taken a week ago, the figure of 65,000,000 acres, the summer-fallowed acreage of 15,000,000 acres is not 26 per cent but 23 per cent. The proposals which were made the other day were to the effect that we should reduce the summer-fallowed acreage, which now stands at between 29 and 30 per cent down to a level of 23 per cent, and that by doing that we could produce more wheat with which to supply those who are in need at this present time.

I submit these figures in order to indicate that I have nothing to withdraw with regard to what I said a week ago. The position I took a week ago was to the effect that back in 1915 and 1916 the present leader of the opposition, as professor of agriculture in the agricultural college of Saskatchewan, was teaching our young farmers that over a considerable part of our province we ought to have 50 per cent of our land summer-fallowed;

over another very considerable part of it we ought to have 33⅓ per cent; over another much smaller part of it we ought to have 20 or 25 per cent, and that the average should be around one-third.

I know he took that position because I was in the house in Saskatchewan as a member in 1914. I was in the house in 1915 and in 1916. During some of those years the leader of the opposition was working for the government of Saskatchewan as a civil servant in the department of agriculture, and during others he was in the university in the province of Saskatchewan. I think hon. members will agree that I knew the grand old man who was Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan at that time—Hon. W. R. Motherwell—about as well as anyone in Canada could have known him. I know what his views were on the question; and I know that no man could have worked for him as a promoter of proper agricultural methods in Saskatchewan and not have been in agreement that we ought to have at least 33⅓ per cent of the lands of that province summer-fallowed each year in order to make provision for a succeeding crop. So that in so far as that particular position is concerned I have no hesitation in making the statement that was the intention of the leader of the opposition when he was teaching the subject at that time, and that everyone in western Canada believed that was the position taken in his articles.

But if I had any doubt about it I do not have to go very far for an answer. Since this discussion came on I had sent to me the opinion of Mr. D. G. Mackay, of Indian Head, Saskatchewan. One only needs to mention the name of Mackay to recall Doctor Mackay, the father of D. G. Mackay, who was the first superintendent of the experimental farm at Indian Head, and one only needs to mention that name to anyone coming from western Canada to recall the fact that Doctor Mackay was the originator of the idea of summer-fallowing, that he was the first one to advocate that policy in western Canada, that the reason he was given his position as head of the experimental farm at Indian Head when it was set up was that he had established on his own land the fact that in a dry country you can grow crops by summer-fallowing that could not be grown in years of drought unless you did summer-fallow. He started out to teach that idea to the people of western Canada, and one of his students was the present leader of the opposition. I did not give the leader of the opposition credit for having established this particular policy in western Canada; I simply said that he was teaching the subject. Prior to the time he began to teach it he had his experiences on an Ontario farm, where summer-fallowing is an entirely different matter. When he came to western Canada to work on the staff of Hon. W. R. Motherwell, who was a bosom friend of Doctor Mackay—the two men together had preached this doctrine for years throughout the length and breadth of western Canada—it went without saying that he was employed to teach the idea which had been instilled into the minds of all good farmers by the two best advocates of the policy that we ever had. So that the present leader of the opposition was then under instructions from men who believed in this policy, and he did what a good civil servant does, he went out to teach the policy, as the figures which I have indicated bear out.

D. G. Mackay has something to say about this. He is looked to by grain marketing authorities throughout the world for information; and this particular information which I have in my hand, and which was sent to me during these discussion, is noted as having been sent to Broomhall. It states this:

> A large proportion of the 1945 wheat crop in Saskatchewan was due almost entirely to the practice of "30 per cent crop, 50 per cent fallow," by the majority of farmers on the lighter lands; and on the heavier soils, to the plan of summer-fallowing at least one-third of the cultivated acreage each year.

It goes on to say:

> Despite the well recognized fact that in dry seasons wheat is a safer proposition than either of the coarse grains, anything that will tend toward a reduction of the oat and/or barley crops—thereby necessitating a further reduction in the live stock population—or in a decrease in the acreage to be summer-fallowed in the areas that for two years have suffered severe drought, must be regarded with very considerable misgiving.

That is the advice given to the people who are passing out information to grain markets all over the world, advice that they can rely upon. And what is the proposed policy he is referring to?

> In recommending an increase of over 30 per cent in the wheat acreage for 1946, the . . . government of Saskatchewan, backed by the wheat pool, seems to have completely lost sight of the fact that one-half the province has been, and is, suffering from drought conditions, that a large proportion of the other half will commence the next crop season with reserves of moisture more or less depleted, and that there will be little or no carryover of feed grain.

Those who are going to buy wheat all over the world are looking to this organization for advices on what to expect from the crops this year. This man who gives them advice says that if the policy which is being proposed before this house by the leader of the opposition is followed, they can look upon their

desire to have more wheat with great misgivings; and everyone in western Canada who knows anything about the policies of farmers in western Canada knows that to be true. That statement was made on February 14, 1946.

In making a further report, on March 11, 1946, he says:

> Deliveries of commercial feed grains in the current season to date—oats 73. barley 56.—might appear to indicate that at least 2 million each of oats and barley acreages could be changed over to wheat without seriously affecting the live stock situation in the three provinces. This however is not a sound basis for even a partial solution of the problems of increasing the acreage for the production of feed . . .
>
> This, then, would appear to leave lands intended for summer-fallow as the cultivation that must necessarily be changed over if a serious attempt be made to meet, even partially, the requirements of the stricken countries. Acreage changes of 3 to 10 million have been suggested, and under the latter an increase of 160 million bushels of export wheat has been mentioned as a possibility.
>
> Under existing moisture conditions in the plains areas the production of 160 million bushels of wheat from 10 million acres of second and third crop lands would seem to be merely a pipe dream, but the effect of the reduction of 3 to 10 million acres in the summer-fallow acreages for the crop of 1947 would be far from that—it would indicate the probalility of the smallest wheat crop in many years.

That, Mr. Speaker, is not the opinion of a man who is a politician, it is the opinion of a man who is still a scientific agriculturist, who has been bred in the ideas of summer-fallowing in western Canada, and who I believe knows the position as well as anyone in Canada can know it. Certainly some people think he does, when an organization such as this relies for its information upon him, and he sends that information out as an indication of what we can expect from the people of this country if we follow some of the advices which are given to us from time to time.

I think that pretty well deals with the first point mentioned by the leader of the opposition. I still maintain that the proper system to follow in this country is not to have even the 23,300,000 acres which we had consented to ask farmers to seed this year, but the proper policy to follow in this country is, 21,500,000 acres in wheat, 21,500,000 acres in summer-fallow each year, and the other 21,500,000 acres in either grass or coarse grains for the feeding of live stock in order that we may keep up our supplies of other feeds as well as wheat.

That is about as plainly as, I think, I can state the position in relation to it, and I hope that the leader of the opposition, who is not here this afternoon to receive the answer I am giving to what he said yesterday, will examine the figures again. I may tell him that I am making this speech now because it gives him an opportunity of replying to it if he desires to do so. If I had waited, as I might have done, until the main motion—because I had not spoken on the main motion—he would not have had the right to speak again. But since I am speaking on this amendment and he has not spoken on it he still has the right to speak on it. Well, all I would say to him is this. I think he has depended too much upon the group of young men whom he hired out of the agricultural college of Saskatchewan—very capable young fellows—and from other agricultural activities throughout Canada, and whom he placed in charge of his propaganda office and of his organization.

These men up to that time were scientific agriculturists giving advice to the people of the country upon the basis of scientific experience; and I would suggest to him, when he takes a week of the time of officials of the department and of the statistics branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the purpose of compiling information necessary to the making of a speech, he should get someone in one of these departments to write his speech for him, and not be reading a speech provided by men hired out of the departments who have become politicians.

In the discussions yesterday the leader of the opposition stated the second major point was this, that the minister said the establishment of a certain percentage of summer-fallowing will produce better results than by summer-fallowing less. It will be noted, when that appears in *Hansard* to-morrow, that I have not used the figures which were used by the leader of the opposition in making the statement.

These figures, as I stated a moment ago, were based upon figures which were not properly interpreted and which were not given full expression to in the statements read to the house yesterday—and I am not blaming the leader of the opposition for that. I do not think he wrote the speech, and therefore I would say again that I believe with him that the rules of this house and fortunately that which states one shall not read a speech ought to be enforced. That rule is put there for a purpose, that purpose being that no one outside this house and not elected by the people may make a speech in the house through some elected member.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does that apply to everyone? Does it apply to the government?

Mr. GARDINER: It applies to me anyway. When anyone is making a speech in this house which is being read, it does not necessarily follow that someone else wrote it—

Mr. GRAYDON: That is an insult to the Prime Minister.

Mr. GARDINER: —though there is a possibility that someone else wrote it. My hon. friend says that is an insult to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has proven himself on many occasions in this house capable of delivering his own speech, either read or spoken.

An hon. MEMBER: So has the leader of the opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Do not worry about the Prime Minister.

Mr. FRASER: He will have lots of worries.

Mr. GRAYDON: It should apply to everyone if it applies to the leader of the opposition.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not intend to quote again figures which were not correct.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): All out of step but my son John.

Mr. GARDINER: Another suggestion has been made; it is that I was wrong in maintaining that we had kept the crop up through summer-fallow—kept the total yield up through summer-fallow—and in order to answer that, the leader of the opposition dwells upon a suggestion that, because in a certain season I had said that the acreage ought to be so-and-so, and in another season I said it should not be any more, I was not advocating greater production of wheat.

The fact is that the leader of the opposition thinks you can get more wheat by merely increasing the acreage. I do not believe that. I have been attempting to demonstrate to the house, every time I have spoken on the question, that the one way to get a higher quantity of production in the west is to summer-fallow one-third of the land on an average, and over a very considerable part of the area one-half of the land. If we do that we can get a much higher production of wheat and feed and live stock and dairy products and all other farm products in that country, and as a matter of fact all dairy and live stock products produced in other parts of Canada, because in no other part of Canada do they produce enough feed grain to feed all the live stock they can maintain on their pastures and by other means on their land. Therefore we must produce feed grain that is to be utilized, and elsewhere increase these productions right across the country.

In dealing with this matter, the leader of the opposition became eloquent, maintaining that I did not give sufficient credit to Providence or to someone else. I might say this, I would far rather be guilty of not giving credit to the Lord than be guilty of blaming our difficulties upon Him, and that is exactly what the leader of the opposition did. He said it was the drought and grasshoppers, the sawfly and the cutworms—these were the things which caused the difficulties from 1935 to 1939; and because I did not mention them, I gave all credit to the government for the summer-fallow policy which I maintained had increased production from 1941 to 1944.

The fact is that I did not choose that period at all; the leader of the opposition chose that period. In his speech a week ago he challenged me as Minister of Agriculture to ask the people of Saskatchewan and of western Canada in general to go back to the acreages in the period immediately prior to the war, and I took him at his word and compared the two periods. I simply stated that we had this production in the one five-year period, not only of grain, but of live stock and dairy products and everything else that goes on the market; that we had another production in the other period, and that the production in the second period when we were encouraging summer-fallow was much higher than in the preceding period. And now he says to me that in making that statement I have said it was better than at any other time.

Probably I am a little guilty of having said that.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Just a weeny bit.

Mr. GARDINER: I certainly said that one year of the period, 1942, had produced more than any other year in our experience, but I am quite prepared to accept the criticism; for where did he go in order to check up on that statement? He went back to the years prior to 1929, in the twenties. I would call his attention to one fact in that connection.

We were told in this house that certain things have happened because of certain policies which this government had. We were told that we had certain support because of certain things we did, while there was lack of support because of things we did not do. Then he goes back to the twenties to find a period he thinks was better than this period during the war, although he does give us credit for having had the best period of all in the last three years.

What does that bring us to? It brings us to this fact. We have had changes of government from time to time in this country. The government under the leadership of the present Prime Minister came into power in 1922—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: 1921.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, December, 1921, and continued in power down to 1930. In that period what happened? Agriculture rose from one experience to another, from an experience which it had had in the years following the first world war to the early thirties. It rose from one position to another until the only period that the leader of the opposition can take us back to in order to find better conditions than those prevailing at the present time, according to his story, is the twenties following the last war. That brings us down to about the time that a previous leader of his party whose policies he would like us to follow was in office. No one would suggest we return to the early thirties. What about the period following that to which he advised us to go the other day?

In speaking of the last three years of the war period he did not emphasize this; the highest heights to which we as a farming population ever rose prior to the last five years were in 1928. The total gross cash income of the farmers was $1,060,000,000 The average for the total cash farm returns in this country for the last three years has been $1,600,000,000, and in one of those years, 1944, it was $1,800,000,000. In other words, if one takes the three-year period during the twenties and compares it with the last three-year period it will be found that we are from $600 to $700 million higher on an average than we were in the preceding period.

If the policies of the government have led us to the present position in the last three years, what about the next three? Yesterday I had the privilege of bringing down in this house the agreements which have been arrived at between this government and the British government. They showed on a firm basis for this crop year, the next crop year and the following crop year, price levels and other returns for farm products equal to those we have had during the last three years. I have showed in this policy that we have not only laid down for a three-year period, which is admitted by the leader of the opposition himself, a programme which will assure as good returns, but also for at least another three years which will assure as high returns as have already produced a record.

That brings me to the suggestion that I did not take into consideration pests such as wireworms, cutworms, grasshoppers and some other things.

Mr. GRAYDON: And the C.C.F.

Mr. GARDINER: I am beginning to wonder whether the C.C.F. is as much a pest as my hon. friends directly opposite. I hold in my hand a map which shows the areas that are infested from time to time by grasshoppers. It is the same area that we speak of as the Palliser triangle. Then I have another map which shows the same thing for wireworm.

An hon. MEMBER: Did you make it up?

Mr. GARDINER: No; some of the people who gave my hon. friend some of his information made it. Then I have one with regard to the sawfly which shows the same area. Then I have another one that shows the sawfly in 1938, and it gives the same area. Then I have another one that shows the sawfly in 1942 and it covers the same area. I could go on throughout all the years that we have had experience with the different kinds of pests and indicate that they thrive in the drought area known as the Palliser triangle in western Canada. Then I hold in my hand the advice which is given to the farmers from time to time by the scientists in relation to this particular problem. Here is what they say with regard to grasshoppers:

> Careful planning is essential to best control. This is particularly important in the areas of open plains, where widespread infestations of the lesser migratory grasshopper are likely to be found. The work should be so timed that summer-fallows will be completed before the grasshoppers migrate from the stubble to adjacent crops.

Note that the grasshopper's eggs are laid in the stubble. They are there in the fall of the year. It is pointed out that the summer-fallowing should be done sufficiently early to destroy as many of these pests as possible before they can move out of that stubble land on to the land that is growing a crop. The scientists say, "Take care of your summer-fallow, but do it early, and that in itself will assist you in treating grasshoppers." The article goes on:

> As much as possible of the infested stubble land and recently abandoned land, which may be heavily infested, should be summer-fallowed and worked in a manner that will destroy the grasshoppers or their eggs and prevent migration. In severely infested areas it is folly to "stubble-in" any crop.

In other words, they are emphasizing cultivation and more, particularly claiming summer-fallowing as a means of contesting grasshoppers.

I now come to another of the pests mentioned, the stem sawfly. We are told much the same thing. This statement is made:

Any type of farming practice or rotation in which wheat is seeded on land containing infested stubble or adjoining such land tends to increase the abundance of the sawfly. Infestations in large field units, which are summer-fallowed in alternate years, are usually found to be confined to the margins.

In other words, the only places where you have the sawfly in a well summer-fallowed field are where the sawfly comes in out of the areas immediately roundabout. Therefore summer-fallowing is a means of dealing with all these infestations. I do not need to say to men from western Canada who have had experience in farming that in so far as the cutworm is concerned that is more particularly true. The cutworm comes from an insect. It lives on top of the ground. Naturally the grub goes into the ground when conditions are suitable, and they are suitable to it only when there is not much moisture in the land. When the land is properly summer-fallowed and maintained there is less likelihood of cutworm being prevalent than if that process is not carried out.

I go into this in some detail to show that not all the pests are of the insect variety. These people who are going around the country telling us that we ought to have less summer-fallow in the area when the experts tell us that we have already had two drought years are, I think, greater pests than all the army worms, wire worms, cutworms and grasshoppers that we have ever had. We ought to get rid of some of these.

Since listening to the discussion and looking at the statistics that were placed on *Hansard* yesterday, I have come to the conclusion that scientists when they get out of their element and into politics giving information are just about as dangerous as any pests we have ever had. We have had some experience with that kind of thing. Scientists have their noses glued to a task. They are working at it. Their minds are upon the accomplishment of it, and while they are working at these tasks they do some wonderful things for all of us. But when a man who has been studying matters of that kind during the early part of his life and instructing the youth how to carry out those ideas and then in some way or other gets shoved into something else in which he has had no previous experience and tries to instruct the people he gets into trouble. I believe the leader of the opposition is the one man in this country at this time who demonstrates that to a greater degree than anyone else. He has been shoved over into that position. I do not know that he desired it. I am going to deal with that in a few moments. He has been utilized in a certain way and I shall deal with that in a few moments. In the meantime all I wish to say is that we have had some difficulties as a result of scientists taking over other responsibilities and trying to give us advice in other fields. Some scientists are in the organization offices of the Progressive Conservative party and some are in that leadership going around the country talking to our people on the ground that because at one time they were considered to be experts in agriculture, therefore every farmer should follow them. I am not greatly worried about that. It is pretty well known what the intention was when these leaders took over; it was fairly clearly stated to us yesterday. The intention, of course, was to appeal to the agriculturists of Canada, and more particularly to the agriculturists of western Canada to support a certain party. Well, if anyone benefited from that appeal it was not the Progressive Conservative party; probably it was our C.C.F. friends. The appeal made to the farmers of western Canada under the present leadership did not return more Conservatives to this house from western Canada. Two very able men at whom I used to look across the way, coming from the province of Saskatchewan, are not in their seats this parliament. True, these leaders succeeded in removing quite a number from this side of the house, but after all they did not accomplish very much toward the objective they had in mind in establishing one set of principles as against another set of principles. I would suggest that when we go to the country again we place our principles squarely before the people and rest our case upon those principles. Then I think we shall get much better results than by simply trying to encourage men who were scientists and experts in certain lines of activity to go out and tell our people that more can be accomplished by following some particular individual than by following sound scientific practice.

The third point which was raised was to the effect that the government had claimed to have switched its policy, which up to 1943 had been to encourage the production of live stock; that from that time on we encouraged the production of wheat, but that we had not done so. In dealing with this matter yesterday the leader of the opposition read from the reports of the dominion-provincial conference which has been held each December since 1939, to substantiate the position he took, and said that according to those reports I had not advocated an increased wheat acreage during the last three years. Then he went on to

quote from a newspaper in western Canada which he said was a supporter of the government. Of course we like to get support from any quarter, and to the extent that this newspaper supports the government we appreciate it.

An hon. MEMBER: You will need it.

Mr. GARDINER: Well, I have not needed it as much as some people, so far. I have here some of the opinions expressed by this same newspaper just a year ago, and I should like to place one or two of them on *Hansard* in order that we may understand just what the position is from time to time. I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg *Free Press* of March 23, 1945, just about a year ago. The first sentence is:

> The supply of foodstuffs during the coming year has become a matter of urgent concern to the governments of the united nations. The prospective deficiency in the supplies of meat is the main cause for anxiety.

Then further:

> The first matter to be examined in this connection is the recently announced policy regarding wheat. The government has decided to increase substantially the returns which western farmers will receive from wheat . . .
>
> This policy is bound to have important repercussions on the nature of agricultural production in the prairie provinces. It is widely expected that the increase in the returns from wheat, coming on top of the shortage of labour and the growing strain on the agricultural population, will result in a further expansion in wheat acreage at the expense of animal feed stuffs and live stock production. It is clear that such a development would be directly contrary to the real needs of the situation.

That was just about a year ago, that this paper was saying that to encourage wheat production in Canada in order to take care of the food situation that was developing would be a mistake. I could go on and read some two or three more issues of the same newspaper along the same lines. I think I shall read only one portion from the issue of April 11, 1945:

> When Canadians think of food relief for Europe they think, too often, of wheat. We have great wheat surpluses, but wheat is not the answer. It cannot be ground quickly into flour in Europe because of the war-damaged mills and power shortages. Every flour mill in Canada is working to capacity, so there is little chance of our increasing our flour supplies.

Having read those three statements from the editorial page of the Winnipeg *Free Press*, I do not think I need go farther than to say that even newspapers sometimes change their minds. A year ago they were advocating a policy entirely different from that which was read to this house yesterday in order to indicate that the statements I made a week ago were not based upon the facts, were not based upon the experience of farmers, and were not in the best interests either of the farmers or of the people who were depending upon us for food. Yet within twelve months the same newspaper was arguing that we ought to have been doing what I maintained last week we were doing

I may say I had some controversy with the newspaper at that time. The suggestion was made that we had raised the prices of grain and that by doing so we were going to deplete our live stock because we had not raised the prices of live stock sufficiently. They went on to suggest that we had not increased the price of bacon at all after having increased the price of grain. I wrote them to point out that we had increased the price of bacon after raising the price of grain, and that we did consider there was a pretty fair balance, as a result of which we believed the farmers would make their own choice. It is true I did not come out and say, "Seed a greater acreage." A great many people were saying that, and it was being said by some from whom I was quite sure it would be just as acceptable to the farmers of western Canada as any advice I could give in a matter of this kind. So that what I said the other day was this, that in 1943 the government had announced an increased price for wheat, and increased prices for oats and barley, and by those increased prices had encouraged the production of grains as against live stock; and that we had done so advisedly. As I stated a week ago, I went across this country and addressed twenty-five audiences in the part of the country concerned, indicating that we were not asking the farmers any longer to keep down the production of wheat, that we were desirous of having them make the decision on the basis of their own needs. If they required cash immediately they could produce live stock and sell it upon a market which was available at all times. If they did not require cash immediately it was quite safe to produce wheat, and store it in bins against the time when we would require it. I believe the farmers acted upon the suggestions which were made over that area which is pictured in the maps I exhibited a few moments ago. We had great increases in wheat acreage, greater than we desired. So that on every occasion that I spoke to the farmers with regard to this matter I said that 23,000,000 acres was too high, that it should be brought down to 21,500,000 acres as soon as possible. Last year for the first time we told them to main-

tain it at 23,300,000 acres for this one year; then we could again size up the situation in Europe and tell whether it would be essential to do the same thing in the years ahead. We were two years in advance of either the *Free Press* or anyone other than the government in encouraging increased acreage.

I think I have fully covered the position I took the other day. I have repeated that the policy of the government is one of having one-third of the land in the three prairie provinces summer-fallowed, one-third in wheat and one-third to provide feed grains and fodder for live stock; and on that basis we shall produce more food than we shall in any other way. We did agree to continuing this year with an acreage of 23,000,000 acres, which is 2,000,000 acres higher than our judgment suggests in normal times.

In order that I may not be misunderstood with regard to this, and in order that this house may know that the *Free Press* is fully informed with regard to it, may I point out that I have here an editorial which was written on the 19th day of this month. The other one, which was read yesterday, was written on the 22nd. My telegram is dated the 23rd, in reply to the first editorial. In that editorial it was stated that the government did not seem to be very firmly convinced as to what way the farmers ought to go, and that we were not giving the kind of leadership that ought to be given. It was stated that some others, including provincial governments and grain concerns, were giving definite leadership, and that they agreed in that leadership to the effect that we should have increased acreages in wheat.

I sent this telegram on March 23 to the editor:

> Have just read your editorial headed "Greater cultivation needed", in which you refer to leadership and uncertainty.
>
> There has been no uncertainty since last December as to the wishes of the federal Department of Agriculture or the government of Canada. The advice of this department to the western farmers is that they do not take any land out of summer-fallow or feed grains this year and sow it to wheat.
>
> This advice is based upon every experience we ever had in western Canada to get increased food production immediate or long time.
>
> If the *Free Press* on its own responsibility wishes to advise otherwise they are of course free to do so without it costing them anything as are some others referred to. It has been the dominion treasury and the farmers that have had to pay the costs of poor farming practice coupled with drought in the west over the past twenty years.
>
> The only direction some desire to recognize as leadership is their own. We are not leading in the direction you appear to wish to go but we are leading in the opposite direction.

I wanted to make that as clear as I possibly could make it. I hope it has been published. I say that because it cost this government and others $217 million in the last drought period to take care of those who during the years immediately after the last war followed a policy similar to that being advocated now. Those of us who had experience with that situation, have no desire to return to it—even if the government were prepared to pay the money.

Mr. MacNICOL: What was the length of time over which the government had to give $217 million?

Mr. GARDINER: From 1930 down to 1939, probably. It included the last two terms of government. That is an enormous sum of money. And those of us who are entrusted with the care of the money in the treasury of the country feel that we have some responsibility. If others persuade farmers to go in another direction, and the farmers go along and suffer as a result of it, then so far as I am concerned, following the experience I have had in the last twenty years, I want to be on record everywhere possible as having said that the only policy to ensure us against drought and the only policy to ensure us against pests is a summer-fallow policy which puts one-third of our land under summer-fallow.

Had it not been for the closing observations of the leader of the opposition I would have had nothing further to say. However, he did say something further, which requires some comment. I do not know why the leader of the opposition thought he had to make some explanation about his becoming leader of the Progressive Conservative party. Most people do not require to make explanations after having made moves of that kind.

No, most people are well understood by all, and particularly people who rise to the height of becoming leaders of great political parties. Everyone knows they are the leaders of those parties. Everyone knows they are leaders because they have always—or at least for a very long time—been members of those parties. They have fought for them, worked for them, led others into them, and so have gained leadership. They require to make no explanations whatsoever.

For instance, we understand why the hon. member who sits at the far corner of the house is leader of the Social Credit group. We understand why the hon. member who leads the C.C.F. party is leader of that group. We understand why the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is leader of this group. No one needs to explain it.

But why the leader of the opposition should have thought it necessary yesterday to explain why he had become leader of the Progressive Conservative party—other than is disclosed by the record—I do not know.

He says, "I supported this government for twenty years." Well, this government has been in power for 15 of the last 20 years. One of those periods—a period of five years—was at about the centre of that time and his party was in power. I do not know just what the leader of the opposition means by his statement. Maybe he means that he was supporting whichever federal government was here. In any event his statement is that he supported this government for twenty years.

Let us look at the record. The record shows that in 1922 there was an election in Manitoba. Who won it? The U.F.M. won it; the present leader of the opposition did not even run in it. In that election the following representation was returned:

Progressives	1
U.F.M.	27
Labour	6
Liberals	7
Conservatives	6
Independent	8

There were 28 in that house who were not members of the U.F.M. and 27 who were. Something had to be done about that. A government was formed with the support of other than those who had been elected with the U.F.M. group and under the leadership of Mr. Bracken.

In 1927 there was the same kind of election, with the same kind of results—with the exception that the leader of the opposition was then leading the party in Manitoba. However, it was led under another name, namely that of the Progressives. That was the name used, although there had been only one Progressive in the previous house. That election returned the following representation:

Progressives	29
Conservatives	15
Liberal	7
Labour	3
Independent	1

That takes us through two terms in the twenty years, and I am quite sure that not even the leader of the opposition would say that in that kind of leadership he was supporting either the party now sitting directly opposite me, or the party which now has been charged with forming a government in Canada.

This brings us to 1932, at which time there was another election. But let me recall that this party was not in office at Ottawa in 1932. In that year the campaign was conducted under the name Liberal-Progressive party, with the present leader of the opposition in this chamber acting as leader of that party. At that time there were elected:

Liberal Progressives	38
Conservatives	10
Labour	5
Independent	2

In 1936 there was another election, with the same name and leader heading the government. At that time this party was in office at Ottawa, although we had been here for only a few months. The result of that provincial election was as follows:

Liberal Progressives	23
Conservatives	16
C.C.F.	7
Social Credit	5
Independent	2
Communist	1

Then we come to the election of 1941, under the name "Coalition." Why? It was done in that way because, in order to carry on in the previous period, with only twenty-three elected under his leadership, he had to obtain the support of the Conservative party. The result was a coalition, in which the Conservative party took part.

I leave it to the judgment of the house and country as to when the hon. member changed over, first to support this government, and later not to support it; or, to put it more clearly, this party. When was it? Those figures suggested the answer. I submit it was not in 1942; I submit it was not in 1943; I submit it had nothing to do with the ninety cent price of wheat and the $1.25 that he was advocating, as he said yesterday. If it had, this government, within a few months after he became leader, made the initial price of wheat $1.25 a bushel. If that was all that was involved in his crossing over from one group to another, it is nearly time he was coming back again, if he would be received. I have no doubt that anyone who has changed so often, so many times, so easily and with so little provocation, could change again if he found it necessary to do so. But those of us who got our convictions fairly young in life and who have tried to hold them, tried to maintain them—

Mr. JACKMAN: Stopped thinking.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend says "stopped thinking". They may do that in his party, but they do not in this. Those of us who started early and kept right at the job of trying to convince the people of Canada that our policies are best for the country do not need to go around explaining our position. We do not need to try to convince the people that we have taken a certain position for the first time. We have

been taking the position which we take to-day with regard to farm policy and other matters for a very considerable period of time. That is the position we took during the period from 1921 down to 1929, which was the best period for agriculture that this country had experienced down to that time. Just as my hon. friends opposite in the short period of five years demonstrated that their policy was the worst possible policy for agriculture. So have we, since 1935, been working at the job with the same set of principles, with the same views with regard to agricultural methods and practices, demonstrated to the people of western Canada as well as to those of eastern Canada that we have arrived at the point where agriculture has passed the heights it rose to under the previous Liberal government. Even the leader of the opposition says that in the last three years agriculture has been in the best position it has ever been in, even back in the twenties. But he goes on to say even more than that; he says, "What we are worried about is the future." The only thing if he is concerned for agriculture that he needs to be worried about is whether anyone will ever put him in office.

This government with the policies which have been in effect during the last ten years, developed to fuller completion in the last five or six years and which are guaranteed by the agreements which were read yesterday by me and which will be submitted on grain later by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) and by the further arrangements that will eventually be brought down will satisfy even some of the criticisms that have been made in this house. Some people may be sorry before it is all finished that they made the criticism they did. They may find that some of the things they proposed are not only already arranged for but are in position to be brought down in sufficient time to take care of what they are worrying about in connection with farm production and the condition of the farmer in the immediate future.

Therefore I say that in voting on this motion of want of confidence that is now proposed, the thing for this house to do, first, is to vote down the amendment in order that we may get on to the main motion and, then, vote the main motion through in order that this government may get on with the job of further improving agricultural conditions in this country.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I had not anticipated speaking again in this debate, but since the opportunity has arisen, and, as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) has quite properly stated to the house, this debate affords an opportunity to discuss some matters that are before the country, and there may be a danger of some misunderstanding as to where we stand in this controversy regarding price ceilings and the production of food, I felt that I should like to say something further this afternoon.

Before I proceed may I say that I was greatly interested this afternoon in hearing the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) rise on a question of privilege and read into the record a short statement by Tim Buck. I presume that the marriage of convenience which seemed to have been consummated before the elections has now been very happily dissolved.

As I said a moment ago, I am rising to say something about the discussion on the removal of price ceilings. The other evening the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman) urged the removal of price ceilings in the building trades. He complained about the difficulties of the builders in obtaining labour because of insufficient wages, and in obtaining materials because of insufficient prices. I listened last night to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) who stated that in his opinion butter should be seventy-five cents a pound, or, indeed, perhaps even a dollar a pound. I believe that some adjustments must be made in the prices of farm commodities, but let me say to these gentlemen at once that if prices are allowed to take flight, then we are in for a severe trimming of the consuming population of this country. Inevitably the prices of all the things the farmer has to buy will rise, but the prices of the things he has to sell will trail the prices of the things he has to buy. The worker will find himself chasing prices upward and wages never catching up with them. Then when we get to the peak, as we found after the last war, there will be the collapse and inevitable suffering by the working people and farmers of this country.

May I say that the demands we have been listening to in this house from the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and from some of his followers are strangely like those that are now being heard in the United States, where the former isolationists in the senate and house of representatives, and the newspapers which supported the isolationists in that country, are demanding the removal of price ceilings and the elimination of controls. I venture to say there is no desire on the part of those in Canada who are really behind this move to benefit either the worker or the farmer. In reality it is engendered by powerful business and financial interests in this country

who want to puncture the price ceiling and get rid of controls in order that they may have a Roman holiday.

Mr. GRAYDON: You could not believe that.

Mr. COLDWELL: I may say this, that the past record of these same big business people, as was noted yesterday by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis), fully confirms the opinion I have just expressed.

I want to place before the house exactly where we stand in this controversy. We have always urged, because we believe in it, economic and social planning of an intelligent sort. We believe that our economy should be intelligently directed in the interests of the Canadian people. And may I say to the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch), who objected to voting for our subamendment last evening on the ground that his group had not a mandate for the establishment of a socialist state, that that amendment did not ask for a socialist state but asked for the institution of intelligent national planning. At the moment there is a need for such planning. If ever there was a need of intelligent planning of our economic life and of our production of food, it is now, when starvation faces millions of people from one end of the world to the other; and this can be met, it seems to me, by encouraging the production of food and of other materials. In order to encourage that production, the people who work and produce must be guaranteed, not only now but in the days to come, the reward of an adequate and rising standard of living. That means, of course, that the prices of consumer goods and of farm commodities must bear a direct relationship with one another.

Floor prices and minimum wages are essential, but in considering floor prices and minimum wages let us remember that if we are to have floor prices, minimum wages and adequate standards, we cannot allow speculation of the type that will shoot prices high in one period and depress them in another. Under present conditions, ceiling prices and fair wages are essential, and in order to arrive at both fair prices and fair wages we require a national plan under which negotiations to set these fair wages and proper prices would be conducted by the representatives of agriculture, of labour, and of industry. That is what we mean when we talk about a national planning authority. A mad scramble for higher prices and higher wages obtained by strikes and by pressure groups will sooner or later cause economic and social chaos.

Mr. TUSTIN: Does the hon. member think the farmer is getting a fair price NOW?

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. COLDWELL: The farmer wants a fair, reasonable and stabilized price for his butter, his eggs, his wheat, his hogs and other products; and I told my hon. friend how that might be arrived at—if he had listened to me—in the very last statement I made before the one I am making now.

Mr. GRAYDON: The hon. member did not answer his question.

Mr. COLDWELL: I answered his question. I said that in order to achieve a fair price, that price must be based on negotiation among all those interested. I am not one of those who guesses, as the hon. member for Stanstead did, that the farmer might get a dollar a pound for his butter, or guesses, like somebody else, that he might get $3 a bushel for his wheat. The only manner in which prices can be found to be reasonable, fair and stable is by intelligent examination and by negotiation among the parties concerned. That is the manner in which I would answer the particular question.

I do not believe that the farming population of this country desire to take advantage of the widespread starvation which exists throughout the world to-day. I was reading only this morning an account of the recent by-elections in Great Britain, and I was greatly struck by the attitude of the British people who to-day are enduring a greater austerity programme than they endured even in the days of the war. One of their constituencies, the Heywood and Radcliffe division, up to 1935 was regarded as an entirely safe Conservative seat. In the general election last summer the Labour party won the seat by a small majority. In the by-election that was held last month the Labour party won that constituency again, by a slightly reduced majority; and when the result was made known the successful candidate, Flight-Lieutenant Greenwood, summed up the whole matter in a single sentence. This is what he said:

> I have won this election because the people of this division were not prepared to sell their birthright of two thousand years of Christian principles for a packet of dried eggs.

To-day, Mr. Speaker, a packet of dried eggs —or the lack of it—is a symbol of the austerity programme in Great Britain. And I do not believe that the farmers of this country are prepared to forgo the teachings of two thousand years of Christianity and try to wring the last cent out of a starving world.

I am rising this afternoon because I find that lately, in the Winnipeg *Free Press* and some other papers, we have been bracketed with the Progressive Conservatives.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is a compliment to you.

Mr. COLDWELL: No. If it is a compliment it is a very left-handed one.

Mr. GRAYDON: Think of us.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am rising because I want to make it very clear that we are not joining them in the propaganda to get rid of all price controls including the controls on the prices of farm produce. In order to show that I am not saying this only this afternoon I should like to refer to the speech I made in this house on March 18. At that time—and I do it again this afternoon, in spite of what the Minister of Agriculture has said—I criticized the government because I believed that they were failing to take a risk this year in increasing the production of cereals, which I believe is warranted. The house will remember I expressed the opinion that if we did increase wheat acreage beyond a certain level, we were incurring some risk. But I believe that that risk is warranted this year; and about that may I add at once that there may be an honest difference of opinion. I went on to say this, *Hansard,* page 57:

> Uncertainty wtih regard to prices of farm products is already causing a serious decline in some products. Agriculture needs the assurance of floor prices which will be reviewed from time to time and be set in relation to the cost of production and the sacrifices farmers made or are making to the maintenance of price ceilings. I wish to say at once that we cannot subscribe to the propaganda that farm prices should be allowed to find their own levels by open market trading. True, levels of some farm products, notably wheat, would reach a high level now; but inevitably the day would come when they would become equally low. Consequently we believe the farmer desires, not high prices at one period and low prices at another, but some stability in price levels.
>
> The farmer, like the industrial worker, wants fair, stabilized returns so that he may maintain a decent standard of living every day of every year.

The Minister of Agriculture pointed out that many of my hon. friends who sit in the Social Credit group are from farm constituencies, representing a farm population to whom this problem is of vital interest. Let me say to him that around me in this party are men who in the main, with only three or four exceptions, represent farming areas.

Mr. GARDINER: My distinction was different from that. I said that the Social Credit group, I thought, had the largest proportion of men who are actually farmers, men living on the farm.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am not sure about that. I have not checked it up, but I doubt whether even that is true. In any event, however, it is correct to say that the two parties sitting to your far left, Mr. Speaker, do represent largely the wheat-growing area of this country; consequently this matter is of vital interest to us. It is true that the farmers during these war years, in spite of improved prices, have not received either the returns for their labour or the recognition which they deserve of their contribution to the maintenance of price ceilings.

I have stated on a number of occasions in this house that the assessment for income tax, for example, which has been mentioned several times in the debate, is wrong so far as farm families are concerned. Some allowance should have been made long ago for the farmer's wife and the farmer's family. These wives and families have contributed a great deal, in their long hours of labour on the farm, to the building up of farm incomes, and some recognition should have been given to them long ago. I hope that when the new budget comes down their remuneration, if you like to call it that, will be considered a legitimate part of farm expenses.

I wish to say something about the wheat policy of the government, and I shall deal with wheat for the reasons I gave a few moments ago. The policy of the C.C.F. prior to and during the early part of the war was a pretty continuous demand for increased prices for wheat in order to give the farmer a return which would enable him to hire the necessary labour, buy the necessary machinery, and attain a reasonable standard of living; and as long as wheat prices remained at 60 cents, 70 cents, 90 cents and $1 a bushel we fought for increased prices for wheat, and fought continuously.

Farmers organizations want stabilized prices, and I am glad that the Minister of Agriculture was able yesterday to place before the house the outline of the agreement that has been reached with Great Britain. I had hoped that some such agreement might be reached, and now we have before us an agreement which does guarantee certain prices to farmers this year and the two succeeding years. I have not examined all the details of the agreement. Some of these prices may be out of line, too low. If so, then I agree with the member for Acadia that if the farmers are asked to take any price that is too low, they should not be penalized on that account but the difference should be made up by all the people of Canada. It should not fall on farmers alone.

Farmers organizations, as I have already said, continue, as they continued in those years, to demand adequate and stabilized prices. Our position now is this, that the act establishing a floor price of $1 a bushel

ought to be amended and at least $1.25 substituted as the floor. I should prefer to see an amendment made, not on the basis of $1.25 but on the basis of a thorough discussion with the farm organizations concerned, and by negotiation and by intelligent appraisal, to find out what the floor price really ought to be at this time. Perhaps it might be nearer $1.55. When this floor price is set it should take into consideration the average cost of production, and some consideration should be given to the contribution that agriculture made during the course of the war.

I want to make this abundantly clear, as I said a short time ago, because of articles that have appeared in the press linking us in some degree with the propaganda of the Progressive Conservatives, and incidentally with the private grain trade of the country. The C.C.F., in common with western organizations, including, may I say, some western Liberal organizations, have always condemned reliance on open market trading as a method of fixing prices. We have consistently urged and we urge now the abolition completely of the Winnipeg grain exchange. Why keep it in existence, particularly when these new agreements are before the house? We have condemned the grain exchange and that method of marketing because of fluctuating prices, high at some period and inevitably low at another.

We believe in a democratic and intelligently planned economy in which prices would bear some relationship to each other. I think we can be proud of what Canada did during the war in the provision of food, when we came to the fore in the supplying of all kinds of commodities to the united nations through mutual aid. Our principal contribution even then was of great quantities of wheat.

My hon. friend the member for Swift Current last night outlined part of the history of the wheat problem. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) announced on September 28, 1943, that all the Canadian visible wheat had been taken over by the wheat board in order that we might carry out commitments we had then made under mutual aid, and the wheat board became the only marketing agency. It was at that time, I believe—in fact I know—that the initial price of $1.25 a bushel was set, an increase incidentally which pleased us, because it was 35 cents a bushel more than had been prevailing up to that time; and subsequently the government purchased from the wheat board for mutual aid the wheat it needed, which I believe at that time amounted to 150 or 160 million bushels, at a price of $1.43 a bushel or thereabouts.

Mr. GARDINER: $1.46.

Mr. COLDWELL: I thought it was $1.43. Then came an interesting development which caused a great deal of discussion throughout western Canada. There was a shortage of United States bought wheat from us, about wheat in the United States. We had built up surpluses, and thank heaven we did. The United States took 200 million bushels, and at $1.46 a bushel.

Mr. GARDINER: It started at $1.25 and gradually went up to $1.46.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes. I want to draw attention to this, because we are told that the United States price was the true price. About two weeks ago I listened to the able and genial gentleman who is the economic adviser of the Searle Grain company, Major Strange, speaking over the radio. He was arguing about what the true price of wheat was. He argued that in the United States it was arrived at on an open market, but as a matter of fact at that time the price of wheat we sold in the United States was based on the United States price, which was determined in relation to something they called parity and I understood was kept under a ceiling price the United States had established. Therefore the Canadian farmer obtained what was in effect the United States parity price together with the premium in exchange on United States funds, less, of course, the cost of the freight and handling charges to the United States.

Mr. GARDINER: And the duty.

Mr. COLDWELL: And of course the duty of forty-two cents a bushel. The line elevator companies, the western pools and the farmers all seemed satisfied with the results that were being obtained in that way. In the autumn of 1945 the position changed in the United States. The United States had reaped a good cereal crop and did not need to import from Canada. It became the only other exporter of wheat in any large quantity for the use of the starving world; in fact we in North America were the only sources of supply.

During the last few months there has been much discussion in the papers, in farm organizations across the country, and, as we have noted, in this house, as to the reasons why our wheat price in Canada should be lower than the wheat price in the United States. Let us not forget this, that after Japan was defeated last August mutual aid suddenly came to an end, as did lend-lease in the United

States. When that occurred I suppose it was necessary for the governments to get together and negotiate a price for Canadian wheat. I suppose that is how the $1.55 was arrived at What was actually done was to maintain the $1.55 that had been in effect for some time. When I speak of this $1.55 price I have it in mind that I understood from the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he spoke that that price might not necessarily be what I might call the long-term price; that there is room for variation in that figure. If $1.55 is not a fair price after the method of arriving at it has been properly discussed with the producer organizations and the government, then the price can be varied and brought into line with what it should be.

In discussing this price and opposing the propaganda for uncontrolled prices for farm products, I wish to make it clear that the position I take is that we approve price controls, but without more facts than we have at our disposal at this time we are not committing ourselves to-day as to whether $1.55 is the right and proper price or not.

I said that I listened to Major Strange a little while ago and when I heard him arguing about these prices I thought of the days when the grain exchange was really functioning, when following the last war we had a price of over $2.73 a bushel for our wheat at Fort William. One year later, if I remember correctly, the price had dropped to just above $1. That was between 1920 and 1921. What we are anxious about is that this does not happen again. As I have said before, the producer of foods is not interested in a high price now and a low price hereafter. If we try now to gouge from the world the last cent for our wheat and other Canadian products, the world will do exactly what it did after the high prices following the last war. The countries of the world will endeavour to bring about their own self-sufficiency; they will endeavour to free themselves from the prices that we have exacted, and then our position will be exactly the same as it was when prices fell to low levels following the period I have mentioned. I have here the average cash prices for wheat. In September, 1920, the price was $2.73½. One year later, in November, 1921, the average price had fallen to $1.10 a bushel.

The C.C.F. stands for what? A policy of marketing boards, a policy of intelligent price levels. We demand stable and adequate prices, set by negotiations for a period of years, and varied by taking into consideration the cost of living and production from time to time. May I add that what I have just said is really a repetition of what the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Burton) said earlier in this debate when he was placing before the house substantially our point of view on agricultural matters. It seems to me that this is the intelligent policy for this house and the country to pursue at the present time.

May I repeat, to take advantage of shortages and of starvation now in order to obtain high prices, when incidentally wheat producers have very largely disposed of the last crop and of their reserves, would in my opinion be a suicidal policy benefiting no one. When supplies are adequate it would result in a similar disaster to that which occurred between 1920 and 1921. National planning, in which the stability of farm prices is the fundamental consideration, must be based not on speculation but upon the stability of purchasing power of the farming population.

In conclusion may I say that I believe it would be in the interests of this country and of our wheat producers in particular if we could establish under the leadership of the united nations organization a method by which we should be able to guarantee quantities and prices both to the producer and to the consumer, on a world-wide scale, and that Canada should take part in such an organization and indeed help promote it. If I may say so, the social and economic council of the united nations organization in some of its phraseology clearly visualized such a plan. When I was present at San Francisco and on the committee which established the social and economic council, this was both formally and informally discussed by the delegates.

What we need, in the words of Henry Wallace, is an ever-normal granary not only for our own country but for the whole world. There is no reason why a series of good crops should be regarded as a disaster. A series of good crops surely ought to be an inestimable blessing to this country and to the world. My mind goes back to the bible, to the story of Joseph; to the story of Pharaoh's dream of the fat kine and the lean kine, the seven fat years and the seven lean years. Often in the old book you can find a parable or a story that is applicable even in these most modern days. Joseph planned in Egypt. Joseph built granaries in the seven fat years, and, as we are told in the bible, there was corn in Egypt during the seven lean years. In my opinion that is what the world must do in future—plan so that there may be foodstuffs in the event of widespread disaster such as we have at the present time; and I am not thinking only of the disaster of war. We have been told authoritatively, and I saw this repeated in London, in the U.N.O. records I have read, that even in peace time two out of every three living human beings in the world

have never known what it was day by day to be guaranteed a full stomach. There is something wrong with a world of that description.

To the extent that this house, this country and this government are prepared to plan our production, to see that our producers and workers obtain adequate returns for their production and their labour and are in a position to build up reserves against evil times, to that extent the programme will be supported by the party which I represent.

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking to this amendment, though as one of the oldest farmers in this house I am greatly tempted to spend some time in a discussion of farming. However, my object in making these few remarks is to reply to a statement which was made yesterday by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) at page 286 of *Hansard* who, in referring to my speech of the day before, said:

> I am quite sure that the remarks he made expressed his personal opinion and not the opinion of many members of his party.

I think most hon. members are aware that the members of the social credit party are not strictly party-bound, that we do preserve a very wide latitude in the expression of opinions by members of this group. In reference to the remarks I made the day before yesterday, to which the hon. member for Kootenay West referred, I should like to say that the ideas I expressed are my own; that I did not consult any of my colleagues, and that as far as I know they are mine and nobody else's. My only purpose in saying what I did was to do what little I could do to preserve the peace of the world, and I believe that the best way to preserve peace is to restore as far as possible the truth about international relations, which were so largely destroyed as a consequence of war propaganda.

In this connection may I remind the house of an incident which took place in Great Britain in 1944. In that year Mr. Voigt, editor of *Nineteenth Century*, one of the solid, old established, respectable political magazines in Great Britain, accused the BBC of falsifying a Yugoslav royal proclamation by inserting forged words favourable to Tito. When a member brought up this charge in the British House of Commons Mr. Brendan Bracken, then minister of information, denied the charge and slandered Mr. Voigt. Anthony Eden, who was absent from the house at the time, at a later sitting admitted that Mr. Voigt had spoken the truth. The *News-Chronicle*, a daily newspaper in Great Britain, repeated the slander and was sued by Mr. Voigt. In awarding damages of £1,000 against the *News-Chronicle* the judge said:

> Mr. Voigt comes out of this matter with his character completely and finally vindicated. The fact is he is a critic, an honest and a fearless critic.

I hope to qualify as an honest and fearless critic, and I am well content to leave the verdict to the passage of time.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Quelch) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Ashby
Bentley
Blackmore
Bowerman
Burton
Case
Castleden
Church
Coldwell
Fair
Ferguson
Gillis
Herridge
Hlynka
Jaques
Johnston
Knight
Kuhl
Low
McCuaig
McCullough (Assiniboia)
McKay
Marshall
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Moore
Quelch
Robinson (Bruce)
Shaw
Skey
Strum, Mrs.
Thatcher
Townley-Smith
Wright
Wylie
Zaplitny—35

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott
Archibald
Argue
Arsenault
Aylesworth
Baker
Barrett
Beaudoin
Belzile
Benidickson
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Black (Yukon)
Blair
Bonnier
Boucher
Bourget
Bradette
Bradshaw
Brooks
Brown
Brunelle
Bryce
Campbell
Cardiff
Casselman
Charlton
Chevrier
Clark
Cleaver
Cloutier
Cockeram
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Croll
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Desmond
Diefenbaker
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Dionne (Beauce)
Dorion
Douglas
Drope
Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Fleming
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser
Fulton
Gagnon
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)

Gibson (Hamilton West)	Marier
Gingues	Marquis
Gladstone	Matthews (Brandon)
Glen	Maybank
Golding	Mayhew
Gour (Russell)	Menary
Gourd (Chapleau)	Merritt
Grant	Michaud
Graydon	Mitchell
Green	Mullins
Hackett	Murphy
Harkness	Mutch
Harris (Grey-Bruce)	Nicholson
Hazen	Nixon
Healy	Parent
Henderson	Pearkes
Hodgson	Picard
Howe	Pinard
Ilsley	Pouliot
Isnor	Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie)
Jaenicke	Raymond (Wright)
Jean	Reid
Jutras	Richard (Gloucester)
Kidd	Richard (Ottawa East)
King, Mackenzie	Ross (Hamilton East)
Lacombe	Ross (St. Paul's)
Lafontaine	St. Laurent
Lalonde	Senn
Lapointe	Sinclair (Ontario)
Laurendeau	Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Leger	Sinnott
Lennard	Smith (Calgary West)
Lesage	Smith (York North)
Little	Stanfield
Lockhart	Stewart (Winnipeg North)
McCann	Stuart (Charlotte)
McCubbin	Stirling
McCulloch (Pictou)	Stokes
Macdonald (Halifax)	Tremblay
McDonald (Parry Sound)	Tucker
Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario)	Tustin
McGarry	Viau
McGregor	Warren
McIlraith	Webb
MacInnis	Weir
Mackenzie	White (Hastings-Peterborough)
MacKinnon	White (Middlesex East)
MacLean	Whitman
McLure	Winkler
McMaster	Winters—166
MacNaught	
MacNicol	
Maloney	
Manross	

Mr. BRIDGES: I was paired with the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce): Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. GARDINER: I was paired with the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

On motion of Mrs. Strum (Qu'Appelle) the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

63260—21½

Thursday, March 28, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

UNITED NATIONS

MEETING OF SECURITY COUNCIL—REPORT FROM OBSERVER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in his capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that we have a Canadian observer at the meeting of the security council in New York, I should be very glad, and I think the house would be pleased as well, if the Prime Minister could impart to us such information as may be proper from the report of that observer covering the present situation, which appears so grave, at the New York conclave.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): All I can say to my hon. friend is that I understand that at three o'clock this afternoon there was to be a secret session of the security council at which matters of procedure would be considered. Apart from that, I have no knowledge of any other actions about to be taken.

Mr. GRAYDON: I take it there has been a report from the Canadian observer on the situation to date.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon, friend that I have an official report, whether from the Canadian observer or from our embassy, I cannot say. The report I give on my responsibility as the minister responsible speaking in this house.

OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT

DISSEMINATION IN RUSSIA OF CANADIAN VIEWS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): In his address to the house dealing with the matter of espionage, the Prime Minister expressed the hope that the views of Canada might be disseminated to the people of Russia. Has he any knowledge as to whether this has been done?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I have no knowledge of what, if anything, has been done.

WAR ASSETS

FACILITIES OF PACIFIC COAST COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): May I direct a question to the Minister of Reconstruction? Can the facilities of the Pacific coast communications system, recently declared surplus to requirements by the armed forces, now be made available for use by the general public?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): War Assets are now dealing with the property in question. It will take some time before arrangements can be made to place the services under civilian ownership or to operate them under civilian control. Until then, it will not be possible to throw the facilities open to public use. The services are not willing to open the service to the public, and as long as they are operating the facilities, nothing can be done.

FISH

MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN—PLANE TRANSPORT TO RAILHEAD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. RONALD MOORE (Churchill): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries, notice of which has already been given. On account of bad weather conditions this winter in northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan, the fishermen in this area have been left with approximately five hundred tons of good quality fish which cannot be transported by tractor because of the early spring thaw. The secretary of the trades and labour council at Flin Flon, Manitoba—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The question should be short and to the point. Any lengthy question should be put on the order paper.

Mr. MOORE: The question is as follows, Mr. Speaker: In view of the announced food shortage would the minister consider providing a transport plane to freight this product to the nearest railhead—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already asked the hon. member to put his question on the order paper.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I point out that this is a matter of food spoiling and is therefore of some considerable urgency.

Hon. H. F. G. BRIDGES (Minister of Fisheries): I received notice of the question, and no doubt it is a matter of urgency. In reply I would say that since the administration of the fisheries of Manitoba and Saskatchewan is entirely in the hands of the governments of those provinces, I immediately referred to the appropriate provincial ministers, Hon. J. S. McDiarmid, Minister of Mines and Natural Resources of Manitoba, and Hon. J. L. Phelps, Minister of Natural Resources and Industrial Development of Saskatchewan, representations which reached me Tuesday morning with regard to difficulties in the transportation of fish to railhead at Flin Flon. I presume the matter is receiving the attention of these ministers. I have not received any information from them.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

The house resumed from Wednesday, March 27, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fernand Viau for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mrs. GLADYS STRUM (Qu'Appelle): I hope that no one will consider that my silence up to this point has been consent to all the sins of the government, whether they be sins of omission or of commission. I hope also that my constituents will not have expected me to insist on the prerogative of ladies first, and to assume that I must have been absent from the house or I would have spoken before this. I believe that democracy is for women too, and agreed to forgo my privilege of speaking in the interests of expediting the business of the house in the hope that we would take the vote on Tuesday, as we had agreed.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that Tuesday afternoon as the crash of broken agreements filled this chamber and I listened to the academic and statistical denials of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and yesterday to the reply of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) I could not help thinking that if we had more women members in the House of Commons we might pay closer attention to our knitting and do less verbal embroidery.

In regard to the preliminaries at this late hour, and referring to the speech from the throne, I would say, greetings to the new governor general in his appointment to office, felicitations to the departing, and congratulations to the mover (Mr. Viau) and the seconder (Mr. Winters) of the address.

The greatest weakness in the speech from the throne was the neglect of the domestic field. I can understand the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe), and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) surveying with

satisfaction this strapping adolescent, the Dominion of Canada. It is the same feeling a parent gets when one day he looks at his teen-age offspring. The child may or may not even slightly resemble the parents. He or she may be bigger, huskier, lustier, have new appetites and needs, and have acquired new tastes. The offspring is bursting at the seams. The kid grew up in spite of its parents. To-day Canada is in that interesting and crucial stage. During the war we grew in stature. Whether we developed much in wisdom remains to be seen. Our course now will indicate our maturity as a nation. We are now at the fork in the road. Two courses are open to us. We can shed governmental responsibility as quickly as possible and let powerful economic groups plan our national economy, or we can continue as a government to take the not-so-easy, not-so-free-of-blame path of governmental responsibility for the state of our economic life.

We must decide now as a matter of policy for what ends we shall use the powers of government. Shall the everyday lives and homes of the millions of people in Canada be our first concern, or shall we use the authority in the machinery of government to interfere with our economy only in order to preserve the power and profits of the few?

To what end shall mankind dedicate his heritage and the work of his lifetime? To what uses shall we apply science, law, engineering, power and the new chemistry? In the international field we are building the united nations organization on a functional basis. We have set up special organizations to deal with food and agriculture, with monetary arrangements, with security, with cultural and social problems. We have begun to learn as a nation that it is useless to talk of peace and freedom and security and leave undone the things we ought to have done to remove international friction and injustice. Sometimes it is easier to undertake an international problem than it is to tackle the job at home.

The pleasant and complacent picture of Canada as outlined by the speech from the throne reminds me of the man who had recently acquired wealth and prominence and decided to have a family tree. He hired an expert and everything was lovely until they ran into a relative who had died in the electric chair. The social climber was alarmed, but the professional purveyor of respectability said, "We could put it this way: we can say his untimely death was a matter of deep and widespread public concern. He occupied a chair of applied electricity in a well-known public institution, and it could be said that he literally died in harness."

Whether you look at housing, veterans affairs, labour, marketing, food supply, education, pensions or health, Canada has a great unsatisfied need and stands in very great peril of losing the gains of expansion made under the stimulus of war.

I want to make my criticisms and comments in the light of the needs of the home and family. In a few weeks we shall all be sending flowers, telegrams and cards by the bushel assuring the mothers of our country that they are the most valuable, most beloved and most revered and cherished people of all time. It is a noble sentiment which many people gladly and genuinely express; but do we carry through when it comes to proving that we really believe it? Everyone in this house agrees that the very heart of the nation is the home. The home is the keystone, if you will, the source of our civilization, the core of our very lives, and the thing above all else sacred. Does anyone in this house dare stand up and assert that we have safeguarded the homes of our country in this or in any other session?

Take the wives and children of the men who died in defence of their homes, not in this last war but in the previous war of 1914-18. We have many widows of these men still without pension. They have just finished a convention, still pleading with a reluctant government to grant them pensions that will enable them to live in decency. These women have reared their children. Many of them are getting on in years. We took their husbands and with them their source of income. Now they have reached the time of life when they are unemployable. Many of them gave not only their husbands, but their sons and daughters in the struggle just ended. Now they have no guarantee either of homes or of bread.

Take the widows of the veterans of the war just ended. The treatment of the women and children who gave their breadwinner in this war is an example of the value we place on the home and family. A widow of a hero of this war gets $60 a month for herself and $15 for her child. How far will this go in building up a permanent home? How far will it go in paying rent, buying milk and oranges and shoes?

Or take the wife of a wounded veteran. A man who has suffered the loss of a limb, a man permanently disabled, must endure seeing his wife and family live in the kind of quarters that can be had for very little. Perhaps his wife goes out cleaning, or takes in washing.

Take the family of the wage earner. According to the bureau of statistics, in 1941 wage-earners earning less than $500 a year numbered 1,028,800 or 35·9 per cent of the total wage earners in the country. City workers, heads of families, earning from $500 to $1,000 a year, numbered 219,000. Rural workers, heads of families, earning from $500 to $1,000, numbered 80,000. City workers heads of families, earning $500 or less, numbered 114,900. Rural workers heads of families, earning $500 or less, numbered 103,100. What happens to families who have so little to spend? Where will they live? The family receive notice that the house they have been renting has been sold. The wife tramps the streets in desperation looking for a house or rooms. Nobody wants children—that is, nobody but the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton). He got a bonus for them. This is a good thing, but it does not find a house that a mother can afford to rent in an area safe for children to live in; and so only the old, dilapidated, crowded, unsanitary and yes, often condemned quarters are available for these, the little children, and their much lauded parent, their mothers.

Take the wives of veterans and their children who are trying to complete a course at university. How far will $92 go in paying rent, buying food, shoes and milk? What strains are put on the marriage of these young veterans making the difficult adjustment to home, family and class-room. How can these young men do the necessary home-work in one room cluttered up with baby, play pen, washing, cooking, bottles and all the indispensable hardware that goes with an infant? How can the veteran be free of worry and put his whole mind on his classes when every month he must take from his gratuity to make up the deficiency in his government grant for education? How can the young wife stand the double strain of protecting her child from her husband and her husband from her child?

What about the wives of farmers? Although their contribution is so vital to the success of a farm that no married veteran under the Veterans' Land Act is permitted to take advantage of the act without having his wife duly inspected and labelled as a fit help-meet, in her husband's income tax returns the farmer's wife gets no recognition for her labour. In passing I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie). Will the minister require of an unmarried veteran passed by the board that in the case of his marriage his prospective wife shall be duly interviewed, inspected and certified before such marriage shall take place; and in case the wife is rejected, what happens then? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to inspect wives already acquired, we must also inspect wives in prospect.

All wives of farmers, old and young, inexperienced, and seasoned by exposure to long years of unremitting toil, have no guarantee of income. They too are vulnerable in regard to low family income, bad housing, insecurity, debt, inadequate health care and lack of facilities for the education of their children. These affronts to human dignity are universal in our economy.

Surely there is no one in this house who would not gladly subscribe to the principle that every Canadian family should have a home fit for little children to grow up in; that the birthright of every child is enough good food, enough good clothing, and adequate shelter, a safe place to play, fresh air, enough space and light and heat for health. We put our seal of approval on this when we passed the Family Allowances Act last year. Now we must extend the areas of family protection by applying to our national economy those techniques that will result in good homes, happy families, healthful surroundings in town, city and country; and for your consideration I commend again the platform of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and the following points:

(1) That there be a lay-off or severance pay to provide twenty-five dollars per week for all displaced workers until they are reemployed.

(2) That discharged veterans be paid full pay and allowances until reinstatement in civilian life with the same minimum of twenty-five dollars a week.

(3) That in order to maintain the purchasing power of Canadian farmers floor prices for agriculture be extended and continued.

(4) That we have legislation to protect workers' and farmers' equities in their homes and to prevent evictions and foreclosures.

(5) That immediate action be taken to raise wages in industries frozen at sub-standard levels.

(6) An extensive public low-rental housing programme which will provide both large-scale employment and urgently-needed homes.

(7) Old age pensions at sixty.

Again I wish to press for the simple practical, urgently needed plan of action, so often advocated by our group, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. When you have implemented these proposals, the mothers and the grandmothers of this country will rise up and call you blessed and you will have a few more planks of the C.C.F. platform.

Mr. JOHN T. HACKETT (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, I had occasion two days ago to draw to the attention of the house some of the perils which attend dairying in south-eastern Quebec. At that time I was unaware

that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and his colleague had succeeded while in Britain in negotiating contracts for cheese for an additional year, thus ensuring to Canada a certain market for this commodity until the end of March, 1948. The price is 20 cents a pound. That may mean, if my understanding of the situation be correct, as much as 25 cents a pound to the producer, less factory and hauling costs which I am eliminating for the moment because I am doing the same thing when I come to speak of butter. The price to be paid at the factory is 20 cents. Now this is supplemented or may be supplemented by a quality bonus of one per cent if the cheese achieve a test of 93 per cent, including a flavour test of 40 per cent; or if the cheese is better still, it may achieve a quality bonus of two cents a pound, if it be 94 per cent perfect, including a flavour test of 41 per cent. So it is possible in this way to add two cents a pound to the price the maker will receive for it. In one of the provinces at least there is a bonus of two cents per pound payable to the manufacturer of cheese, and there is also a federal bonus of 20 cents per hundred pounds on milk devoted to the manufacturing of cheese. So it is possible that the cheese producer receive, less factory and hauling charges, 25 cents per pound for his product.

A hundred pounds of three and one-half per cent milk—that is, 100 pounds of milk containing 3½ pounds of butter fat—converted into cheese produces about 9½ pounds of cheese. If an average price of 23 cents per pound be taken it will be seen that 100 pounds of milk in this way will yield a return of $2.18 plus.

Let us take the same quantity and quality of milk, and see what happens when it is converted into butter. The ceiling price of butter is about 34 cents a pound. A bonus of 10 cents a pound of butter fat is added by the government and paid to the farmer. If one multiplies 44 cents, which is the selling price of butter, by 3½ pounds, one finds that the yield is $1.54. And if my mathematical calculations are correct they show that the man who makes cheese gets 64 cents per hundred pounds more for his milk than the man who makes butter.

I understand there is some reason behind the desire of the minister to secure for Canada the cheese market in Great Britain.

Mr. BERTRAND (Prescott): Would the hon. member permit a correction?

Mr. HACKETT: I should be very happy to.

Mr. BERTRAND (Prescott): He has omitted the cost of manufacturing of the 9½ pounds of cheese in 100 pounds of milk, at the rate of 2½ cents, which would be subtracted from the price received by the producer. This does not apply to butter. Furthermore, the hon. member has not referred to the value of skim milk in the feeding of young cattle and poultry, which amounts to about 40 cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. HACKETT: I am very grateful to the hon. member for his observations. However I think the Chair will admit the hon. member did not ask a question. I concede readily that the feeding value of skim milk is greater than that of whey, and that calves or pigs fed on whey would not fatten for the market. As against that however there is the labour charge for separating the milk and washing the machine; all those dreary hours of drudgery that are completely eliminated when the whole milk, as it comes from the cow, is sold to the cheese factory.

Mr. BERTRAND (Prescott): It is the same thing if one takes milk to the cheese factory.

Mr. HACKETT: My hon. friend has not asked a question; I submit with great deference that the additional labour the butter producer has to put into his product offsets added value that may be found in buttermilk when compared with whey.

To pursue further my earlier observations: I said it was easy to understand why the minister should seek to retain a high and ranking place for Canadian cheese in the British market. Our butter making is not considered a success in Great Britain; whether our butter be good or bad is beside the issue. We do not make the kind of butter that is liked in England. We do not make butter which competes successfully in the English market with Irish butter, Danish butter, or with that commodity about which we heard so much in other times and places—New Zealand butter. On the other hand Canadian cheese is so highly esteemed in Great Britain that they call it English Stilton. It is consumed in large quantities, and undoubtedly if that market could be secured for us in perpetuity, and without rivalry, it would be beneficial to the Canadian producer.

I submit, however, that that market must not be secured at the cost of an injustice and of permanent damage to the dairy industry as a whole, and to the dairy industry of Southeastern Quebec in particular. Canadians are a butter-eating people; the eating of butter is a life habit. I do not believe it is a habit from which they can be easily weaned. To-day it is practically impossible to buy butter. We find that the reserves stand at roughly 9 million pounds, whereas

a year ago they were 20 million, two years ago about the same figure, and for the last five years at this time of year they have shown an average of about 18 million pounds plus.

I speak only of creamery butter, of course. To-day our reserves in creameries, storage and transit are barely 9 million pounds, or less than half of what they were a year ago, or what they have been on the average in the last five years. I point this out to show that there is a scarcity.

I wish to put on record the following table to show the number of dairy cattle exported to the United States in the past ten years:

1945	45,889
1944	35,149
1943	42,267
1942	24,619
1941	22,228
1940	15,014
1939	13,000
1938	12,194
1937	13,542
1936	13,492

Those are the numbers of dairy cattle exported to the United States under a system of price fixing, controls and inadequate returns to the makers of butter, and during the four year period which preceded the war. The number exported has increased over threefold during the period of controls. The number exported to the United States this year up to March 31 is nearly double the number that was exported during the same period last year.

I want to open a parenthesis here, because one can never talk about a matter of this kind without being charged with being actuated by political considerations. I want to say that despite what has happened there was an increase of 7·2 per cent last year in the production of butter in the province of Quebec, while there was a reduction of 3·4 per cent in the production of cheese. There is a reason for the trend. As I said a few minutes ago, the province of Ontario has paid a bonus of two cents per pound on all cheese manufactured in the province. The province of Quebec also paid a bonus on cheese. It has now ceased to pay that bonus. I cannot say whether the bonus was effective throughout the year 1945; it may have been paid until the end of the year, but it was known that the bonus on cheese was to be withdrawn, and there was an effort made by the farmers to get away from cheese production. This may explain the increase in butter production that has taken place in Quebec.

More butter is produced in Quebec than in any other province in the dominion. Quebec is essentially a butter-producing province. Quebec hopes, and I trust not entirely in vain, that we are approaching an era when prices will cease to be fixed, when these controls will be released and when competition and orderly and unrestricted marketing will again be the vogue. The farmers of Quebec hope that the excellence of their product will bring them a decent return for their efforts.

Having stated these facts I wish to suggest to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and to the government that the ceiling price of butter be increased. I need not tell the minister that I believe that price-fixing of commodities has ceased to be useful. I believe it is baneful at the present time and I believe the Canadian farmer, particularly the Canadian dairyman, would be better off if he were freed from all restrictions and were able to enter a market in which he could buy and sell without restriction. But those ideal conditions do not yet obtain, and I am suggesting to the minister and to the government that the necessary changes be made in these ceiling prices to give the butter producer a fair return for his effort. At the present time the producer of butter is not receiving an equitable return for his product as compared with the producer of cheese. The producer of butter is not receiving a price which enables him to hire people to work for him.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Why do you not pay wages in Quebec?

Mr. HACKETT: We are able to carry on our dairying industry in Quebec because our families are closely knit together and because the people there are not ashamed to work.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: For nothing.

Mr. HACKETT: The wife and daughter and the son of the household are proud and willing to go into the barnyard to help the father milk the cows and do the other chores incidental to farm life.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They do that in all parts of Canada.

Mr. HACKETT: I ask the minister to take these facts into consideration and to raise the price of butter, not just four cents as was suggested in one of the papers this morning. Twenty-cent cheese means sixty-cent butter. There is no reason why that price should not be paid pending the removal of ceiling prices.

I speak for an area the population of which is fifty per cent engaged in farming and fifty per cent engaged in industry. In other words, one-half the population of these eastern counties of which I speak are makers of butter while the other half are consumers

of butter. I believe the purchasers realize that the farmer should have a fair return for his commodity. They realize, moreover, that if he does not get a fair return, butter will become still more scarce. Butter is becoming scarce by reason of the dissipation and sale and export of the herds. Laudable as may be the minister's desire to win and keep the cheese market of Great Britain, I suggest that he should not do that by depriving the Canadian people of butter. They will have butter, and if it cannot be made in this country, they will import it.

I noticed this morning that in another place an hon. gentleman whose political faith is identical with that of the government in power—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Oh, no, it is not.

Mr. HACKETT: —and who is not unfriendly to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), brought in a bill under the heading "Dairy Industry" and told his house that he was seeking to amend the Dairy Industry Act whereby certain portions of that act which prohibited the manufacture, importation and sale of oleomargarine in Canada would be repealed. Now if it is government policy to force Canadians to eat oleomargarine—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Who said it was?

Mr. GRAYDON: Keep quiet, Sir Oleo.

Mr. HACKETT: —that it may export cheese to Britain, I fear that the government will have to amend its policy or it will find itself with abundant leisure to think of other things. The Canadian people have a taste for butter.

Mr. GARDINER: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine has never been discussed by the government at any time to my knowledge within the ten years that I have been in the government. The present law was passed I think in 1922 and has remained that way ever since. It was brought in by the then Liberal government.

Mr. HACKETT: My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has made a statement but it is just possible that he is not entirely aware of all that is taking place within his party. The fact remains that there has been introduced by an outstanding member of his party in the upper house a bill to repeal those portions of the Dairy Industry Act which make it illegal to import oleomargarine into Canada at a time when there is the greatest scarcity of butter that this country has ever known, and if that bill is not introduced for the purpose of substituting oleomargarine for butter, then I do not understand that twice two makes four.

Mr. GARDINER: I am sure that my hon. friend does not want to have a misrepresentation go out.

Mr. HACKETT: If my hon. friend wishes to ask a question I am willing to answer, but I have heard a number of interruptions and—

Mr. GARDINER: If I may ask my hon. friend a question, does he know that the Prime Minister announced this morning to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture that the question had never been discussed by the government, and that the introduction of the measure referred to in the senate has nothing to do with government policy?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Hear, hear.

Mr. HACKETT: I was not aware of that, and I think it is unfortunate that—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Golding): I must ask hon. members to keep order. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) has the floor, and hon. members have no right to interrupt him unless he permits a question to be asked. I hope that he will be given attention and will not be interrupted while he is speaking.

Mr. GRAYDON: He is touching a sensitive spot. That is why he is interrupted.

Mr. HACKETT: When hon. gentlemen on the other side become restless and begin to find their seats uncomfortable it is perhaps because they are being told things which remind them of past errors of policy and of the retribution, swift and inexorable, which followed.

The purpose of my remarks is to ask the Minister of Agriculture to raise the ceiling price of butter so that the owners of herds can continue to make butter and that they may have from the proceeds of the sale of that butter money sufficient to buy the feed that is necessary to exploit their herds, money sufficient to clothe their children properly and send them to school, money sufficient to enable them to keep their herds instead of selling them, as they have been forced to do and are doing at an alarming rate.

The market in Britain is a good market, and I commend the minister for trying to secure it for Canada. But he can secure it only if he proceeds fairly, and he cannot be unfair to a considerable element of the agricultural population and hope to bring a benefit to the rest of Canada. If he destroys the butter-making element he will weaken the

very industry that he is seeking to strengthen. If he permits the butter maker of Quebec to be squeezed out of existence, and forty cents a pound butter is doing it, he is following a policy which is dangerous not only to the largest single element in our country, the farming element, but to the country as a whole.

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put I wish to say a few words. It had not been my intention earlier in this debate to take part in it but rather to leave what I had to say to another occasion.

An hon. MEMBER: Leave it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I heard somebody say "Leave it". The leaders of all the parties agreed to do that very thing, but every party except the Social Credit party broke that agreement, and some to a greater degree than others. I think the greatest betrayal of that agreement was by the Conservative party, but the Liberals shared in it, and now I see they are applauding themselves. But that is not the point of my argument this afternoon. I want to deal with several matters, and I am glad the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) is in his seat, because later I shall address some remarks particularly to him.

First of all I wish to warn the house of the gradually increasing number of unemployed throughout Canada. Particularly is this so in the part of the country I come from, the west. Just before I left Calgary the unemployment register roll in that city was well nigh the 5,000 mark—and this represented people who were registered as unemployed, not counting the vast numbers of unemployed of whom there was no record. The same is true of Edmonton and of all the other cities in the west; in fact there are thousands of unemployed throughout the country, and this at a time when Canada's government is boasting that it is doing so much in an all-out production effort.

It is only a matter of months now since we had everyone employed. True, they were wearing uniforms, but the government promised them that no time would be lost in converting from war-time to peace-time production. I saw in the papers not long ago that the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) had stated it would be only a few weeks until we would be again short of man-power. I fancy he will have to do a good deal of miraculous work and planning if he expects to be able to take up the great lag in unemployment which is increasing so rapidly across Canada.

Not only is this true among the civilian workers in war production plants who have been laid off and are now finding it impossible to get any jobs, but it is true of the veterans themselves. Many veterans in Calgary have come to me appealing for jobs, but I do not know where there are any jobs to be got. We cannot find them.

Mr. SINNOTT: There are lots of farm jobs.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Yes, but some of you farmers, not all I am glad to say, hardly pay help sufficient to maintain what might be called a decent standard of living.

Mr. SINNOTT: You cannot get men at $100 a month to-day.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I do not know many who would refuse $100 a month. But that does not solve the problem of the increasing number of unemployed, and it was the hon. gentleman's party who went about the country hanging up great yellow posters—yes, they were yellow—on every telephone pole saying, "Jobs for all", and they were going to maintain the standard of pay which prevailed during the war years. The responsibility rests upon the Liberal party and other parties who advocated jobs for all. Let me tell the hon. member that it was the Social Credit party alone who told the people definitely, although it was not a popular thing to say at election time, that we knew there would not be jobs for all under the present set-up. There is no guessing about this. The facts are there; they speak for themselves. I have the posters upstairs in my desk.

One other thing which I think should be called to the attention of the government is the ever-increasing burden of taxes and the cost of living. We members in the house—and I make no apology for this, nor did I apologize for it anywhere in my constituency—voted ourselves an increase of $2,000. When I was asked about it in my constituency I made no bones about it at all. I told the people that I was one of those who did vote for the increase. It has been our policy as Social Crediters, ever since we have been in the house, to do everything possible to increase the standard of living of every Canadian. We have persistently and consistently throughout the years fought for increased living standards for all, and when we ourselves had the opportunity to give ourselves an increase—and some of us really needed it—we voted for it. It behooves every

member of the house, therefore, to see to it, and at this session is the opportune time, that other people in Canada, especially those in the low income brackets, have some relief from the present tremendous taxation.

I suggest, and it has been suggested by other members of our party as well as members in other parts of the house, that the income tax exemption be $2,000 for married persons and $1,200 for single. That would be a step in the right direction.

The government seems to have forgotten that agricultural workers are the backbone of industry in this country. During the war years, however, the farmers have not shared in the profits which other industries have enjoyed. Indeed, they shared very little in increased prices until quite recently, and now the government comes along, when there is a chance for agriculture to participate in some small measure in any advantages there may be, and deliberately increases the cost of production by adding another cost in the price of gasoline. The farmers in my constituency are greatly perturbed by the increased cost of gasoline and white products generally, because, without any question, that raises the cost of production for the farmer. When they look across the border and see that the farmer there can purchase machinery at prices considerably less than those charged for the same machinery in Canada, made by the same companies and distributed by their agents in this country; when they see that our people have to pay twice the price, our farmers do not feel well about it. One cannot wonder at their uneasiness.

It has been suggested by the members of this party and by others that the government remove that three per cent war tax on gasoline. That would bring the price down for the benefit not only of farmers in the west but of the people generally throughout Canada. It would be a step in the right direction. I have here a resolution which I should like to put on the record because I know that many other members have received similar resolutions. It will give the house and the people of eastern Canada some idea of what the farmers of the west have to contend with in the way of increased costs of production. A copy of this resolution was sent to the Prime Minister:

Whereas there is to be an increase of two cents a gallon on the price of gasoline, effective March 18, 1946, and

Whereas this action on the part of the federal government will affect the farmers of Alberta in their cost of production and also the cost in all other services rendered by business to the farmer throughout the country, which will ultimately result in a further increased cost to the primary producer, and

Whereas we do believe the remedy could be effected in the removal of the federal tax of three cents.

Therefore the Langdon, Alberta, farmers union and the Langdon United Farmers of Alberta at a recent meeting held

Resolved that a fact-finding board be set up by federal and provincial governments to investigate into records of all oil producers, manufacturers and distributors of white products to determine whether any increase in price is justified at this time.

I think there is a great deal of merit in that resolution. A fact-finding board should be set up, in the form of a commission, to find out whether it is necessary to have increased prices in gasoline. The meeting referred to in the resolution was no small affair. There were delegates from all parts of the district. There were over 92 persons present, and the resolution represents not the feeling of a local community but the feeling of quite a large area. And the same feeling prevails generally throughout Canada.

I stated a little while ago that I should have a few words to say to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. May I say that the minister has been very considerate in regard to conditions affecting the returned man. He has done about as good a job as any Liberal could do; in fact he is about as good a Liberal as there is.

I wish to refer to the general housing situation. Quite a few members have spoken about housing, but not from the point of view to which I wish to address myself. It has been pointed out that the housing situation is becoming desperate across the country. We all know that. When Wartime Housing first started two or three years ago I spoke on this question because I visited Wartime Housing in Hull, and afterwards I spoke in the house with regard to things I had actually seen. Under Wartime Housing, houses were built in Hull which were a shame and a disgrace and a waste of public money. On that occasion I pointed out to the house that I had seen several houses in Hull the outside walls of which were falling away from the foundation. You could stick your hand between the inside partition in the house and the outside wall. I pointed that out because I had actually seen it in many houses in that city. The floors had warped to such an extent that you could not get in through the kitchen door from the outside. The door could not be opened. There was hardly a door in the whole house that could be properly opened and closed.

An hon. MEMBER: Ontario lumber.

Mr. JOHNSTON: No, Quebec results and Liberal policy.

An hon. MEMBER: Warped.

Mr. JOHNSTON: They were a little warped —I mean the houses.

Mr. MacNICOL: And the policy.

Mr. JOHNSTON: This is not new to the government because they have been fully informed in regard to it. One would think, sir, that having heard about these things the government would have at least sent out a competent and responsible inspector to see if the statements were correct, and immediately stopped any such practices. But this was not done.

It has been admitted by the government that under the national housing scheme 27,000 houses have been built and under Wartime Housing, 16,000. These houses have been completed and are occupied. As I said last year, I have no great complaint to make about the national housing scheme. I have carefully watched construction from the laying of the foundations to the time the families moved in. I have visited the homes after the families moved in, and I must say that under the national housing scheme the government has done a fairly good job. The material is satisfactory, the workmanship has been well done, and the people are satisfied. But that was done by private contractors, and the individual was allowed free choice of his own contractor. He was permitted to get the design that he required and to go ahead with his house. The government did not assist him with any gifts; it was merely a loan which the recipient had to repay at a rate of interest.

Under the two plans the government has built 43,000 houses. We have no indication of how many veterans' houses have been built. At the appropriate time the Minister of Veterans Affairs may tell us how many veterans' houses have been built.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Twenty-seven hundred.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Last year the department announced that some fifty new homes would be ready for occupancy a few months ago in Calgary. When I left I believe eighteen were occupied. The minister knows that the veterans in Calgary are decidedly dissatisfied with the conditions of affairs there; he knows it because he has been informed. An organization of veterans was formed in Calgary and the different members of parliament invited to attend meetings. Meetings have been held regularly and I have attended all of them. On different occasions the government inspector has been there. We have gone over the problem thoroughly and I am sure that the minister must have been informed by his own representatives of the condition of affairs. If he has not, it is time he removed some of his officials. May I say that he should start in with some of the inspectors, as I shall indicate as I go along.

These houses are costing the veterans a considerable amount of money. When you compare their cost with the cost of the national housing scheme there is not a great deal of difference. I have one house particularly in mind which cost a veteran $5,400, and also a national housing house, just a few blocks away, which cost $6,000. The basement alone of the national housing house is worth the whole of the veteran's house. The veteran's house is going to fall apart in six months. If a good windstorm comes up it will not be there at all; it will look as if an atomic bomb hit it. Five thousand dollars odd is a large sum of money for the type of house the veteran is getting. The houses are valued at too high a figure. The sum of $4,000 is the maximum that should have been paid by the veteran for the house to which I have referred. I can point to dozens of houses that have been privately built in Calgary under the same conditions—better houses by far, and they have not cost $5,400. But I shall refer to that a little later.

To-day I want to take the members of the house and the minister on a visit to these veterans' homes. I am going to confine my visit to Calgary, because I know it is typical of all veterans' houses throughout Canada; I cannot see why it would be different. First of all, let us look at the basements of these veterans' houses. As I said at the beginning, I have watched these houses from the time the basement was dug until the families moved in. Some of the veterans have been in them for three months. I want to be fair; there may be an explanation for this, but out of the eighteen houses that are occupied by veterans in Calgary there may be one or two in which the cement floors and walls have not cracked; in every other case the walls and floors are cracking. The federal government inspector who should inspect these buildings told me that they had put in five bags of cement to the yard in the walls and six bags of cement in the floor. It was a four inch floor. I wish to address these remarks to the minister through you, Mr. Speaker. Either the inspector is lying or the veterans have taken a bad trimming in the amount of cement that was put into the walls, because no cement wall eight inches thick and no cement floor four inches thick that has five or six bags of cement to the yard, and the proper proportions of sand and gravel, would ever crack in the manner in which these walls and floors have cracked. The walls and floors are the very foundation upon which the whole house

is being built. I know enough about cement work to know that there is some funny work somewhere. I say to the minister, through you, sir, that somebody is doing some dirty work somewhere, and when this dirty work is passed on to these veterans it is about time something was done about it.

Let us start with the cement floor. Remember, all these buildings have been inspected and accepted by the federal government inspector. Where his eyes were when he did that, I do not know; they were not in his head. As to the plumbing in the basement, one can go along and take hold of a water pipe and shake it all over. The pipes were not even fastened properly to the joists in the building. In many cases they were leaking. Instead of using galvanized pipe, as I presume the specifications called for, in connecting up the hot water tank, they used ordinary gas pipe. I have not seen the specifications; that may be permissible, but I doubt it very much.

The drain in the basement floor was an inch to an inch and a half above the cement. That meant that when the wife went to do the washing, and drained the washing machine, a great puddle of water lay on the floor which could not be drained out. Had the inspector been there and been doing the job for which he was paid—and paid well, I suppose—he would have tripped over the thing and probably wakened himself up. I do not think he was ever there; he could not have been, to permit such a thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Would my hon. friend be kind enough to tell me exactly where this house is?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Yes; I will do that later.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I should like to know, because I want to follow it up.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Yes, I will do that.

I mentioned to the government last year the material which was going into the veterans' houses. We are still in the basement of this house. I pointed out to the minister that 2 by 8 spruce joists were used, and that they would not hold up under conditions as we have them in the west. Nor will they hold up under conditions as you have them in the east. Right over in Hull you have had evidence of that, when houses, built practically of the same material, went to pieces. I pointed this out to the government, but nothing was done.

A beam runs across through the basement to carry the middle weight of the house. When the joists are laid they are supposed to be long enough to double over the beam; everybody knows that. But in some of these houses the joists do not even reach the beam; they are spliced in, and the weight comes entirely on the nails. You cannot expect a house so constructed to stand, and it will not stand. As I pointed out to the minister last year, the spruce joists fastened together with one or two spikes where they come across on the beam are coming apart. The result is that the floor above is sagging; it could not be otherwise. The bridgings down in the basement holding the joists were 1 by 2 strips of spruce nailed with 2-inch nails. I told the government that they would not hold up, that as soon as these narrow strips dried out you could pull the nails out with your fingers; and that is exactly what is happening. There is hardly one of these small bridgings which you cannot pull off with one or two fingers; the joists are twisted, and the house is going to be twisted as well. If this happens after they have been occupied for only two or three months, what is going to happen when the heat strikes them at 110 degrees in the shade?

Mr. MacNICOL: Have these houses passed inspection?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Yes, they have all been passed by the government inspector. I shall refer to that government inspector a little later.

I have not seen the specifications of these houses. I think there are different specifications for each house. But the city by-law definitely prohibits the use of anything less than a 2 by 2 for bridging, yet the government has put in 1 by 2 spruce.

Let me now take you up to the first floor of one of these houses. Incidentally, in walking up to the first floor one of the men fell through the stairs. He did not trip, either. I should like to give the minister a picture of these houses that our veterans have to live in; and may I tell him that their wives are not very well satisfied when for twenty-four hours a day they have to live in these places. Imagine a wife who is doing her washing and drains the washing machine and finds the basement floor filled with water, which will not run off. It is not a very pleasant situation to be in.

We are now on the first floor, the main floor. As hon. members know, these walls are 4 by 8 sheets of plaster board. Plaster board is something like gyproc lap, but in larger sheets, and if you use small headed nails in putting on the plaster boards they will not hold. Some of these nails have small heads, others have larger heads, but the type of head used was the small-headed nail, the very poorest one which could be chosen, with the result that the boards are loose on the

walls and in a great many cases have to be gone over and renailed. I never, Mr. Speaker, saw such a miserably poor job of workmanship. It is possible to have a nicely finished room by using plaster board, and I have seen houses in which it has been used, where the joints have been properly cemented before the tape was put over, and sanded down, and after painting the joint is completely invisible. But in these houses you could look clear across the place and see the joint as clearly as you could see the wall, right through the paint. All across the ceiling you can see these joints running clear across. Imagine the wife of a veteran who is entertaining her friends in the evening, with these big strips of tape running across the wall. One finds that throughout the house. It is faulty workmanship, not faulty material in this case. The joists in the basement were faulty material, and the government was responsible for them; what I am speaking of now is a matter of faulty workmanship. But the government is responsible, because it should know the contractor to whom it let the contracts for these buildings, and the inspector who passed them.

Where the walls come to the corner it is usual in all well-built houses to have a metal bead running down the corner. In these houses instead of having metal bead they have a 2 by 2 spruce on the edges of the partition. The 2 by 2—I am speaking now generally of the finish—was never sanded off when it was painted; it was furry before it was put up, and when it is painted in that condition you cannot remedy it without sandpapering all the paint off. There was no attempt to finish up the cheap material used in the corners in this building instead of metal beads.

The doors are not properly hung. Hardly a door is properly hung. On one occasion when they came to repair these buildings they put pasteboard behind the hinges to even things up around the door, but the gap is still there. It was faulty workmanship, but still the inspector passed it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is this the same house?

Mr. JOHNSTON: No. I have visited several.

Mr. MACKENZIE: How many?

Mr. JOHNSTON: I would say I have visited half a dozen of the eighteen, but those who were at these meetings told me that conditions were almost the same in all these houses.

[Mr. Johnston.]

Mr. SINNOTT: I think you would make a good inspector.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I could do better than that; there is no question about it. Even the hon. member himself could, I think. He has a fine house, I understand.

Now let us go to the flooring. The floor was supposed to be No. 1 edge grain flooring. Edge grain flooring has no knots in it. This is not No. 1 edge grain fir flooring, yet the veteran is paying for it. I remember one house in particular when the inspector was present and the man who owned this house was complaining about the knots in the floor right in the front part of the room. He said he did not know how that could be; and one of the other fellows said, "Well, if you recall, when you inspected the house it was covered with paper." I said to the inspector, "Did you not raise this paper when you went in to inspect the building for the government?"—and he said he had not. How can a government inspector go through a house and inspect floors that are covered with paper—even looking at them? That is something no woman wants in her front room—knots all over the floor. The veteran was paying for No. 1 material, but he did not get it.

Let us go upstairs—but be careful of your head, because you will have it bumped. That is the government's fault, the architect's fault. I am not a tall man, but I know the minister would have to get down on his knees to go up there.

Mr. GRAYDON: It would do him no harm.

Mr. JOHNSTON: No, it would not. He should get down and pray for these poor veterans who have got such a fleecing. Now, that is the architect's fault. I do not blame the contractor for it, because I imagine it was that way in his specifications.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Who was the contractor? I do not know where the house was.

Mr. JOHNSTON: If you want me to name it—Bennett and White.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Where is the house?

Mr. JOHNSTON: In Calgary.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Calgary is a big place.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It is a fine place; you ought to come out there. Now, that was the main staircase going upstairs. One has to duck his dead as he goes up. That is not a very satisfactory state of affairs, as the minister will no doubt agree. However, I shall not prolong this phase of the matter.

I want to say something about windows. Here I am not blaming the contractor so much as I am the government. When the windows were put into these houses they were fitted for sash cords and weights, and ploughed out for that purpose. But when those windows were installed, no sash cords or weights were put in, nor was there provision made for it. The windows were already ploughed, and as a result when the wind blows it goes right up both sides of the window and simply blows out the curtains. As anyone knows, with the wind blowing in like that, and blowing the curtains, it is not a very satisfactory state of affairs.

I am skipping over quite a bit of the detail, because my time is limited. I do wish to speak about heating. It will be understood that as I go along I am picking out the major items. If I were to deal with all the minor items it would take a very long time.

The heating is a gravity system. When it comes to the first floor, the registers are in the wall. That is the proper place for them. But the cold air vents are on the floor, and they are placed out about ten inches from the wall. They are oblong in shape, about ten inches wide and about sixteen inches long, fitting in between the joists. There are wooden slats across them, and those slats are about one-quarter inch by 1¼ inches, and sixteen inches long. There they are, sitting I was about to say, almost in the middle of the floor, ten inches from the wall; and if a person came in there and put his chair in that part of the room it would go right down through the floor. Besides, it is a regular dirt trap. One cannot put chairs in the vicinity, because someone would fall through it—a very unsatisfactory condition. The wooden grills should have been put in the wall.

When one goes upstairs he finds that the hot-air vents are placed in the floors. These are just metal grates, not fastened down in any way. All the dirt falls down into them. The children could very easily throw articles in there—in fact they could even get in themselves. The hot-air vents should have been in the wall. It would have cost practically no more to put them in the proper place than to stick them out in the middle of the room, as they are now. These are conditions which should be rectified.

I did a little estimating on this house, which cost $5,400, and I do not think I am far out. I have estimated the plumbing at $400.

Mr. GRAYDON: How many rooms?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Five or six; I am not just sure which. An ordinary plumbing job for such a house would cost about $475, but I think the government would get it for a little less than that, and for that reason I cut it down to $400. The city works section would cost about $400, and the lumber about $1,600. I have made that figure a maximum, because I do not think it should cost more than that for the type of house in question. That would make a total of $2,400, and to this should be added the carpentry work as the remaining cost item, approximately $3,000 for the carpentry work on those houses. I say a contractor has no right to receive $3,000 for building a house of that kind. It is entirely too much money; $2,000 would be enough. And for that he should do a good job.

Someone will say, "Oh, well; they have to pay high wages." They are not paying high wages. When it comes to the matter of having skilled workers to build a house, I say one does not have to have all skilled workers. All one needs to build a house, and to build it properly, is to have one or two good carpenters. The rest can be nail drivers. In this way one can build a first-class house, in first-class condition. There is no scarcity of labour in that regard.

Mr. TUSTIN: Had the house a basement?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Yes, this house had a basement. Another complaint I have is that these contractors are getting approximately $3,000 for the carpenter work, and the government supplies the material; then they sublet contracts for laying floors, putting on lath, etc.

When I refer to floors there is something further I should add. I have been skipping along so fast that I have been leaving out important details. In laying the upstairs floors they laid the spruce lumber groove to groove and tongue to tongue—and that was passed by a government inspector. In the kitchen they put down first-class battleship linoleum over the spruce floors. Of course the spruce shrunk, and the linoleum drew in, with the result that there is a quarter of an inch space down the middle of the kitchen. Adjustments have had to be made in these things. In fact they sent a carpenter up there at extra expense to the government, because the contractor got extra for this.

Mr. MacNICOL: Was the inspector one of those dollar-a-year men, or how was he paid for inspecting?

Mr. JOHNSTON: The hon. member will have to ask the minister that question. I do not think he is working for a dollar a year. I think he is a Liberal.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Does the hon. member know that?

Mr. GRAYDON: It sounds like it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I think it is a wrong practice to permit the contractor to sublet his contracts for laying floors, putting on plaster board, or putting on this or that. He sublets for shingling, for flooring, and for this or that.

This procedure of building veterans' houses or war-time houses on a mass production basis is wrong. We give a contract for 300 or 400 houses to one man, and then he starts to build the houses on a mass scale, subletting this and subletting that. Why not let them out to private contractors who will do the job under proper and decent conditions? Why should not a man have some say about the house he is to live in, or have some supervision over its construction, especially when he has to pay for it? Surely he should have something to say about it.

What are we going to do to rectify these unsatisfactory conditions? My estimate is—and I do not think I am far wrong—that it will cost from $500 to $1,000 more to condition these houses so that they will be at all passable, and so that veterans can live in them. I believe, as I have said, that it will cost the government from $500 to $1,000 more to put these houses into such condition that they can be lived in. And even when that much has been spent, still we shall not have proper houses, because as soon as the heat strikes in the summer the damage will continue. The men who have bought these houses should be permitted to have new ones. I do not think they should be asked to live in these places. The government should immediately stop building houses with spruce. Of course they contend that there is a shortage of material, but I would rather have one good house built than two poor ones, and I would rather have one veteran satisfied with his home than have two dissatisfied. I do not think we would be so short of material if we stopped shipping out the best of our materials to other countries. Let us keep some here to build houses for these men whom just a few short months ago we were calling great heroes, whom just a few short months ago we were meeting with bands, for whom just a few short months ago we had signs up in the stations, "Welcome home, boys." Then we give them one of these houses. That is not good enough.

The government should do everything possible to remedy these conditions, and I am sure the minister will, now that the matter has been brought to his attention. Proper precautions should be taken. These veterans should not be told, and I know they would not be told by the minister, what was told to the chairman of this committee by a government representative: The chairman of this committee was told, "You can either take it or get out." I said to them, "Don't be afraid of his kicking you out, because I know the Minister of Veterans Affairs will not stand for anything like that." Maybe I was speaking out of turn, but I do not think so.

That is not the way to talk to these men. All they want is satisfaction. They want something for the money they are paying, because they feel that they have earned their gratuities. They feel that they have some right to fair treatment. I hope the minister will take this matter under advisement and have an immediate check made of these things. Efforts should be made to see that these men are satisfied and that they have houses to which their wives and families will not be ashamed to bring their friends.

Mr. MACKENZIE: In order to carry out the request made by my hon. friend, will he kindly tell me the exact location of the house in question?

Mr. JOHNSTON: I have not the exact address, but I will give it to the minister.

Mr. TUCKER: What did the veteran pay for the house?

Mr. JOHNSTON: $5,400.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is plenty.

Mr. JOHNSTON: These conditions are not applicable to just one house. I know of another man, and I am not going to tell you his politics although I think the minister would be pleased if I did. Before this man felt he could move in he spent over $250 out of his own pocket to finish the house. He did a fairly good job, but they dare not put a piano in the house because the floor now looks like a camel's back.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is that the same house?

Mr. JOHNSTON: No, it is a different one.

Mr. MACKENZIE: In the same location?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Yes, it is the same location, up on North Hill, where veterans' houses are being built in Calgary.

Mr. TUCKER: Is the hon. member sure that those houses were built under the land act administration?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Oh, yes. Mr. Finlater is one of the inspectors and Mr. Turner is the other. Bennett and White were the contractors.

Mr. HARKNESS: That is the small holdings development?

Mr. JOHNSTON: That is right, out at North Hill.

Mr. WILLIAM BRYCE (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I have refrained from taking part in this debate because I was one of the lesser lights who went to the continent this year and I was waiting until the greater lights had had their say. I was greatly taken with what I saw there. I was interested in what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) had to say the other day. He finished his remarks with these words, which will be found on page 97 of *Hansard:*

> One found a condition there which gave one a certain impression. I came away from Paris feeling that I had seen a very dejected people, a people who were suffering because of need, a people who were not properly clothed, a people who required a great deal of sympathy and care from those of us outside.

I had intended to demonstrate the benefits I had derived from my visit to France by speaking in French, but there are so few of my French-speaking friends here this afternoon that I am just going to stick to my own doric. No person can understand or realize what the French people have gone through. Perhaps those members on both sides of the house who fought over the Normandy beaches, up through Falaise, Caen, Amiens and right on through know what it is like because they were through the worst of it. We must remember that when we were not in France, the Germans were. These people were bombed incessantly. If the Germans were not bombing them, we were. This put us in a rather awkward position. We would meet people who had lost legs and arms and naturally we would say, "How did you lose your leg?" or "How did you lose your arm?" A man might reply, "Well, one of your airmen came over one night."

I want hon. members to realize that these people have suffered as no other nation has suffered. England and Scotland also suffered, but they are taking it right on the chin. Hon. members have no idea of how they are taking it. I went to my native city and they said, "We were not damaged at all," but in two nights Jerry destroyed 4,500 homes. Still they said they were not damaged. Then we hear members in this House of Commons say that we should not lend them money to help them get back on their feet or reinstate themselves. Those hon. members just do not understand because they have not had an opportunity to see like the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Winkler), the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and other hon. members. We saw the terrible conditions that exist.

In Paris I saw people line up at seven o'clock in the morning to try to get food. This was not in front of the Ritz either. I stayed at the Ritz to see what it was like.

Mr. MacNICOL: Where did you get all the money?

Mr. BRYCE: I travelled with a Conservative. I saw those poor people standing in line waiting with their coupons for bread. They would wait until ten or half-past ten o'clock and then they would be told, "No bread to-day." We never had anything like that. The nearest they got to us was the St. Lawrence river. We should be ready to go down on our knees and thank these people for what they saved us from. Our boys and girls went there and did their part, but we folk at home never knew what was going on.

When you speak to the British people they will tell you that they have plenty of food, that they never wanted for anything at all. I have in my hand a book entitled, "Dainty Dishes for the Queen." This contains 160 recipes for dishes made out of oatmeal and potatoes.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is good Scotch food.

Mr. BRYCE: I know we have big men like the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) who have been raised on meal and potatoes, but believe me that gets pretty monotonous, and that is what is going on in the old country to-day. I make this plea to everyone who has friends in the old country: Send them a parcel, for they will appreciate it. I had the pleasure, with other members of this house, of seeing people over there receive parcels from Canada, and they were just like kids around a Christmas tree. They were so pleased to get something different from what they usually had. We were in places in France where, when we got up in the morning, we could get no breakfast and had to drive to the next town before we could get anything to eat. That is a deplorable state of affairs. When we did get a good meal and asked how that came about, the answer was that the food was procured in the black market.

France is up against a problem which no other country in the world faces to-day. For the last five or six years French boys in their teens, from fifteen up to twenty, have been trained in the underground movement to believe that they were heroes if they killed a German or disrupted the then government service. Now they have a government of their own, but they do not yet realize that it is

their own government. That is a problem which France is up against and which you do not find in Britain because there the people realize what government means. I hope that everybody will support this loan to Great Britain to help the mother country get back to a good healthy condition.

I always take great pleasure in handing out bouquets to the government. When I was in England I saw a boatload of Canadian bacon. We farmers have always heard here that our bacon was not as good as Denmark's, but I saw our Canadian bacon over there, and it is the finest bacon that is reaching England to-day. There is nothing to beat it. I saw also Danish bacon, United States bacon and Australian bacon. The Canadian bacon that I saw was "A" bacon; there were no seconds or thirds, nothing but "A". Of course I have always maintained that that is what it is when it gets there. Our bacon was first-class bacon; they like our bacon, and I should like to see the government do everything possible to maintain that market.

The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) is quoted in the press and in *Hansard* as saying that butter should be $1 a pound. I never got $1 a pound; I have got seventy-five cents, but then I had to pay $25 for a bag of sugar. But with sugar at eight or nine cents a pound and butter at fifty cents a pound I think I would be better off than with butter at $1 a pound and sugar at twenty-five cents a pound.

I agree with the hon. member for Stanstead that while the price of milk averages throughout the dominion $3 per hundredweight, the man who is producing cream is making only about $1.62, if it is 3·5 milk. There is something wrong there. You cannot get a man to produce butter fat if he can get a market for his fluid milk. That is a matter which the government must straighten out. The greatest difficulty is this. Right across this dominion you will find that the milk producers have been organized in every city and have fought for their rights, but the cream shipper has been away off in some isolated spot, never subject to sanitary regulations or anything else, and he has had to take just what the creamery could give him. I know we are very short of butter, and to relieve that shortage I make this suggestion to the government, either to the Minister of Finance or to the Minister of Agriculture, that cream cheques for some time forward be free of income tax. I think that would help get considerably more butter produced. I want to make myself clear on that. My suggestion is that cream cheques should not be subject to income tax. That would start a lot of people milking cows again who have stopped doing so now.

Now a word as to speculation and the grain exchange. I remember when we had the last wheat board in 1919, I remember that in 1920 we had the same agitation that we have to-day. It was the demonstration of collective marketing by the operation of the Canadian wheat board in 1919-20 which brought home to every western grain grower that the futures system was not essential to the successful marketing of wheat, when all farmers received the average price for their wheat regardless of the time they delivered it. There has always been a strong sentiment among the wheat producers of western Canada against the futures system, which in their opinion, determines by public gambling the price of the grain they have to sell. They consider that, as stated by a Canadian economist:

> Aside from the demoralization inseparable from widespread gambling, price instability is in itself an evil. It means that wider margins are necessary to offset possible losses not fully covered by "hedges" in the trade. It also means that farming as a business has less stability. Unless an expert seller, the individual farmer is likely to sell without consideration when prices are low. Some farmers will get high prices and some low but the risk of farming is increased.

It was the handling of the 1919-20 wheat crop by the Canadian wheat board, coupled with the drastic decline in the price of wheat on the futures market upon the termination of the board's operations which brought about an insistent demand on the part of all those directly interested in western agriculture for the reestablishment of the wheat board. That is happening again to-day. We have men clamouring: If we had an open market we would get a better price. We had $2.73½ in 1920, and they said that if we had an open market we could get $3. Do not let us be fooled again. The cash closing price of wheat on August 18, 1920, the first day the Winnipeg futures market was reopened, was $2.73½ a bushel basis 1 northern Fort William. By November 18, the cash price had declined by sixty-six cents to $2.07½ a bushel. On November 18, 1921, the cash price was $1.11⅝ a bushel, showing a drop of 95⅞ cents in one year. On March 18, 1922, by which time practically all the 1921 crop was out of the farmers' hands, the price had returned to $1.43¾ a bushel. Again, by October 18, 1922, the peak month for farmer deliveries, the price was again down to $1.02¼ a bushel. On April 18, 1923, when once again little or no wheat was in farmers' hands, the price was again up to $1.22

a bushel, but at the peak of delivery on October 18, 1923, was back to 95⅞ cents. I am sure hon. members can recall that.

So great was the agitation carried on both by individual farmers and by farmers' organizations generally, that a new political party known as the "Progressives", which had as one of its main planks the establishment of the wheat board, almost wiped out the other two parties in the three prairie provinces in the 1921 dominion general election.

There are in Canada to-day people who are clamouring for an open market. I repeat what I have said before: God forbid that the market be open again for speculative purposes. It would mean the most deplorable state of affairs that we have ever known to exist in Canada.

I congratulate this Liberal government on having set up the wheat board and I appeal to them to keep it. Speculating on the market is out of date. It came with the horse and buggy long ago, and if the farmer had stayed with the horse and buggy he would still be cutting with a reaper. But he has moved on continuously. He got a tractor and a binder and to-day he has a combine. Speculation in grain is the same as it was when it started.

I was born in a Liberal home; I was raised in a Liberal home and I thought a lot of Liberals in my young days. I studied Gladstone, Lloyd George and even our own Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). But when this Liberal government allow people to gamble in rye, when the farmer gets 90 cents and the man who has to make bread with it has to pay $2.50, then I say that my hon. friends have forgotten all the Liberalism that was ever taught them.

May I quote from the Prime Minister as reported in *Hansard* at page 2498 of the session of 1933:

> Most of the social legislation on the statute books of the different countries throughout the world to-day is the result of great Liberal battles, great battles in which the particular interest has been subordinated to the general interest, great battles to give first place to the well-being of the many, rather than to the privileges of the few.

Again I quote from page 2501:

> I submit that human need, social justice and the common good have been the constant aims of Liberalism with respect to the distribution of wealth.

How can any man with a creed like that allow gambling in rye to go on? I cannot make sense of it. I have admired the things he has written in his fight for the common man, but here we find that the government in 1919 and 1920, needing a wheat board, established one, and another one later on, maintaining it through the war, taking over oats, barley and flax; and yet they left rye out of it. They left these gamblers to go on in rye.

Mr. MacINNIS: Coming through the rye.

Mr. BRYCE: The argument put up by these gentlemen who speculate in futures is the future market. I have the figures here, showing that on December 7, 1945, there were visible in Canada 1,442,000 bushels, and on February 1, 1946, there were 1,458,000 bushels, or 16,000 bushels more on the futures market. We are told that when there is less the price should go up and when there is more the price should go down. But here the price jumped from $1.81½ to $2.29⅛. This Liberal government sends representatives to a food conference with the idea of feeding the world, and it will pay a farmer ninety cents or $1 for his rye and then allow these fellows to gamble in the commodity, while the poor man who has to turn it into bread pays $2.60 a bushel for it. One wonders how people can do such things. If it is good for wheat, oats and barley to be under the control of the wheat board, then the same arguments apply to rye.

I do not know whether I have made that argument strong enough, but I feel that this is one of the greatest injustices the government has done to the common man, because the man who produces rye produces it in the poorest ground. Up in the interlake country where there is nothing but sand they will grow rye, and some of the most underpaid people in the world eat rye bread to-day; yet the government will allow these privileged few to gamble in the produce of the farmer. There is no place in the modern world for gambling in food.

I have some other things I wish to discuss but perhaps I have said enough for the present. However, I will say this to the government. We need live stock legislation to protect the farmer, just as we need a wheat board. You can call it anything you like. I am not fussy about the name. When I made the proposal before, I called it a board of live stock commissioners, and it was suggested that it might not be legal. Well, the members of this government have enough brains to get over such technicalities, if they want to use those brains. I hope they will use them and give us a live stock marketing board to protect the farmer, because he will need that protection.

There have been great changes over the last thirty years. We no longer market our produce in a haphazard way. If you want quality and you establish grades, then I submit that the farmers should be given some say

in the fixing of those grades. It is absolutely necessary that they should have representation on any board. I am not suggesting that the packer is not also entitled to representation on it, as well as the consumer and all others concerned. But let everyone be represented on the board.

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): In the first place I congratulate the two hon. members who have just spoken; and I will remind the latter that the late King George once admonished the Prince of Wales because he had been speculating in grain. The teachings of the king were to the same effect as the speech of my hon. friend, that there should be no speculation in grain and especially in rye because it is a kind of grain that is just as good to drink as to eat.

We need some reform in this country; we need reform in a broad spirit; but all those who desire to obtain reform must realize in advance that they will get no place, to use slang language, unless they have the determination to suffer slander, insult and abuse for the good cause. That was my experience. Yesterday I received a clipping of a dirty sheet that is published at noontime in Montreal. I shall read it in a moment, but before I read it I shall make a correction in *Hansard*. At page 220 I am reported as having said, speaking of Colonel Bovey:

The man who makes molasses peaches . . .

I never said that. I did not say that he had received pay as one of the 140 who make preserved peaches, but I said that he was making molasses speeches, sticky speeches for his own benefit. That is what I said and afterwards I complained of McGill university being a red house. By the same mail I received a clipping from the *Gazette* of March 19 with the picture of Tim Buck addressing the students of McGill, and the gentleman wrote me a very fine letter which I will send to my hon. friend the leader of the Social Credit group (Mr. Low) who stated a few truths that were denied by Principal James.

By the same mail I received an editorial of that dirty sheet. I shall read one paragraph. I have some other excerpts from newspapers which I shall read later on:

Montreal, Wednesday, March 27, 1946.

Something has been added to the "hotbed of communism" charges levelled at McGill by Solon Low—endorsation from the lips of J. F. Pouliot, M.P.

Most Canadians are familiar with Mr. Pouliot's near perfect record for inaugurating and supporting groundless accusations, designed to increase disunity and embarrass governments and institutions.

Only that; that is all I have to say about that remark. I will not say it is inspired by anyone, but I prescribe a triple dose of castor oil to the writer of this editorial and a similar one to Colonel Bovey. That is my potion.

I shall draw the attention of the members of the house to the fact that one thing has been said for the public good by the leader of the Social Credit group and I have repeated it in asking for some reform. Instead of securing any reform, we get abuse from a paper which is inspired by the very man of whom we complain, because they give the wrong information to us; that is all. My hon. friend was the victim of some abuse and so was I. I am far from suffering from the mania of persecution; but I wish to point out that nothing will be accomplished unless all members of parliament have the triple armour of steel around their breasts to defy all the iniquitous persons whom we may meet on the way to reform.

That is my first point, and I have other incidents. There is a young man who lived for a time in the Saguenay district, lake St. John. He was the public relations officer of a big company. He gave false news and led the cabinet and a minister into error. That man never corrected himself. He is now in the eastern townships in charge of a paper. When I received very great honour he wrote this article which appeared in the Sherbrooke *Record* of February 4, 1946:

In many quarters Mr. Pouliot is regarded as rather irresponsible and as something of a firebrand.

Afterwards he said that apparently it was right, but there was some insult and innuendo in his article. It was the old story, that one cannot complain of any parasite, profiteer, pirate, highway robber or thief without having bad motives. One must have bad motives, no manners at all. What has happened? Of course, I never belonged to the army, but I was described in my constituency last December as a friend of the draftees and the soldiers alike, friend of both. They gave me a dinner and presented me with a brand new car, which is something that is appreciated, because it is the only county where it has been done. It has been done for my provincial mate. Before that, it was done only for one other member of parliament, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who had a big square automobile in the old days. It is something that touched me very deeply.

Mr. MacNICOL: It would touch anybody.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes. I hope that the constituents of my hon. friend give him the finest limousine because he deserves it.

I come now to the Victoria Cross. I am interested in the recipients of this medal and when I spoke about the McGill students I mentioned that. Your Honour did something for one of the winners which is merited, but it is not enough. However, Your Honour did more for him than anyone else had done. The press took it up and it was reported in the papers of Victoria. I received word from another hero in British Columbia who had received the Victoria Cross from the hands of our king during the first war. By the way, he was the first officer of the Canadian army to receive the Victoria Cross, and he passed above the heads of everybody in British Columbia, above the heads of all members of parliament, even those who had a very fine war record, even above the head of the legion, to send an S.O.S. to Jean François Pouliot in lower Quebec. I consider it a very great honour and, to be just and fair, I will say that the minister is doing his best to fix up this case, with the assistance of his most valuable parliamentary assistant. It is something which touches one, that a hero of the last war, who has been abandoned by all, goes far away, thousands of miles from his district, to get in touch with one who is ready to fight for him. I took up his case, and at the same time that the newspapers said that apparently it was worthy of consideration, they said of me, "In many quarters Mr. Pouliot is regarded as rather irresponsible and as something of a firebrand." Those who are afraid to be called names by such a nonentity will obtain no reform; and I tell my colleagues, for whom I have great respect, that if they want any reform in this country they have only one thing to do, namely, not to be afraid to say what they believe is right and what they believe is for a good purpose.

There is something else; and I come to the crucial point. Last year hon. gentlemen who listened to me will remember how difficult it was to unearth the amount of money which was earned by the firm of Borden and Company in Toronto. How many times did I rise in the house to ask for that information? I was told that everything that was earned by the firm was returned to the government in a mood of sacrifice and generosity on the altar of the country.

An hon. MEMBER: You believed that, of course?

Mr. POULIOT: I did not believe it at all, and that is why I asked the question. I asked for copies of the cheques which had been sent for the amounts of moneys received. It was no insult; it was a matter of fact, that the man who was there in the department was looking after his own interests. What did the *Globe and Mail* say about the member for Temiscouata? I cannot complain very much about the *Globe and Mail*; I have much more respect for it than for the Sherbrooke *Record* and for the other dirty sheet which is published in Montreal. I have had great respect for the *Globe and Mail* since the days of Harry Anderson, who was a dear friend of mine.

Mr. MacNICOL: He was a very fine man.

Mr. POULIOT: Certainly. My hon. friend knows I had the honour of being amongst Mr. Anderson's friends; and when his picture was unveiled for the press gallery I was one of the very few members who, along with the then Prime Minister, Mr. Bennett, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), were invited there. I appreciated that very much. I had and I still have very good friends in the province of Ontario. But what I say about the *Globe and Mail* is what Poujoulat, a great French author, said of Cardinal Richelieu:

Le cardinal m'a fait trop de bien pour que j'en dise du mal; le cardinal m'a fait trop de mal pour que j'en dise du bien.

That is, "The cardinal has done too much good to me for me to speak badly of him, and he has done too much evil for me to say anything good about him." But I will say something nevertheless; and I will read what has been written about me in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* to humiliate me. That was the purpose, but it was not realized, because I have the skin of a crocodile. Nevertheless the purpose was to humiliate me, to abuse me, to treat me with insult, to make me suffer humiliation. Here it is:

A malicious attack.

Imagine; a man who is malicious, a man who wants to do harm to someone! I am astonished that the title was not "a blasphemous attack". It should have been, because down there they still believe in the golden calf. There are some in Toronto, as there are in Montreal and other places.

Mr. Jean Francois Pouliot staged in the House of Commons on Wednesday another of his many deplorable performances as a public mischiefmaker.

That is inoffensive!

Some time ago he tried to tarnish the reputation of Mr. Henry Borden, K.C., by suggesting that, as legal adviser for the Department of Munitions and Supply during the war years, Mr. Borden had used his position for the advantage of his private law practice.

What an abomination!

Munitions Minister Howe, under whom Mr. Borden served, came to his defence with a categorical denial of Mr. Pouliot's defamatory charges.

You see, I am there portrayed as slinging mud at such a distinguished and sane person as Henry Borden. Mark you, there is nothing infamous in a man looking after his office when he has a very fat job in the government, giving him the opportunity to send cases to his law partner.

If Mr. Borden's reputation needed any public defence, the minister's sweeping refutation at that time should have sufficed to end the matter.

Well, now, Pouliot was a liar because he had dared to say that Borden had taken advantage of his big position as controller of the controllers to encourage his law office. What an abomination! What a scandal! It takes a man who has no honour to defame someone like that in the minds of fellow citizens. There is the conclusion of the paragraph I have read.

Well, now, I have been as stubborn as a donkey. I wanted to get the information; I thank the minister for having given it to me, and I thank his parliamentary assistant, one of the hon. members for Ottawa (Mr. McIlraith), for having helped me to secure it. I now have the information. The question is obvious: did Borden send more to his office in the matter of fees, et cetera, than was returned to the government? That is Pouliot's statement; is it true or not? I have the figures. I will not read them in detail; I do not want to take too much of the time of the house. But here it is:

Professional fees were paid to the law firm of Borden, Elliott, Sankey and Kelley or Borden, Elliott, Kelley, Palmer and Sankey as follows:

From 1941 to 1945, $77,429.75. That is the amount which has been earned by that firm. If the answer which was made to me had been true, the amount returned to the exchequer should have been $77,429.75. But it was a little different:

None of the above amounts paid to this firm included any charge whatsoever for the time and service rendered by Mr. Borden to the department or any government-owned company while Mr. Borden was in any way associated with the department. Of these amounts the following were returned to the department as voluntary contributions representing all profit.

And then are set out the amounts for the three years 1941, 1942 and 1943. This was tabled on March 21, and therefore it must include all that was sent. The amount returned was $21,048, and therefore they enjoyed $56,407.75. For this reason I say

Pouliot was right, and his charges were not defamatory. I did not write to the *Globe and Mail*. But I put a question before the house, so that the house knows that when Pouliot asks a question, if he does not know all the details he at least has good reason for asking that question, and knows something about it.

I have too much respect for the house, including my colleagues, to make any false statements to it or to them respecting matters of fact. Of course I may err when I express an opinion, but when I state a fact I can always prove it. If someone wants information I will answer, and will tell my source of information, so that the house may know about it in a definite way.

My first conclusion is that one who has not been affected by the atmosphere of Ottawa will not be affected to any considerable extent by the unfair criticism of some of the local newspapers which are controlled by interests which always cater to bureaucracy. One must make his own judgments. One must not take for granted that everything said to him is true, and that because something is said by Mr. So-and-so it must be right. Therefore I tell my colleagues, whom I respect, that if they want to continue their war against bureaucracy, and to bring back responsible government in Canada, they are sure to be abused and to be slandered; they are sure to be minimized in the eyes of their electors.

I am not alone in that category. I remember well the insults that were heaped upon us at the time of the sittings of the civil service committee. My hon. friends were on that committee serving with me. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier) served on it, and did excellent work, as did the other members. It gives me pleasure to offer them praise for what they did.

That is my first observation. Then I have another point I would ask hon. members to keep in mind. While I have the deepest respect for returned men and while I am always ready to help them, and want to have the help of the minister and his assistant—because apparently they are two of the very few good men in the department—yet we must not lose our sense of proportion. Because a man has done excellent work during the war, it does not necessarily follow that he must be considered infallible in anything he does afterwards, in any field of action.

For instance, it was ridiculous to consider as infallible two former defence ministers, simply because each had a fine war record. It was silly to do that. But I could not contradict either Power or Ralston because both had fine war records. It is true; I concede it;

I admit it. But that is no reason why one should not find any fault in the managing of their departments. Those who believed them infallible were simply credulous, and behaving like children. I have too much respect for members of parliament to let them fall into such credulity, which is childish.

I have one thing further to say, and I shall have finished. It is to repeat in another form what I said when I was sitting on the opposite side of the house, at a time when I suggested we should have a union opposition, composed of all liberal-minded members of parliament. That was a time when the clean-up which has been made in the three defence departments had not been completed, and I felt it was time to do something about it.

We are here to do something; we are not here just to make speeches. We are here to reform the government of the dominion, so that we can do something beneficial for the common people. I give credit to all hon. members that they intend to do something for the country. We will do it together, if we remove obstacles to progress.

If we are to deal effectively with bureaucracy, with fairness and with equity, keeping in mind at the same time the usefulness of civil servants to the state—and this is not being done by the commission now making an investigation—and if we want to make a clean-up of the civil service, then we must first of all make a clean-up in all political parties, so that liberal-minded men may act together, whether they be Liberals, Conservatives by name, Social Crediters, or in the C.C.F. group. That is not important.

We are reaching a time when there will be a great cleavage in Canada between people who are thinking about the future of the country. There will be those who have a Canadian spirit and who think of Canada before any other country; and on the other side there will be those who think of any other country before Canada. Let us put them under the same roof and in the same corner.

What shall we do? In the first place the two old parties shall get rid of the control of international finance. I have mentioned something about Mr. Borden. He may be a good lawyer, and I have not attacked his reputation as such. I said, too, that he had collected funds for his party—perhaps for both major parties—when he was working as controller. I find nothing scandalous in that. People become scandalized over things which ought not to affect them in that way.

But he is now the adviser to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken). He is the man who was with Ralston, and who belongs to the Dunning-Ralston group in Montreal, the international finance promoters and agents. He is not the kind of man who should be adviser to the leader of a great political party—and just on account of that fact.

He was controller of controllers here in Ottawa, a position he should never have had, but he did have it, because of the influence of Ralston, who was sitting with him at Barclay's.

Who is the chairman of the National Liberal Federation? It is Gordon Fogo, a former law partner of Ralston, who was assistant to Borden in the Department of Munitions and Supply, holding the position of acting controller of controllers. I want to get rid of them. I want to clean out the party of all these rascals and pirates. I want the Canadian people to know where we are. The party should have a definite policy. If our policy is to be a Canadian policy, let it be a Canadian policy throughout Canada. If it is to be an imperialistic policy, let us make it an imperialistic policy also in Quebec, so that the people of Quebec will not be deceived when the election comes around. That is enough for to-day, but it will be continued at some other time.

Mr. W. D. WYLIE (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate at this late date I find myself in the same position as many hon. members who have spoken during the past two days. I had not intended to take part in this debate, but since our rules were more or less broken on Tuesday I decided that I might just as well get into the debate with the rest of the speakers from the different parties.

No reference was made in the speech from the throne to several matters of paramount importance to Canada, and in particular to western Canada. We have listened to many important speeches during this debate and have heard many important issues discussed, but I wish to touch upon two matters which, in my opinion, are most important to the people of my riding, to southern Alberta and to Canada as a whole. It is not that I think the other matters are not important; I certainly think they are important and I may take an opportunity of discussing them at some later date in the session.

I am confining my remarks mainly to two issues, irrigation and the trans-Canada highway. Those issues affect the future development, prosperity and economic welfare of southern Alberta in particular and of Canada as a whole. I wish to take this opportunity to thank the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) for the interest he has taken in the irrigation of western Canada and in particular for the meeting which he held in

Medicine Hat in January. My only regret is that I was unable to be at that meeting. I was in the hospital at the time, but from all reports I have heard that meeting was certainly one of the best meetings they ever held in Medicine Hat. There is no one better qualified to discuss irrigation than the hon. member for Davenport. I am sure he knows every coulee and where every dam should be put in connection with either the St. Mary's-Milk river project or the Redcliff-Ronalane project.

The residents of the drought area are fully aware of the fact that irrigation is the only solution of our crop-failure-due-to-drought problems, and that is the reason why more extensive efforts to obtain irrigation have been made during the past year than ever before. It might be well to enumerate for the information of the house some of the support which has been given to this effort during the past year. I shall mention only a few of the organizations that have supported this matter, but I believe they should be mentioned. These are:

South Alberta Water Conservation Council
Alberta Board of Trade and Agriculture
Medicine Hat City Council
Medicine Hat Branch of the Canadian Legion
Medicine Hat Chamber of Commerce
Medicine Tat Trades and Labour Council
Redcliff public meeting
Bow Island Board of Trade
Executive of the U.F.A. and Farmers' Union
Lethbridge Board of Trade

Various clubs in Medicine Hat as well as other organizations and individuals have given their support to these irrigation projects. I should like to read one paragraph from a resolution which was passed by the Medicine Hat trades and labour council, because this will give the house an idea of just how the residents of that area are looking at this project. They said:

> We have given billions to Britain and other European countries, 750 million to the Export Credit Act, 750 million to Bretton Woods. Increased the capital of the T.C.A. from 5 million to 25 million. Now surely we can give to our own people enough to give them the horn of plenty, that they deserve.

I wish to state right away that the Medicine Hat trades and labour council do not object to the money we have given to the people of Britain. Those people have given much more than we in this country have given, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) has just said in his most interesting speech. Simply because it is mentioned in their resolution does not mean that they are opposed to the idea. They believe that when we can do that for other countries there is no reason why we cannot do something for our own people. That is why they say that in their resolution. Irrigation is the formula for an all-out Canadian prosperity. The east is dependent upon the west for its prosperity. It is in the interests of the dominion as a whole to place the prairies on a sound financial footing.

The projects most urgently needed could be undertaken first. As other areas are brought into greater and more suitable productiveness, the drain upon the government for drought relief would be lessened. The gains at first may be small, but as the areas under the ditch are increased the field of prosperity will be steadily enlarged and the need for assistance correspondingly lowered.

The St. Mary's-Milk river and Redcliff-Ronalave projects can be described as an urgent need owing to deficient rainfall in that area and the feasibility of both projects. The provision of work when needed is important but this should not be the primary objective. The main purpose of water conservation and irrigation in southern Alberta is to rehabilitate the farming industry in that area. That is why such strong protests were made when it was suggested that both projects be placed in the category of an employment stop-gap. It is true, however, that the construction of irrigation works provides jobs, which is an added reason for the early completion of both projects, in view of the prevailing unemployment situation.

Mr. Speaker, the year 1945, like so many in the past, was another drought year. The devastating effects were extensive and far-reaching. This, following two years of drought, which were almost as serious, brings severe hardships to many farmers, and hundreds of farmers find themselves in the same position as they were in, in 1937, in having to dispose of their cattle herds. While stock prices were good, the majority of cattle were sold as feeders, which of course meant a loss to the farmers. Many cattle in that area have died this winter on account of the feed shortage. Feed was hard to get and had to be hauled long distances, mainly from the irrigation districts of Brooks and the Taber-Lethbridge area. The development of the projects mentioned would change this situation materially. The placing of the available water on these lands is the finest type of crop insurance against drought. For a long time we in the south have known that we have the natural garden climate of western Canada. This area can be made into one of the great producing areas of this continent. All that is required is to make water available when and where it is needed. Experience has proven

that we cannot depend upon natural rainfall to provide sufficient moisture for the growing crops. There is, however, sufficient water running to useless and inexcusable waste down the South Saskatchewan river to irrigate almost a million acres of the best land in Alberta, and still have plenty of water for various projects in Saskatchewan, also water for Moose Jaw, which the hon. member for that city mentioned in his able speech last week.

With reference to the St. Mary's-Milk river project, international waters are involved and Canada has long neglected to make beneficial use of its share, while the United States of America has built reservoir facilities to store practically the whole flow. Unless we make a more combined effort to use our rightful share, the United States might claim this on the basis of prior use. We must remember that every drop of water which runs to the sea without rendering a commercial return is a public waste.

I have an illustrated pamphlet prepared by the eastern irrigation district at Brooks, of which E. W. Brunsden is general manager. I am sure most hon. members received this pamphlet. It is interesting and shows what can be accomplished by turning water on the soil.

On the first page it shows a lovely field of sugar beets and says, "This proven irrigation project has everything a food processor seeks." Then it shows part of the irrigation works, the Bassano dam, also the Brooks aqueduct, with two miles of continuous concrete conduit. It also shows the flume at Lathom, a fifteen-foot semi-circular wood stave, half a mile long, and various other pictures of interest. It gives the hours of sunshine. I do not think it is necessary for me to describe the pamphlet in detail because I am sure most hon. members have received a copy. It is a well known fact, of course, that under our present system of dry land farming out there we get too much sunshine and not enough rainfall. It also shows the long frost-free period, which of course is beneficial to irrigation. The southern part of the province has the longest frost-free period in the west, due no doubt to the Chinooks that we get in that part. The productivity of the soil in that area is also shown, not only in the Brooks area but in the south. It also tells about the specialized crops that may be produced to get away from wheat farming. It says this about specialized crops:

> The farmers of the eastern irrigation district are not one-crop farmers. They long have practised diversification. Potatoes, alfalfa and sweet clover for hay and seed; sugar beets, radish, beetroot, mustard and peas for seed are among the crops successfully grown over periods of years in addition to all of the cereal and coarse grains and flax.

It also mentions the high quality of the live stock of all types produced in that district. This is a natural result in an irrigation district where there is an abundance of feed.

Mr. MacNICOL: Before the house rises may I ask the hon. member to write to the publisher of the pamphlet to which he has just referred and ask that a copy be sent to each member of the house. I did not get a copy, and the hon. member to my left and the hon. member in front of me did not receive a copy. It would do no harm and might do a lot of good.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WYLIE: Mr. Speaker, before the dinner recess I was dealing with an illustrated pamphlet showing what can be grown in the district of southern Alberta under irrigation. There are a few more points in this pamphlet which I wish to touch upon, such as types of food processing plants. For example, they have vegetable canning, and I understand they are getting a new factory this year which will mean a great deal to that district. There are small fruit canning and quick-freeze plants, to which farmers can take their fruit, have it quickly frozen and take it out as they wish, using it as fresh fruit. There are also pickle packing establishments for cucumbers, cauliflower, onions and so on, and there are also meat processing plants. They have not a sugar beet factory at the present time but have high hopes of securing one in the near future. There is a move on now whereby, by next fall, they expect to have a plant.

The farmers of that area are so convinced of this that they went out and raised $600,000 in a matter of a few days to assist in building this factory, and they hope that the same results will not befall this undertaking that happened to the last factory which they planned on building.

There are also dairy products and poultry packing plants. That all goes with irrigation. Then, last but not least, this pamphlet shows the wonderful homes of the farmers in that area. There are twelve hundred farm families at present in the area and their homes would be a credit to any district. In my travels around this part of Canada I have found very few homes that compare with those in the irrigation district. By that I do not mean that the homes in the west are as large as

they are here. They are more of the cottage type. But they are all painted and have lovely lawns, with beautiful shrubs surrounding the farms, so that they are a credit to the district.

The last page shows a picture of the Bassano dam, which would be of interest to many members of the house. I am sorry that all members have not received that pamphlet. I was under the impression that they had all received it until the contrary was called to my attention by the hon. member for Davenport.

In "Alberta's eastern irrigation district, where water works wonders," the charge for water is approximately $1.60 to $1.75 per irrigable acre, so that the cost is not so high considering what the farmers produce.

The pamphlet goes on to show what is raised on the irrigated land, giving the number of bushels per acre and other information. I hope that more of these pamphlets will be circulated in the near future.

Going from the irrigation district to the drought area, which comprises most of my riding, you run into an entirely different situation. You pass into an area where during the last three years the average yield of wheat has been less than four bushels to the acre. The Minister of Agriculture can very easily verify this by reference to the amounts paid to the farmers through the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. Not only that; there are farmers who have stock that is in poor shape for the reason that no feed has been grown. The homes are not so good—that is, the majority of the homes—as in the irrigation district. They lack trees around the buildings and also windbreaks, and that would mean a great deal in southern Alberta as well as in southern Saskatchewan, where we have plenty of Chinook winds. It would tend to break the wind not only in the summer but also in the winter.

In passing, I wish to make a few remarks regarding the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. That act has helped, of course, the majority of the farmers in this area. If it had not been for the act they would have found themselves very much the same as in 1937, back on relief, not only as regards direct relief but in the matter of agricultural advances as well. However, many changes are necessary in the act, and I hope we shall have an opportunity, before the session ends, to discuss some of the important revisions that should be made.

The question of farm products prices has been dealt with thoroughly by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) and I do not think it is necessary for me to go over that again. The prosperity of Medicine Hat depends entirely on this irrigation system. There are many businesses waiting until the irrigation system is developed and, after all, we cannot blame the businessmen, because we have had promises of irrigation for twenty-five or thirty years and not very much has been done.

I was talking to a garage man the other day and he was interested in irrigation projects. He said to me, "If I were sure of irrigation being developed in this area I would increase my establishment; I would build a garage twice this size." That is only one example of conditions in Medicine Hat at the present time. During the war we had No. 34 S.F.T.S. and the prisoner of war camp also brought many residents into the city so that conditions were improved somewhat. Now, however, these are both being closed. As a matter of fact, one has been closed and the closing of the other will soon follow. When that happens Medicine Hat will revert to what it was before the war.

We hope that what the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann) mentioned is correct, that we can expect a fifty per cent reduction in our taxes this year. We shall wait and see with interest. I agree with the leader of this party who, in his able speech, suggested that the personal income tax schedule should be revised and the income of married couples be made exempt up to $2,000 and of single persons up to $1,200. That is long past due, and we hope that the Minister of National Revenue meant what he said when he said that we would have a reduction of fifty per cent in our taxes.

The seriousness of the drought problem is well known to all Canadians, and during the last election campaign every political party promised its full support to irrigation. That is the one thing upon which we were and still are united. However, it remains for the party in power to show action in this respect and fulfil the election promises. We appreciate the steps already taken by the government in making a start on the St. Mary's-Milk river project, but let us go forward with all the power at our command to develop the irrigation projects.

I have another subject of paramount importance not only to the people of southern Alberta but to the people of Canada as a whole, namely, the trans-Canada highway. Canada requires an adequate highway system built around a hard surface trans-Canada highway equal to any one of the many excellent transcontinental highways in the United States. Otherwise Canada stands to lose her fair share of the tourist trade. This matter has received a great deal of attention by many

of the citizens and organizations in and around Medicine Hat. We feel that adequate highways connecting one part of Canada with another are as essential in this day and age as railroads were in the early days of the west.

The dominion government recognized its responsibility in the building of railroads. Extension grants have been made to railways ever since confederation and many lines were built by government funds, because we were told our national economy required it.

During the war the dominion government expended large sums of money in the development of airports. The dominion government has never committed itself to a programme of highway construction; the only effort made by the government has been in the form of relief projects to create employment. I contend that roads, as public works and essential means of communication, should not be relegated to the status of relief projects. Neither railroads nor airports have been constructed in this manner, and roads are just as essential to-day to the welfare and economic development of Canada as are railroads or airports.

In Alberta we have some very good highways that are so located that they will make very fine feeder lines to connect with the trans-Canada. No. 1 highway is not in the best of shape at present, no doubt owing to the fact that the provincial government is waiting to see what developments are going to be made by the dominion government. Past experience has taught us that many provincial governments are not financially able to reconstruct highways of such high standards through sparsely populated areas, and if we depend on the provinces to build such a highway system it is not likely that it will ever be completed.

The demand for good roads from the populated areas is so great that every province is kept busy trying to satisfy the urgent demand made upon it. It is also apparent that no uniform type of highway will be constructed across Canada if the matter is left entirely in the hands of the individual provinces. Briefly, I might mention why the dominion government should take an active interest in the development of an adequate highway system. It would foster and encourage communication between the several provinces of our dominion with a view to developing a national spirit. It would attract United States tourists and thus enable us to capitalize on the favourable advertising we have received during the past six years. Tourist traffic from the United States affects the pocketbook of every Canadian citizen. One of the finest exports we have to offer the United States is our scenery, our hunting and our fishing. It could be worth hundreds of millions of dollars to Canada. Prior to the war the tourist business had been developed into one of our largest industries, and it can be developed into our largest industry, out of which every man, woman and child in this country will receive some benefit either directly or indirectly.

In his speech the other night the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Brown) mentioned the tourist traffic and said this:

> Situated as we are, the tourist industry is of vital importance.

It is just as important to us in the west. Then he went on to show the number of tourists who had entered through the port of Windsor. In 1945 almost five and a half millions of United States tourists entered through the port of Windsor. That means a lot to the economy of any country.

Large sums have been spent in laying out across our dominion one of the finest systems of national parks in the world; but in most instances there are no adequate highways upon which motorists may reach them, and there is definitely no system connecting these parks. One would almost think they were created only for the people living in the immediate vicinity. Our national parks compare favourably with, and some surpass, all other parks in North America. In addition, people will seek cooler places to spend vacations during hot weather if they have good highways over which to drive. We have been assured by experts on tourist travel from the United States that the tourist traffic is governed entirely by the type of roads supplied by Canada. People naturally drive north to reach a cooler climate during the summer months, and if our roads are comparable with those south of the United States boundary they would continue on to Canada and spend their vacations here. Tourist traffic from the United States is so important to our national economy that our highway system should become a national project.

Of all the peoples of the world the citizens of the United States are the most travel-minded, and the opportunity presented to Canadians should be fostered and assisted in every way possible by the Dominion government. The proposals involve a change of policy in so far as the dominion government is concerned, but the matter is of such vital importance to our national welfare that I believe all the pressure possible should be brought to bear to ensure our so-called progressive country being provided with an

adequate highway system which will be not only a credit to Canada but a great national asset enriching every citizen.

In closing, may I say that in the past we have always been told that the reason why the irrigation projects had not been completed is lack of money; but surely in view of the hundreds of millions of dollars given and lent, also credits to other nations, it should not be asking too much to ask the government to spend a few million dollars on our own people to develop our own country. Abundant production and the successful distribution of goods constitute our greatest assurance against any inflation policy.

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this debate has gone on for quite a while, and that hon. members are getting a bit impatient. However, may I point out that from the province of Manitoba, which has seventeen members in this house, only four have so far spoken, and one of those four has taken more time than the other three put together. So that I do not think we are taking a disproportionate share of the time of this house.

The fact of the matter is that I would not have risen to speak at all had I felt that the speech from the throne had covered all the subjects in which I was interested. But to my mind it was disappointing. It failed to face up to such things as full production, full employment, and housing; it failed also to make any provision for better old age pensions at a lower age, and for relief in the lower income brackets from income tax. Because of these failures I feel it is my duty to point out what, in my opinion, should be done to remedy these defects.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the speech from the throne was disappointing. But this was not surprising. After all, we have to realize that it comes from a government which believes in private enterprise and it is a private enterprise speech from the throne. I was at a loss to understand why hon. members to my right made any objection at all to this type of speech from the throne; in fact I was amazed at the attack made upon it by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) in his first speech on the address, because I believe—my hon. friends will correct me if I am wrong—they are supposed to be the champions of private enterprise in this house. They set themselves up to be so. I would point out that if ever there was a private enterprise speech from the throne, this is it, and they should be happy about it. But they are not happy about it. Why? Because I believe they realize, as the rest of us do, that the legislation forecast in the speech from the throne will not face up to the situation as it is, and I think they realize also, although they may not be ready to admit it, that it will not be long before the people of this country will have to make a choice between two types of economic system. They will have to choose between the private enterprise economy of scarcity, which operates for private profit, and the public enterprise economy of abundance, operating for the public benefit. When the time comes for that choice I believe there will be more reason for the official opposition to feel unhappy. But in the meantime we are going to operate under a private enterprise system. The government feels it has a mandate to carry on under that system for its present term of office and is going to attempt to make it work. That being so, I wish to make some suggestions this evening which I think will be of some assistance to the government in bringing about some changes which are necessary at this time.

At the very beginning of the session the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden) asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). The question asked what the Minister of Agriculture is prepared to do in order to remove the obstacles which are preventing full production in the field of agriculture. In reply the minister stated that he was not aware of any obstacles in the way of full production. If he is not aware of any obstacles I think it is my duty as a member of this house to point out what, in my opinion, are some of the obstacles which should be removed, because I feel there are some.

In the first place we have heard a great deal, through the press and otherwise, of a falling off of hog and dairy production. We heard a lot about it to-day from an hon. member to my right. In order to put it in statistical form, I have here a statement from the cooperative live stock producers of Dauphin. It will be remembered that last year I put some figures on record from the same organization. They point out that in 1944 from that shipping point 7,302 hogs were shipped, while in 1945 from the same shipping point only 4,085 hogs were shipped, which represents a drop at this one point of 3,217 hogs, or a percentage of loss of 44·05. I believe that the same story could be told right across western Canada, and I would not be surprised if there is not a similar record as far as eastern Canada is concerned. The story of the falling off of dairy production has been told in this house, and I will not repeat it, but I should like to make a suggestion. The minister may say, "All right; hog production is falling off, and dairy pro-

duction is falling off; what are you going to do about it? How are you going to make the farmers produce more hogs, milk more cows, produce more butter, and so on?" I say, human nature being what it is, there must be some motive for everything we do. We do things because we feel impelled through some motive to do them. In order to provide a motive for greater production, something must be done to make that production pay, to make the farmer feel it is worth his time and labour to produce that type of product.

One obstacle which, I believe, needs to be removed is the unfair system of income tax to which the farmer has been subjected. I do not know how many farmers with whom I have talked in the last few months have told me the same story. It is that they have gone out of hog production and the production of dairy produce to a great extent because this is the type of work which they have to do before breakfast and after supper, and instead of being paid, as is usual elsewhere, time and a half for overtime, they get docked so much more income tax. So that I make this practical suggestion to the Minister of Agriculture, or to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley); they can fight it out between themselves. For every hog which is produced and marketed through the regular channels of trade the farmer should receive $5 off his income tax. That would provide a motive to keep up hog production. It would also defeat the black market. I have before me several clippings, including one from the Lethbridge *Herald,* and another from the *Western Producer.* I shall not take the time of the house to read them, except the headlines, from which hon. members can pretty well conclude what they are about. The first is entitled, "Where the bacon goes", and it goes on to point out that it is not going through regular channels; the other is headed, "Black marketers invade the prairies", and it goes on to show why a black market is developing. These are the statements of these papers. They are not mine. I do not know to what extent they are true. But to my mind there is danger, if the price remains too low, if the income tax is not adjusted, that much of the bacon and other pork products will not go through the regular channels of trade and will not reach the people we want it to reach.

I may also incidentally point out, in case the treasury board is worrying about the financial end of it, that to knock off $5 per hog from the farmers' income tax would not cost the treasury any money, or, if it did, it would be very little. The reason for that is that the government at the present time is not collecting income tax on hogs which are not being produced and therefore it cannot lose any money on them. As I have pointed out, at the one shipping point of Dauphin there was a drop of 3,217 hogs between 1944 and 1945. That means 3,217 hogs on which the government will not get any income tax, because they were not produced and not shipped. So that by knocking off so much income tax as regards each hog you are not going to lose money.

I wish also to endorse the suggestion made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) that the cream cheque should also be exempt from income tax. I do not need to repeat what I said, that milk and cream production is the type of work which is done before breakfast and after supper. It is not congenial work, as I have good reason to know. Therefore some adjustment should be made to provide greater reward for that type of production.

We come now to grain production. A great deal has been said by the leader of the opposition about the nutritional value of bread as compared with meat. I would agree with him that bread has a high nutritional value, and that possibly per pound it has more value than meat. But there is an old saying that man does not live by bread alone. I believe that anyone who knows anything about nutrition will agree with me that you cannot feed people on bread alone and expect them to be healthy. There are lacking in bread certain things which can be found in meat—fats of all kinds, pork products and bacon products. Therefore we must have a certain percentage of meat and pork products on the market if we are going to keep the people of this country and of European countries, including Great Britain, in good health.

I would say, therefore, it is just as important to have hogs and dairy production on the market as it is to have grain. This does not mean that we do not need more wheat. After reading the speeches of the leader of the opposition and the Minister of Agriculture I was struck by their length, and by the great number of figures and statistics contained in them. I came to the conclusion that they were dangerous speeches, and for this reason, that if the farmers in the west attempted to follow the instruction contained therein, we would be in great danger of not having any wheat production in the next year, because by the time the farmers went through that mass of statistics the time for seeding would be over.

I cannot see the value of the leader of the opposition and the Minister of Agriculture engaging in a verbal duel in the House of Commons, and taking up three or four hours' time in doing so—not that I am complaining about that at all. But I cannot see the value of their telling the farmer what he shall do in connection with seeding because, after all, in the last analysis, the farmer is going to make his own decision as to how much grain he will sow. I have lived among farmers and have done some farming in my lifetime, and I have yet to know a farmer who goes to *Hansard* to find what the Minister of Agriculture had to say, before he pulls out his seed drill in the springtime.

Every farmer has to develop his own farming practice and his own farming unit. He has to put in the acreage which will fit in with his plans. Whatever the Minister of Agriculture may say, and no matter how the leader of the opposition may contradict the minister, these circumstances will not make any difference so far as making a decision as to how many acres of wheat are to be sown is concerned.

But I know what will make a difference. If we want to have greater wheat production or grain production of any kind, then I submit that there is only one way in which we can get that greater production. Apart altogether from the weather, we must provide a price which will establish a motive for the farmers to produce grain. I do not know exactly what the price policy of the leader of the opposition is, although he did speak twice in the debate. Unfortunately, however, in his second speech he usually contradicts what he says in his first one. But it seems to me that he advocates a price of $1.80; and so that hon. members will not think I am making it up, I shall quote from *Hansard*. At page 275 we find these words of the leader of the opposition:

> In the meantime I would change the stupid policy which keeps the price of our export wheat 40 or 50 cents below the world price, and either fix it at $1.80 instead of $1.55, or let the world price prevail until the shortage is corrected.

Let me point out that the leader of the opposition has described as a stupid policy one which keeps the price of wheat 40 or 50 cents below the world price. If one adds 40 or 50 cents to $1.55 he finds that it brings the price up to $1.95 or $2.05. Yet the leader of the opposition advocates $1.80, which is still below the world price, and is therefore still a stupid policy.

Mr. FRASER: That is only your say so.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Well, I am reading it from *Hansard*. Even though the farmer is interested in the ceiling price or the highest price that he can get for his wheat—and that is undeniable—I believe that through bitter experience he has learned that it is far more important for him to know the lowest guaranteed price he may expect to get. He has seen times when wheat jumped up to $2 a bushel, and other times when it has fallen to 20 cents. So that the farmer wants to know, first, the guaranteed price the government is willing to give for the next four or five or more years.

I believe, if we want to get greater grain production, we might use a simple formula, namely that of letting the present ceiling price become the floor price. Under those conditions the farmers will produce grain for the next four or five years—that is, if they are sure that they are not going to produce at a low price.

It is far more important to have a guaranteed price of $1.55 as a floor than to let the wheat price go up to $1.80 or $2, and put the farmer back into a speculative market, and take a chance on it again.

Another obstacle that can be removed from production is the matter of gasoline prices. Early in this session I took occasion to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) whether he would reconsider the order which has been made permitting an increase of two cents a gallon on the price of gasoline. His answer was that the matter has been given consideration, and that he was not prepared to make any further promise.

I know the farmers are dissatisfied with that price increase. I do not think I can find better words to emphasize that dissatisfaction than to read a letter, a copy of which was signed by over a hundred farmers in my constituency, and sent to me. This is addressed to the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, and says:

> Sir:
>
> As a farmer trying to help feed a hungry world I wish to vigorously protest against the proposed advance in the price of gasoline, as it is another brake on the wheels of industry and a deterrent to agricultural production. If we are to avoid the hazards of inflation it seems to me that the government should be the last to countenanace the proposed advance of the oil corporations who have made huge profits all through the war years, and are well able to stand on their own feet in the transition to normal times.
>
> The farmer of western Canada has been asked to bolster international good will by selling his wheat greatly below world prices. Bacon and other products over a bargain counter.
>
> The Canadian consumer is getting his flour greatly below world wheat value and the eastern feeder of live stock is being subsidized at the western farmer's expense.

If I have anything left over in a good year the income tax agent is on hand to attach the money that I have been trying for years to get to improve my humble home and surroundings, the remodeling of which is long past due. Now the government wants me to help out the poor oil baron. This is about the last straw. Have the legislators forgotten the recent kick in the pants they received when they tried to raise the tariff on certain steel products. The western farmer has not.

The sit-down strike is in progress and will soon reach disastrous proportions if something is not done and done quickly.

The Minister of Finance did not lay before the house an accounting of why it is necessary to permit oil companies to raise their prices. He did mention a subsidy, and made it appear as if the western provinces were the only ones receiving subsidies. As a matter of fact, in the last year the government spent over $103 million in subsidies; and I state, therefore, that $3,500,000 to western farmers does not loom up quite so large in comparison.

I wish to mention another obstacle which should be removed in connection with implements for war veterans. There is a certain class of war veteran who is not able to obtain the farm implements which he needs because he cannot take advantage of the provisions of the land act. I refer to the veteran who, instead of buying land under the act, has bought it with his own money or has had land given to him, perhaps by his father. Under the act he is not eligible for a grant with which to buy farm equipment and therefore is under a handicap. I hope this situation will be remedied.

I should like to point out to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) that the Prairie Farm Assistance Act does not operate to the advantage of all farmers. I mentioned last year the matter I have in mind and hoped there would be some change made, but apparently nothing has yet been done. I have a letter which I received to-day from the deputy minister of agriculture in connection with an area in my constituency which was damaged by hail. One sentence in that letter reads:

Township 29-20-W1, R.M. of Mossey river, was found by the board of review to have an average wheat yield of 8·3 bushels per acre; therefore, the board of review declared the township ineligible.

There have been many areas damaged by hail where the wheat crop averaged over eight bushels per acre, and therefore the particular township would not be eligible for prairie farm assistance. I would point out to the minister that it is almost impossible to find an area damaged by hail where there will be a large, wide belt of damage. This act may be suitable for relieving drought conditions, but it certainly does not work in the case of hail damage. I believe some provision should be made to provide for relief on an individual basis, say from section to section rather than from township to township. Then the individual farmer whose crops had been damaged by hail would not have to depend upon his neighbour's crops being damaged in order to obtain assistance from the government. It would almost appear that if there had been a little more hail in this particular township the farmers would have been better off, because then the average yield would have been .3 bushels per acre less and they would have then been eligible for prairie farm assistance.

I should like to touch briefly upon the matter of industrial production. This subject has been covered by other hon. members, but I wish to say that the government is going to have to do some tall explaining to the people of this country. At the present time there are over a quarter of a million unemployed. There is also a great shortage of consumer goods; houses are needed at a time when materials for building those houses exist in Canada. I would not be saying this if I did not feel that the government had promised the people of this country full employment. As was pointed out the other day by an hon. member, before the election took place we saw large signs nailed up on fences and telephone posts saying, "Jobs for all" in letters about six feet high.

I refrained from saying anything about this during the last session because I felt the government should be given a breathing spell after the war in order to readjust industry and put things in order. But in my opinion they have had sufficient time to get the wheels of industry turning. If they are not able to provide full employment when there is such a shortage of goods of all kinds, when there is such a need all over the world for the products that we can produce, what prospect is there for full employment, let us say five years from now?

I feel a little apprehensive about the whole matter because I am afraid we are back on that downhill run that we took in 1930. Unless the government can figure out some way to make private industry provide jobs for all, then I think the only alternative is to plan for full employment and full production under public enterprise as was done during the war.

In conclusion, I wish to touch upon a question that was brought up in this house during last session and again at this session. I hope this is not a controversial matter because it does not enter into party politics. I refer to the displaced persons and refugees in

Europe. As a member nation of UNO we have a responsibility to discharge. As a member of the British commonwealth of nations we have a tradition to live up to. The responsibility that we have as a member nation of the united nations is clearly set out in the charter of the united nations. I intend to quote directly from that charter in order that I may have for the plea I intend to make a basis that is authentic. One of the objectives set out in the preamble is:

> To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small.

I agree heartily with that. Then in article 1, section 2, these words appear:

> To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

Again I am glad to agree with that. Then in section 3 of the same article there are these words:

> To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character.

These quotations appear in the charter of the united nations which has been endorsed by this house and which has received, I believe, the whole-hearted support of every hon. member. It is upon these three quotations that I wish to base my plea. I do not intend to go over this question of displaced persons and refugees because it has been fully explained in this house. I only want to point out that there are a great many of these unfortunate people in Europe who have to turn to someone for moral and material assistance. I do not know to whom they can better turn than to a member of the united nations. I do not think we will back up on the position we took when we endorsed the united nations charter, when we undertook to extend democratic and human rights, the rights of freedom and liberty to all the peoples of the earth.

While UNRRA is doing a splendid job in Europe, it has certain limitations as far as displaced persons and refugees are concerned. The provisions governing UNRRA state plainly that it is to deal with constituted nations. That is, the organization is set up in such a way that all nations contribute what they can, and then those who need assistance receive that assistance through the regular channels of their governments. But we must realize that there are perhaps several million people in Europe to-day who cannot truthfully say that they have a nation, who because of their political or religious beliefs or for some other reason find themselves not only homeless but nationless. UNRRA is limited in what it can do for those people. It is true that the Red Cross has come in to fill the gap and has done a wonderful job, a job which will be remembered for generations to come, but that organization also has its limitations; it cannot do all that it would like to do.

As I said, we have a responsibility as a member nation of the united nations. We also have a tradition to uphold as a member of the British commonwealth of nations. The tradition that has been built up in the British commonwealth of nations, especially in Great Britain, the mother of the commonwealth, is one which will go down in history, not only for generations but for centuries to come. One of the reasons for the greatness of Great Britain and the British commonwealth of nations has been and remains that spirit of tolerance, that insistence on the other fellow's rights as well as your own, and a readiness to help out people who have become political or religious refugees. I think, if we accept the premise that all peoples on this earth have a right to believe as they please, to think what they like and say what they like, then we cannot but agree that the greatness of a nation is measured by the degree of tolerance and the degree of freedom and the lack of discrimination that it shows among all its peoples. I believe that Great Britain occupies the place in world history and in the minds of the peoples of the world that she does to-day chiefly because of this one quality, which has been her greatest quality, the spirit of tolerance and the spirit of freedom which it has been willing to extend to all people. As a member of the British commonwealth of nations, Canada, I believe, can take a lead in this matter.

I have said once before, and I repeat, that we should take our share of refugees into this country if we can possibly do so. I wish to make it very clear, as I have on other occasions, that I am not at all interested and have no wish to drag into this discussion any political implications. If we are going to help the people of Europe in a moral or material way I believe that we shall help them best by allowing them to settle their own political differences among themselves, because by the very nature of things we are too far removed to understand all the intricacies of their political differences. So that I say I am not looking at this question at all from a political angle but purely from a humanitarian point of view as one who voted for the adoption of the united nations charter.

I believe that we can help by accepting into this country our share of refugees. I know there is a hesitancy on the part of the government to do this, perhaps for two reasons. There is the fear that it may have political repercussions because all types of opinions have been expressed on this matter, and there is also hesitancy because of the unemployment situation in this country. I have letters on file from the immigration department in which they express doubt whether it would be good policy to bring in people when our own employment situation is not of the best.

But I wish to make a concrete proposal to the government, in which I believe there will be no political implications and which will involve no danger of putting anyone in this country out of a job. The suggestion is not original with me; it was made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mrs. Strum). It is this, that we bring to this country, let us say to start with, 10,000 children of displaced persons and refugees, who from the very nature of things are the most innocent and most unfortunate victims of the war and its aftermath. Let people in this country who are willing and in a position to do so, take these children into their homes and bring them up as young Canadians. Let them stay here at least for a while. There may be some who after staying here for a number of years may apply for permission to remain permanently, and I have no doubt that will be true of the great majority. There may be others who, for personal reasons, or sentimental attachments, may wish, after staying here for a number of years, to go back to Europe. Both of these groups will be of great help to this country. Those who stay here will have been brought up in the spirit of Canadianism, and will have grown up under our laws and will be perhaps the most grateful type of Canadian that we can have, because they will realize that we have come to their help when they needed it most. Those who go back would also be a great help to us, because they will be ambassadors of good will of the very best type. Can one imagine any better people to go back to Europe, perhaps to those dark spots where the light of freedom and democracy has not yet penetrated, than young people who have grown up in this country and learned something of the ways of tolerance and freedom in a democracy and of the things we hold dear in this country? Back in Europe they can preach the gospel of friendship to Canada. I cannot imagine any better kind of advertising or any better ambassadors of good will that we could have. It would be far better than sending out Canadians who have grown up into adult life in this country, not knowing European ways and not being able to compare or contrast conditions in the two countries. Therefore I make the suggestion that we allow near relatives or close friends in this country, who are in a financial position to do so, to bring in children of displaced persons or refugees and give them a home and an education and a Canadian upbringing, something that will be for the benefit both of this country and the continent of Europe.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say just a word. I do not intend to continue the discussion that has taken place in this debate. I have not spoken on the motion and am therefore entitled to speak at this time. All I wish to say, however, is a word to hon. members concerning the motion that is now before the house; a word in relation thereto which has an immediate bearing on the evolution of our parliamentary practice.

The motion that is now before the house is:

> That the following address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada: May it please Your Excellency:
>
> We His Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both houses of parliament.

Hon. members will see that the motion is simply a word of thanks to His Excellency for the speech which His Excellency addressed to both houses in opening the present session of parliament, nothing more and nothing less. It is identical in style and words with the address which over many years has been employed at Westminster.

I do not know what hon. gentlemen opposite are laughing at; I am simply stating something that is wholly obvious. Amendments have been presented to this address on three occasions in the course of the debate, each expressing a certain want of confidence in the government. All three have been rejected. The house has discussed those amendments to the address and all of them have been rejected. There remains now only the motion which is a word of thanks to the governor general for his courtesy in presenting the house with a speech which would enable it to open its proceedings—a word of thanks for that particular courtesy expressed in the form of an address, this being the appropriate manner in which to approach the sovereign or his representative.

The custom in the British house has been to adopt the address without any division. The earlier practice was to adopt the address

without any previous amendment, being moved. The custom of adopting the address without amendment has altered of recent years and amendments have from time to time been presented. But the parliamentary practice, generally, has been to adopt the address, without any division for both houses to adopt it unanimously.

I wish to quote to the house certain authorities in support of the statement I have just made. I have here "On Parliamentary Government in England," by Alpheus Todd, volume II, second edition. At page 363 hon. members will find the following:

> It has now become a well-established rule, to regard the speech from the throne. and the address in reply thereto, as reciprocal acts of courtesy between the crown and the houses of parliament, and the address itself as the unanimous and respectful expression of the deference with which the house should receive the first communication of the session from the sovereign, and as pledging the house to nothing, save the serious consideration of the matters referred to therein.

I quote from page 364:

> Accordingly, it has gradually become the practice to refrain from moving an amendment to the address in answer to the royal speech, "unless some great political objects were in view, and likely to be attained"; or, unless some assertion were made in the address to which the opposition found it impossible to assent.

That has reference to the amendment to the address. But, as I have just said, the old custom of not even having an amendment to the address moved has altered in the course of the years and amendments have from time to time been brought forward. Once one or more amendments have been brought forward and rejected, the house comes to have only the original motion before it, which motion is in the nature of a reciprocal courtesy, a word of thanks to the representative of the King—that is to say, in this country—or in Great Britain to the King himself.

I refer now to Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, third edition, at page 191:

> It is felt that the questions mentioned in the speech can be more conveniently discussed when the house is in full possession of all the information necessary to the consideration of any important subject. Sometimes, however, the house may be called upon to express its opinions at length, and to vote on an amendment to the address, which involves the fate of the government of the day. But under ordinary circumstances the desire is to pass the address with as little delay as possible, and to confine the debate to a general review of the policy of the government, without taking up those specific subjects on which the necessary information is not yet before the house. It is felt desirable, whenever practicable, to allow the address to pass without a division and "be in point of fact the unanimous and respectful expression of the deference with which the houses receive the first communication of the session" from the sovereign or her representativve.

I come now to a much more recent authority, namely, Campion, well recognized authority in the United Kingdom. The volume from which I am about to quote is entitled, "An Introduction to the Procedure of the House of Commons." I must first quote from page vii of the preface:

> This book was projected merely as a manual of first-aid for new members, but with the friendly connivance and encouragement of my publisher its scope has been considerably enlarged. It now aims at presenting a complete account of the procedure of the House of Commons, on a scale midway between the official Manual of Procedure and May's Parliamentary Practice, with fuller explanations and illustrations than the former and in a shorter and more readily accessible shape than the latter.

On page 83 of this volume will be found a section which deals with the King's speech, "Debate upon the Address in answer to the King's Speech." I should like to quote from that paragraph:

> The address in answer to the king's speech is moved and seconded by two members selected by the Prime Minister, one a representative of a borough,—

That is in England, of course.

> —the other of a county, constituency . . .
> Formerly the address was framed to follow the king's speech paragraph by paragraph, but it is now moved in the form of a short expression of thanks. The debate, which follows, normally falls into two parts: (1) a general debate upon the policy of the government as outlined in the speech, and (2) debate on the amendments moved by the opposition, advocating alternative policies, usually expressed in the form of regret for the omission from the speech of the policies advocated. Some five days are by agreement usually devoted to this debate. At its conclusion the address is voted and ordered to be presented to His Majesty "by such members of the house as are of His Majesty's privy council, or of His Majesty's household."

I have looked through several other authorities and cannot find any which take issue with the statement that it is correct parliamentary practice for the house to approve unanimously the motion to thank the sovereign or his representative for having at the beginning of a session come to meet the members of the two houses, to open their proceedings by a speech from the throne.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask the Prime Minister a question? Does he then regard the passage of the address, without division, as an expression of confidence in the government?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Most certainly not.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is the whole point.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I wish to make that clear. Nor does the passage of the address without division commit any member to anything expressed in the address. An amendment affords an opportunity to take exception to what appears or does not appear in the speech from the throne and to the government's policy, but when amendments which have been proposed are rejected and there is nothing left but the simple expression of thanks to His Majesty or His Majesty's representative for having come to parliament and opened its proceedings, it certainly places the Commons in an anomalous position vis-a-vis the crown to refuse to thank His Majesty or His Majesty's representative for that act of courtesy.

Mr. COLDWELL: I believe the general impression here is that voting approval of the address is voting confidence in the government and its policies. That is the general impression in the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was my reason for intervening in the debate at this stage. As leader of the house I have a responsibility to the house in matters of this kind and for that reason I speak at the present time. I should regret to see in this parliament, in the evolution of our parliamentary practice, any course that would depart, either in the letter or in the spirit, from what is obviously the right course of procedure to be followed in relations between members of the House of Commons and the sovereign or his representative. Consequently, I have brought this matter to the attention of the house tonight. Probably I must hold myself in part responsible for what has happened where there has been a departure from this practice. Between 1935 and 1940 there were no divisions on the motion in reply to the speech from the throne, the address each year was carried unanimously. Between 1940 and 1945 there were divisions. The record discloses that the house divided on the motion, or rather, that the motion was passed "on division". I believe that arose because a certain number of members on those occasions rose in their places or called "on division", and the Speaker was obliged to record a division. I am perfectly sure that the hon. members, in so doing, did not realize that what in fact they were doing was to request that the representative of the crown be not thanked for having come to open formally the proceedings of parliament.

So far as the British house is concerned, I have looked through the records of the last ten years, and I find that while there have been amendments to this address, which were debated and rejected, no division has been recorded on the motion to thank the crown. There have been some occasions, both in England and also in earlier years in this parliament, on which there have been divisions, but that has been for some exceptional reason.

It is for hon. members to take whatever course they wish. I do not desire to limit the house in the course it may wish to take on the motion now to be put by His Honour the Speaker, but I believe that the correct practice is that, now all amendments have been rejected and disposed of, the house should unanimously agree to thank His Excellency for the speech which he addressed to both houses in opening the present session. May I make it clear that, this being done, it will be understood, and must be understood, that the house is not thereby giving any vote of confidence in the government. The confidence which the government enjoys has been shown on the three motions in the nature of amendments that have already been before the house, debated, and rejected.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, yes. So far as this motion is concerned, however, it is an act of courtesy in relation entirely to the sovereign or rather to his representative in Canada, and not an expression one way or the other of the confidence which hon. members may or may not have in the government.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): The right hon. gentleman has studied the question. Perhaps he will tell the chamber what was the practice and what actually happened during the time he had the honour of leading the opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When I had the honour of leading the opposition between 1931 and 1935 some members did, I recall, rise on one occasion and there was a recorded division. I have already said that I am prepared to share responsibility for an error in procedure that has developed in that way. But now that I see the correct procedure as clearly as I do, I feel it my duty to bring it to the attention of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. GRAYDON: On division.

Main motion (Mr. Viau) agreed to on division.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The first business after the address has been agreed to is for this house to order that the address be engrossed and

presented to His Excellency the Governor General. This additional formal courtesy helps to bear out what I have been saying. I therefore move:

That the address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of the house as are of the honourable the privy council.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Standing order 57 reads as follows:

The house will appoint the committees of supply and ways and means at the commencement of every session, so soon as an address has been agreed to, in answer to His Excellency's speech.

The committee of supply controls the public expenditure by considering the grants of money that will be required by the government for the services of the year, upon the estimates of expenditure presented by the ministers of the crown.

The committee of ways and means provides the public income raised by the imposition of taxation, and votes the resolutions which authorize the issue out of the consolidated fund of the sums required to meet the grants voted by the committee of supply.

In accordance with standing order 57 I move:

That this house will on Friday next resolve itself into a committee to consider of a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That this house will on Friday next resolve itself into a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

MAIN ESTIMATES, 1946-47

A message from His Excellency the Administrator transmitting estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1947, was presented by Right Hon. J. L. Ilsley (Minister of Finance), and read by Mr. Speaker to the house.

Mr. ILSLEY moved:

That the message of His Excellency the Administrator, together with the estimates presented this day, be referred to the committee of supply.

Mr. GRAYDON: Are all the proposed expenditures in one estimate this time?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. ILSLEY: They are divided into two parts, but they are in the one book.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1946

A message from His Excellency the Administrator transmitting supplementary estimates for the year ending March 31, 1946, was presented by Right Hon. J. L. Ilsley (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

Mr. GRAYDON: Before we proceed with this matter may I ask the Minister of Finance whether the supplementary estimates will be available to the members?

Mr. ILSLEY: They are available now.

Mr. GRAYDON: If we are to deal with them to-morrow we should be in possession of them so that we can peruse them as we so desire.

Mr. ILSLEY: They will be available right away.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WAR MEASURES ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. Has the War Measures Act been amended in whole or in part by order in council since September 5, 1939?

2. If so, when, in what orders in council and in what particulars?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

INOME TAX—FARMERS—INSPECTORS

Mr. THATCHER:

How many government income tax inspectors have been operating in each province since January 1, 1946, checking farmers' income tax returns?

Mr. McCANN: There are 19 income tax inspectors operating in Canada, in charge of as many districts. Their assessing staff may be checking farmers' returns for the part of the day, week, month or year, or longer period, and also during the same periods may be checking returns of individuals engaged in various kinds of activities. Actually, any firm information on the question is not available.

AIR TRAINING PLAN

Mr. POWER:

With reference to article 7, of the financial agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the United Kingdom to be submitted to the parliament of Canada for ratification,—

1. What was the total cost in money of the British commonwealth air training plan, from its inception on December 17, 1939, to its termination on March 31, 1945?

2. If, as and when article 7, above-mentioned, has been approved, what will have been the contribution in money to the total cost made by each of the partners to the agreement (a) United Kingdom; (b) Australia; (c) New Zealand; (d) Canada?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. $1,757,367,389.86.

2. (a) $54,206,318.22; (b) $92,766,680.00, less $27,585,611.77 mutual aid, $65,181,068.23; (c) $48,440,280.55, less $414,887.08 mutual aid, $48,025,393.47; (d) $1,589,954,609.94.

Note: In addition to the amount shown in (a) above, the United Kingdom contributed aircraft and equipment as follows:

Plan I—	
Equipment furnished directly	$ 87,365,032 22
Equipment furnished indirectly through lend-lease account	3,000,000 00
Total	$ 90,365,032 22
Plan II—	
Equipment furnished directly	$ 74,895,755 67
Equipment furnished indirectly through lend-lease account	243,030,799 72
Aero-gas and oil furnished indirectly through lend-lease account	37,469,562 94
Total	$355,396,118 33

Mr. POWER:

With reference to article 7, of the financial agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the United Kingdom to be submitted to the parliament of Canada for ratification,—

1. At the beginning of negotiations was the amount claimed by the government of Canada as owed by the government of the United Kingdom with respect to the British commonwealth air training plan greater than the $425,000,000 which it is now agreed to cancel? If so, what was the claim submitted to the conference by the government of Canada?

2. What were the counter-claims, if any, of the government of the United Kingdom which brought about the reduction to $425,000,000?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. None.

2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. POULIOT:

With reference to the British commonwealth air training plan—1. Did Australia and New Zealand become partners to that plan, and, if so, when?

2. Were all members of parliament notified about it before November 23, 1944?

3. If so, when, where, and by whom?

4. If not, why?

5. Were any trainees from Australia and New Zealand killed or lost on their way to Canada to follow the B.C.A. training, and, if so, when, and who were they?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. (a) Yes; (b) December 17, 1939.

2. Yes.

3. (a) May 20, 1940; (b) House of Commons, Ottawa; (c) Prime Minister of Canada (House of Commons Debates No. 3, Monday, May 20, 1940).

4. N.A.

5. There is no record in this department, the office of the Australian high commissioner or the office of the New Zealand high commissioner of any trainees from Australia and New Zealand killed or lost on their way to Canada to follow the B.C.A.T.P. For further confirmation or otherwise the matter would have to be referred to the air force records office in the respective countries.

BUTTER STORAGE AND SUPPLY, MONTREAL AREA

Mr. LACOMBE:

1. What was the quantity of butter in storage in Montreal on March 1, 1946?

2. What is the quantity of butter now in storage in the city and district of Montreal?

3. What steps have been taken by the government to assure an adequate supply of butter to the above-mentioned area?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. 2,632,693 lbs.

2. 1,407,616 lbs. (March 15) Montreal city only; figures for Montreal district not available.

3. Reserve stocks of butter in Montreal during the first half of March were relatively higher than in any other large Canadian city. The Wartime Prices and Trade Board are endeavouring to see that the butter supply is equitably distributed throughout Canada.

CANADIAN TROOPS IN JAMAICA

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. How many Canadian troops are in Jamaica?

2. Were they at or near Kingston, Jamaica, on or about February 20, 1946?

3. Were they held in readiness to intervene in the public utility workers' strike on or about the above date?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. One officer and one other rank.

2. Yes.

3. On 19th February, a wire was received from the officer commanding the Brockville Rifles stating that one company had been ordered to "stand to" as a mobile reserve and

that certain technical personnel had been ordered to "stand to" to operate water works and sewage disposal.

On 20th February, special instructions were wired to the officer commanding the Brockville Rifles that Canadian troops could only be used to protect life and property but that there was no objection to assisting in the technical maintenance of public utilities.

In accordance with garrison orders, one rifle company with three carriers was held in readiness as a mobile reserve to aid in the prevention of loss of life and destruction of property and 30 driver mechanics were standing by as operators of public utilities if so required.

Neither of these detachments was used but on 25th February, 1946, one platoon (unarmed) took over third line fire fighting duties at the central fire station to help relieve volunteer firemen who had been on duty for 10 days.

LOANS AND GIFTS TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. THATCHER:

1. What is the total dollar value of the loans which Canada has made to Great Britain since September, 1939?

2. What is the total dollar value of the outright gifts which Canada has given to Britain since September, 1939?

3. What is the total of (a) loans, (b) gifts, made by Canada to other nations since September, 1939?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. $700,000,000 under the War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act, 1942, which had been reduced by repayments to $561,279,709.22 on the date the question was asked and which has been further reduced to $538,564,403.57 by a subsequent payment.

2. $1,000,000,000 under the War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act, 1942.

$2,043,100,000 under War Appropriation (Mutual Aid) Acts according to the accounts as of February 28, 1946.

3. (a) Loans under the Export Credits Insurance Act

	Authorized	Advanced	Balance outstanding March 15, 1946
Belgium	$ 25,000,000	$25,000,000	$25,000,000
China	60,000,000	....	....
Czechoslovakia	19,000,000	3,191,551	3,191,551
Netherlands	125,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Netherlands Indies	15,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Norway	13,000,000	8,995,000	8,995,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	3,000,000	2,775,500	2,775,500
Special loan for purchase of wheat, 1943 and 1944			
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	10,000,000	10,000,000	7,500,000

Temporary advances under Section 3 of War Appropriation acts	Balance outstanding February 28, 1946
Australia	$ 8,091,076 00
Belgium	5,745,472 00
Czechoslovakia	912 04
France	67,425,559 00
Greece	189 00
India	48,522,130 03
Netherlands	12,517,232 39
Newfoundland	6,908 30
New Zealand	201,640 00
Norway	14,046 00
Poland	8,227 36
Portugal	255 00
Union of South Africa	4 00
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	9,161,871 16
United States	3,231,397 40

3. (b) Under War Appropriation (Mutual Aid) Acts (according to the accounts of February 28, 1946)

Australia	$ 91,000,000 00
China	26,000,000 00
India	13,400,000 00
France	24,200,000 00
British West Indies	5,500,000 00
New Zealand	14,700,000 00
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	160,100,000 00
Under War Appropriation Acts	
Gift of wheat to Greece	12,633,331 00

Advances to the United Kingdom under Section 3 of the War Appropriation Acts were included in the claims of Canada against the United Kingdom which were offset by claims of the United Kingdom against Canada

and the balance of which is to be settled by the payment of $150,000,000 by the United Kingdom to Canada under agreement signed March 6, 1946.

The indebtedness of the United Kingdom to Canada under the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan agreements, the disposition of which is covered by article 7 of the financial agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom, was carried in the accounts of Canada as an advance under section 3 of the War Appropriation Acts.

CANADIAN GOODS SUPPLIED TO INDIA STATE RAILWAYS

Mr. POWER:

With reference to the agreement on settlement of war claims between the government of the Dominion of Canada and the government of the United Kingdom to be submitted to the parliament of Canada for ratification,—

1. What is the amount involved under article 3 F, of the said proposed agreement?

2. By what financial process does a debt due to the government of Canada for goods manufactured in Canada and supplied to the India State railways become a potential claim of the United Kingdom against the government of India?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. $48,772,566.27—less any reduction that may result from the renegotiation of the contracts concerned.

2. By the United Kingdom government making payment in full on behalf of the government of India with the agreement of the government of India.

HOUSING—QUEENSWAY SURVEY, EAST OF BURLINGTON

Mr. FRASER:

1. How many types of construction and what kind of houses are being built at the Queensway survey, east of Burlington, under the Veterans' Land Act?

2. What is the cost of construction for each type of house?

3. What is the actual cost to a veteran of each type of house, including water and sewers?

4. What terms are given the veteran?

5. What is the complete cost per unit to the government?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. All these houses are of frame construction. There are eight different floor plans, three of which are single storey bungalows and five, storey and a half. The houses are of permanent construction, each having full concrete basement, rock wool insulation, hot air heating and fully modern plumbing.

2. Final figures will not be available until the whole project is completed. Construction is being carried out on a cost plus fixed fee of $225 per house. Ninety-three homes are being erected, of which only forty-eight are close to completion. Several months will elapse before the balance are completed. On the basis of those which are close to completion it is estimated that costs of construction will be as follows:

House	Water and sewage	Land	Total
Bungalows—			
$ 5,648	$ 334	$ 531	$ 6,513
5,187	334	531	6,052
4,956	334	531	5,821
Storey and a half—			
6,067	334	531	6,932
6,018	334	531	6,883
5,829	334	531	6,694
5,698	334	531	6,563
5,991	334	531	6,856

3. The terms of sale to a veteran are set by the formula contained in Section 9, the Veterans' Land Act, which, applied to the estimated costs set out in answer to question 2 above, would be a down payment of 10 per cent of the cost up to $6,000, plus cost in excess of $6,000, and a contract for two-thirds of the cost up to $6,000.

4. Up to twenty-five years with interest at 3½ per cent on the amortization plan.

5. Answered by No. 2 above.

VETERANS LAND ACT—REGINA DISTRICT

Mr. McKAY:

1. What is the number of applications made by the veterans of this war for settlement under the Veterans Land Act in the Regina regional district for (a) small holdings; (b) farm lands?

2. How many of these applications have been (a) rejected; (b) approved?

3. Of the applications approved, how many cases have been actually settled on (a) small holdings; (b) farm lands as of December 31, 1945?

4. Have any applications been approved from areas in southern Saskatchewan known as submarginal?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. Statistical records do not divide applications for qualification into types of establishment proposed by veterans. Total number of applications for qualification up to February 28, 1946, for Regina region: 2,374.

2. (a) Small holdings, None; full time farming, 145. (b) Small holdings, 106; full time farming, 773; Provincial land settlement, 142.

3. Number of applications for financial assistance approved at December 31, 1945; (a) 16; (b) 93.

4. Applications covering the purchase of lands in the drought area of southern Saskatchewan have been approved where veterans have farmed in particular district and know the hazards.

PRINCE RUPERT DRY DOCK

Mr. ARCHIBALD:

What steps have been taken by the government to make use of the Prince Rupert dry dock?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

The Prince Rupert dry dock is owned and operated by the Canadian National Railways. During the war it was used in connection with war-time ship construction. It has now reverted to its original purpose as a facility for the maintenance and repair of vessels.

ROAD BETWEEN ATLIN AND ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. ARCHIBALD:

What has been done by the Dominion government to further the completion of the highway between Atlin and Alaska highway?

Mr. GLEN:

Part of this proposed highway is in the province of British Columbia and part is in the Yukon territory. Reconnaissance of the area through which this highway would pass has been made by engineers of the Department of Mines and Resources and there has been an exchange of correspondence between the Department of Mines and Resources and the province of British Columbia in regard to its construction. It is the intention to have a location survey made of the proposed road as soon as possible.

CANADIAN DECLARATION OF WAR—PRESENT RELATIONS WITH FORMER ENEMY COUNTRIES

Mr. POULIOT:

1. Did Canada declare war on countries other than Germany, Italy and Japan? If so, when and why?

2. How many troops did Canada send to each of such other countries, and on what dates?

3. Since the declarations of war of Canada on such other countries, did Canada renew her (a) political; (b) economic; (c) cultural relations with each of those countries? If so (a) when; (b) how; (c) why?

4. What are our present (a) political; (b) economic; (c) cultural relations with each of those countries?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Yes, against Finland, Hungary and Roumania on December 7, 1941, because these countries had declared war on our allies and were actively supporting our enemies.

2. None.

3. No.

4. Relations with those countries are governed by the provisions of the respective terms of surrender.

RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

Mr. POULIOT:

1. During the last thirty years, how many times did Canada break and renew her (a) political; (b) economic; (c) cultural relations with Russia?

2. In each case, on what dates was each class of the above-mentioned relations of Canada with Russia (a) broken; (b) renewed, and (1) when; (2) why; (3) how?

3. Has Canada ever renewed, either directly or indirectly, her economic relations with Russia before renewing her political relations with that country?

4. If so, when and how?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. (a) Canada granted de facto recognition to the U.S.S.R. on July 3, 1922, by adhering to the Anglo-Russian Trade Agreement of 1921. De jure recognition was extended on March 24, 1924. The Russian trade delegation established in Canada early in 1924 remained until May 28, 1927, when the Soviet official agent advised the Canadian government that he had been recalled to the U.S.S.R. Soviet representation in Canada was not resumed until October 21, 1942, when, following an agreement between Canada and the U.S.S.R. to exchange diplomatic representation, the first minister of the U.S.S.R. to Canada presented his letters of credence at Ottawa.

(b) On May 30, 1927, immediately after the departure of the Soviet trade delegation in Canada, the Canadian government advised the Soviet authorities that while it regarded the notes exchanged in 1922 as no longer having effect, it was prepared to provide for the continuance of ordinary trade facilities between Canada and the U.S.S.R. In 1931, by P.C. 463 of February 27, importation into Canada from the U.S.S.R. of certain enumerated commodities was prohibited. This was followed on April 18 by a Soviet order of embargo against all Canadian products. In the summer of 1936 the Canadian government made arrangements for a visit to the U.S.S.R. by the Minster of Trade and Commerce; as a result of his conversations with Soviet officials, arrangements were made to reopen trade facilities between the two countries and on September 10, 1936, P.C. 463 of February 27, 1931, was revoked by P.C. 2354; the Soviet embargo on Canadian goods was lifted at the same time.

(c) No official information.

2. Answered by 1.

3. Answered by 1.

4. Answered by 1.

RELATIONS WITH ITALY

Mr. POULIOT:

When, how and why were the political relations of Canada with Italy resumed since Canada declared war on that country?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

On January 22, 1946, in announcing the early arrival of an Italian representative in Ottawa, I recalled that on September 27, 1944, the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom had stated that direct relations between their countries and Italy would be resumed. Following this announcement Italian representatives were received in London, Washington, Moscow and other united nations capitals; Canada also agreed to receive a representative of the Italian government in Ottawa, with the personal rank of consul-general. Canada has no diplomatic representative in Italy.

REGISTRATION OF WOMEN

Mr. POULIOT:

1. What was the cost of the registration of women?
2. On what date did it take place and for what reason?
3. What was the age of the said women?
4. How many of them registered in each province?
5. On what date was it decided to discontinue such registration and for what reason?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Casual staff (40 cents per hour to work in connection with registration)	$42,520 51
Fees paid to postmasters (Each postmaster was paid 10 cents per person registered. Where no local office existed registrants registered at post offices. This figure includes postage)	10,847 93
A special form used for this registration	1,466 91
Total cost	$54,835 35

Note: This does not include salaries of regular staff in the employment office.

2. The registration took place from September 14 to September 19, 1942, for the purpose of establishing an inventory of womanpower.

3. The age group 20 to 24 inclusive.

4. Maritimes, 30,014; Quebec, 59,040; Ontario, 77,385; Prairie, 73,786; Pacific, 18,358; total, 285,583.

Note: The figures were compiled by regions, not provinces.

5. This was designed as a "spot" registration only. It was not planned on a current basis nor was any subsequent one or any in other age groups necessary.

RELATIONS WITH GERMANY AND JAPAN

Mr. POULIOT:

What are, at present the political relations of Canada with (a) Germany, and (b) Japan?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. (a) Canada is in a state of war with Germany and therefore any relations Canada has with Germany are governed by the terms of surrender. Germany is for the purposes of occupation under the control of the Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States, the U.S.S.R. and France. Occupational control is vested in the allied control commission in Berlin. At the invitation of the allied control commission, Canada has established a Canadian Military Mission in Germany under Lieutenant-General Maurice Pope, as this house was informed by the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs on Wednesday, October 24, 1945.

(b) Canada is in a state of war with Japan and therefore any relations Canada has with Japan are governed by the terms of surrender. While Canada has no diplomatic representative in Tokyo, Mr. L. B. Pearson, the Canadian ambassador to the United States, is Canadian representative on the far eastern commission, which has its seat in Washington.

RELATIONS WITH FRANCE

Mr. POULIOT:

1. What have been the (a) political; (b) economic; (c) cultural relations of Canada with France since 1939?
2. Have they been (a) broken; (b) renewed?
3. If so (a) when; (b) why; (c) how?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. (a) On November 9, 1942, Canada ceased to recognize a *de jure* government of France and diplomatic relations were accordingly terminated. The French committee of national liberation was recognized by the Canadian government on August 27, 1943, and Major-General G. P. Vanier was appointed Canadian representative in Algiers. Following joint recognition of the French administration on October 23, 1944, by the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Canada, General Vanier was accredited as Canadian ambassador to the provisional government of France.

(b) The application of commercial agreements between Canada and France was of course suspended during the enemy occupation of that country.

(c) No official information.

2. Answered by 1.

3. Answered by 1.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. MERRITT:

1. How many applications for admission to Canada as immigrants have been received by the Department of Mines and Resources since the termination of hostilities in Europe and up to the 1st March, 1946, classifying them by nationalities?

2. How many persons have been admitted to Canada as immigrants during the said period, classifying them by nationalities?

3. How many persons have been refused admission on application, other than for cause in the particular case, during the said period?

4. (a) In the case of those mentioned in question 3, was any indication given them, that at some future date their applications would be reconsidered? (b) If so, what was the nature of such indication?

Mr. GLEN:

1. Information not available. No statistical record is kept of applications filed for the admission of immigrants.

2. 14,367 immigrants were admitted to Canada from June 1, 1945, to January 31, 1946. Their classification by nationality is as follows: Belgian, 10; British, 8,552; Cuban, 1; Czecho-Slovakian, 46; Danish, 10; Esthonian, 5; Finnish, 2; French, 22; German, 753; Greek, 8; Hungarian, 28; Icelandic, 6; Italian, 12; Jugo-Slavian, 13; Latvian, 1; Mexican, 18; Netherlands, 12; Norwegian, 67; Polish, 557; Portuguese, 1; Roumanian, 12; Russian, 6; South American, 1; Spanish, 4; Swedish, 4; Swiss, 8; Turkish, 2; U.S. Citizen, 4,206.

The majority of immigrants recorded above as of continental European nationalities were refugees granted entry to Canada as non-immigrants during the war and subsequently given permanent status. The figures for February, 1946, are not yet available.

3. Answered by number 1.

4. Only in cases where circumstances indicate some further consideration might be warranted at a later date are applicants so informed.

RADIO BROADCASTING—RAYMOND ARTHUR DAVIES

Mr. BRUCE:

1. Is Raymond Arthur Davies in the employ of the C.B.C.? If so, in what capacity and at what remuneration?

2. Did he at any time act as news commentator from Moscow for the C.B.C., and was this news broadcast over the C.B.C. in its news roundup?

3. If so, for what period and how much did the C.B.C. pay him for this service?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. McCANN:

These are matters relating to the broadcasting service of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for which the Corporation is responsible and regarding which it is not subject to government control. Such questions can be taken up very appropriately in a parliamentary committee on broadcasting.

The corporation has advised:

1. Raymond Arthur Davies is not and has not been in the employ of the CBC.

2. He went to Russia as a free lance reporter. He cabled despatches to the CBC and some were used in News Roundup.

3. His dispatches were received between January 20 and October 28, 1944, and between March 25 and September 30, 1945. He was paid at usual rates for such work.

PENITENTIARIES—BORSTAL INSTITUTION

Mr. McKAY:

What steps have been taken by the government to call a conference of dominion-provincial officials for the purpose of establishing a Borstal institution in the dominion as recommended by the Royal Commission of 1938 investigating the penal system?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

Steps are being taken to appoint a commissioner, as authorized by section 4A of the Penitentiary Act 1939, as enacted by Section 2 of Chapter 28 of the statutes of 1945, second session, who will consult provincial officials, as indicated in *Hansard* of December 12, 1945, at pages 3347 and 3348.

WAR ASSETS—SALES TO SPAIN

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. Have surplus war assets been sold to the government of Spain or to any organization, corporation or person in Spain?

2. If so, what is the nature, quantity and value of the goods sold.

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No.

2. Answered by 1.

SASKATCHEWAN LANDING TRAFFIC BRIDGE

Mr. BENTLEY:

1. Has the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply received a definite offer of assistance for the building of a traffic bridge on the South Saskatchewan river at or near Saskatchewan Landing?

2. If so, what was the offer, and has it been considered?

3. What steps, if any, have been taken by the government to implement the construction of this bridge?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Last December, a request for assistance was received from the Saskatchewan government.

2. The federal government was requested to bear fifty per cent of the cost of construction. Consideration of assistance has been deferred pending satisfactory settlement of financial arrangements between the dominion and the provinces, now before the dominion-provincial conference.

3. Answered by 2.

INTERNMENT OF W. F. KUGLER

Mr. BENTLEY:

1. Was one W. F. Kugler, of Leader, Saskatchewan, interned during the war period?
2. If so, for what reason or reasons?
3. What was the date of his apprehension?
4. When was he released?
5. Were any conditions attached to his release? If so, what were those conditions?
6. Have any reports been made on the activities of the said W. F. Kugler since his release from internment?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. Yes.

2. To prevent him from acting in any manner prejudicial to the public safety or the safety of the State.

3. 4th September, 1939.

4. 17th November, 1944.

5. Yes.

Conditions of release:

"1. That he do not return to his former home at Leader, Saskatchewan, or its environs;

2. That he report once a month to the R.C.M. Police, or, if there be no officer of that Force within a reasonable distance, to such conveniently located person as the R.C.M. Police may designate;

3. That he do not change his place of residence without first reporting to the R.C.M. Police or to such person as they may designate.

4. That he do not journey from the city or other place in which he may be living without first reporting the details and purpose of his proposed trip to the R.C.M. Police, and that, if so required by the said R.C.M. Police, he report at his destination or destinations to such police as the R.C.M. Police may designate;

5. That, short of joining the armed services and working in munitions plants, he do everything reasonably possible to assist in Canada's war effort, and that he do or say nothing that might in any way detract from the war effort of Canada or its allies, or that might in any way assist or encourage any enemy of Canada or its allies;

6. That he obey all laws and regulations, including those relating to national selective service, and have nothing to do with any forbidden club or organization;

7. That he sign an undertaking to abide by all of the above conditions."

6. No.

JAPANESE REPARATIONS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Has the governent of Canada collected from or will it collect from Japan, expenses incurred by said government because of Japan's war on and against the allied nations?
2. Will said government collect from Japan expenses incurred by it in repatriating Canadian civilians taken prisoner and kept in concentration camps by Japan until rescued by the armies of the allied nations?
3. Pending such collection from Japan, is the government of Canada demanding from Canadian civilians so rescued and repatriated payment of the expense of repatriating them?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. (a) No; (b) No international agreement has yet been reached on the subject of reparations payable by Japan.

2. Answered by 1.

3. Yes.

WARTIME HOUSING LIMITED—NORTH VANCOUVER

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North):

1. What was the cost of (a) land; (b) buildings; (c) furnishings, of the two staff houses of Wartime Housing Limited in North Vancouver?
2. What is the total accommodation of these two staff houses?
3. How much of this accommodation was vacant on March 1, 1946?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. (a) This land was leased from the municipality of North Vancouver at $10.00 per year; (b) $67,250.83; (c) $11,998.96.

2. 163 beds.

3. 63 beds.

TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES—PATRICIA BAY-SEA ISLAND FARES

Mr. PEARKES:

1. Has any change in the fare on T.C.A. planes, operating between Patricia bay and Sea island, Vancouver, been authorized during the past twelve months?
2. If so, what was the nature of the changes made, and for what reason were these fares altered?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes.

2. On August 1, 1945, Trans-Canada Air Lines licence which authorized the transport of through traffic to Victoria was amended to authorize the company to carry local traffic

between Vancouver and Victoria. Effective August 7, 1945, the fare of $3 one way and $5.40 for the round trip was established by T.C.A. for such local traffic. Air transport board Order No. 2 directed that these fares be increased to $5 one way and $10 round trip. The increase became effective January 1, 1946.

This action by the air transport board was taken as a result of a complaint made by Canadian Pacific Air Lines that the T.C.A. fares of $3 one way and $5.40 return were not just and reasonable.

The facts as found by the air transport board were as follows:

Prior to August 1945 C.P.A.L. and its predecessors had been, for a considerable period, the air carriers authorized to provide the local service between Victoria and Vancouver and they had in the past and still did carry the bulk of the traffic.

A most careful scrutiny by the board and its economic experts established beyond question that the rate of $5 one way, which was the rate being charged by Canadian Pacific Air Lines, did little more than barely cover the actual cost of operation as a local service and that C.P.A.L. was conducting its said operation on a sound and economic basis.

On the other hand, T.C.A. was operating a trunk line service on a basis of only two trips daily each way, in regard to which the local service between Vancouver and Victoria was merely incidental. In effect, the number of seats available on T.C.A. for the local service was entirely dependent on the number reserved for through traffic. In the event that all seats were utilized by T.C.A. for through traffic, there would be none for local traffic. It was, therefore, obvious that the considerations which applied to T.C.A. rates were substantially different from those which governed the operations of C.P.A.L. Having regard to all the circumstances, it appeared to be clearly unsound to permit T.C.A. who could not carry all the traffic, or even any of it, if all its seats were occupied by through passengers, to operate on the basis of a rate which was substantially below the actual cost of operation of the purely local service in question. Had T.C.A. been able to handle all the traffic that offered, different considerations would have applied.

Section 5 (1) of the air transport board regulations respecting commercial air services provides that air carriers must furnish transportation upon reasonable request and must provide safe and adequate service, equipment and facilities. Quite obviously, to provide a

[Mr. McIlraith.]

service which complies with all these requirements, it is essential that the air carrier receive a reasonable rate of remuneration. It would have been unreasonable and unfair to require C.P.A.L. to reduce its rates, with the possible result that the service would have been discontinued. As the communities served were primarily dependent upon that company for the local air services in question, the board found that the complaint of C.P.A.L. was justified and under the authority contained in its regulations the board ordered the change in rate hereinbefore referred to.

CANADIAN TROOPS IN JAMAICA

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

1. Are there members of the Canadian Army serving in Jamaica at present?
2. If so, how many?
3. What is their assignment?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.
2. One officer and one other rank.
3. They are the rear party of the Brockville Rifles and will leave Jamaica by air on 30th March.

CANADIAN LOANS TO OTHER COUNTRIES, FIRST WORLD WAR

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

1. To what countries did Canada make loans during the first great war of 1914-1918, and what was the amount?
2. Have these loans been repaid?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. In the period August 4, 1914 to November 11, 1918, Canada extended credits only to the United Kingdom. In that period the United Kingdom also extended credits to Canada. The amounts of these advances outstanding at each fiscal year-end from 1915 to 1919 were as follows:

	Advances by Canada to the United Kingdom	Advances by the United Kingdom to Canada
Mar. 31, 1915	$ 5,280,659 07	$ 61,473,684 22
Mar. 31, 1916	43,710,945 33	137,992,379 82
Mar. 31, 1917	169,558,345 82	289,583,702 52
Mar. 31, 1918	119,880,176 11	115,784,160 25
Mar. 31, 1919	443,795,649 67	321,745,362 84

2. Yes.

Note:—After the cessation of hostilities Canada extended credits to foreign countries as follows:

	Amount advanced	Amount outstanding March 20, 1946
Italy	$ 6,003,301 20	Nil
Greece	7,521,300 67	$ 6,525,000 00*
Roumania	20,449,083 94	24,329,262 40†
Belgium	1,762,789 63	Nil
France	5,737,954 53	Nil

*Includes $478,699.33 unpaid interest which was capitalized into the principal sum at the time the indebtedness was funded.

†Includes $3,520,636.00 unpaid interest which was capitalized into the principal sum at the time the indebtedness was funded and $359,-542.46 of unpaid interest due on the consolidated debt which was funded.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—PHYSIOTHERAPY EQUIPMENT, REGINA

Mr. PROBE:

1. What was the cost to the Department of Veterans Affairs for physiotherapy equipment installed by the Department of Veterans Affairs in the veterans' wing of the Regina General Hospital?

2. On what date was this equipment ordered and from whom?

3. On what date was it delivered and installed in the hospital mentioned?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. Total value of orders placed but not completely delivered: $4,000.48.

2. Orders placed on January 14, 1946, as follows: Crane Limited, hydrotherapy equipment, $443,58; Ille Electric Corp., hydrotherapy equipment, $725,50; Ille Electric Corp., paraffin bath, $247.00; Victor X-Ray Corp., electrotherapy equipment, $359.13; James Palmer Agency, electrotherapy equipment, $248.50; Fisher & Burpe Ltd., electrotherapy equipment, $1260.77; Reserve Stores (Departmental) sunlamp and treatment tables, $716.00

3. Delivery still incomplete. Installation incomplete.

JAPANESE FARMS—FRASER VALLEY

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. How many Japanese farms have been sold in the Fraser valley?

2. What is the legal description and the price obtained for each property?

3. When will the balance of Japanese farms be available for purchase, under the Veterans Land Act?

4. What steps are being taken to keep them in production pending sale?

Mr. MARTIN: I have spoken to the hon. member about this question, and pointed out to him that it will involve, particularly if No. 2 were replied to, a great deal of work which certainly if possible should be avoided; and I was given the assurance that it is proposed to redraft No. 2 of the questions. The hon. member is not in his seat, and the matter may be allowed to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stand.

MANUFACTURE OF CLOTHING FOR ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROOKS:

1. Are articles of clothing still being manufactured for the armed services in Canada?

2. If so, what quantities of the following articles are still on order (a) boots; (b) battle dress; (c) greatcoats?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes.

2 (a) Boots, ankle, leather, 6, 187 pairs; Boots, Mukluk (Muskox), 600 pairs; Boots, canvas, 35 pairs; Shoes, leather, 29,180 pairs; Shoes, canvas, 5,114 pairs.

(b) Battledress blouses, 472 only; Battledress trousers, 468 pairs. Note: Above are special sizes to be taken as and when required.

(c) Nil.

*POSTAGE RATES—CANADA-UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. BRUCE:

1. In view of the food shortage in the United Kingdom, will the Postmaster General facilitate and encourage the sending of parcels by Canadians to friends and relatives there by (a) reducing the postage to the same rate as was charged for parcels to members of the armed forces during the war; (b) speeding up the time taken in transit at the present time?

2. Will he take the necessary steps to shorten the time for air mail letters to the United Kingdom?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Some days ago I made a statement which is an answer to the first question. As to the second question, the answer is in the affirmative; and from the 1st of February to the 15th of March there have been flights overseas none of which have taken place at intervals of more than three days and no trips have taken more than two days.

Mr. SPEAKER: Answered.

MOOSE JAW ELEVATOR

Mr. THATCHER:

1. Have any employees been laid off recently at the government elevator in Moose Jaw?

2. If so, how many, and what was the reason for the lay-off?

3. What amount of grain is being stored at the government elevator in Moose Jaw at the present time?

4. Is it expected that this amount will increase or decrease in the near future?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. Yes.

2. Eight. Decrease in volume of work to be done.

3. As at March 21, 1946: Grain, 1,465,667-00 bu; Sunflower seed, 3,478,245 lbs.

4. It is anticipated that stocks will decrease rather than increase in the near future.

WAR ASSETS—FARM VEHICLES

Mr. PEARKES:

1. Has the policy, whereby vehicles which have been declared surplus to War Assets Corporation, were sold to farmers in cooperation with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, been discontinued?

2. If so, when and for what reason?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. The policy was suspended for a period pending negotiations with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. Discussions now in progress will, it is hoped, result in a resumption of such sales.

2. Answered by 1.

MANITOBA FOREST RESERVES

Mr. MOORE:

1. Are there any forest reserves in the province of Manitoba, other than those in the Riding Mountain National Park, under federal jurisdiction?

2. If so, where are they located?

3. Who owns or leases them?

4. What is the expiry date of such leases?

Mr. GLEN:

1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

BUILDING MATERIALS—THEATRES

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. Have any permits been granted for construction materials for the erection of theatres in Canada during 1946? If so, how many?

2. What department of the government granted priorities for building materials for the erection of these theatres?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No.

2. Answered by 1.

EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS—OWNERSHIP OF REAL ESTATE

Mr. BRUCE:

1. Has the government any control over the ownership of real estate by a foreign embassy or legation?

[Mr. Thatcher.]

2. If so, how many houses have U.S.S.R. acquired by (a) rental; (b) purchase, and (c) from whom—since their embassy was established in Ottawa?

3. What is the total personnel attached to and employed by the U.S.S.R. in Canada?

4. Has the U.S.S.R. got consulates in other cities in Canada and, if so (a) how many; (b) where situated, and (c) the number of personnel in each place?

5. How many (a) houses, and (b) personnel have the following embassies in Ottawa: French, Belgian, United States, respectively?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. No.

2. (a) no information; (b) three; (c) one was purchased from the government of Canada and two from private persons.

3. Eighty-six, including those mentioned in 4.

4. Yes (a) one; (b) Halifax; (c) six.

5. (a) The French government owns two properties in Ottawa the Belgian government, one, the United States government, one; (b) French embassy, thirty-six (including 16 Canadians); Belgian embassy, twelve (including 5 Canadians); United States, eighty-eight (including 33 Canadians).

These figures do not include consular personnel outside of Ottawa nor non-diplomatic personnel attached to separate purchasing or information offices.

VETERANS LAND ACT—FRASER VALLEY

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. Under the Veterans Land Act, small holdings, how many houses at Haney, Mission, Chilliwack are (a) under construction; (b) completed?

2. What is the total cost of any house completed?

3. What was the cost per house of project overhead?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1.

	(a)	(b)	Per cent completed
Haney	20	None	85
Mission	25	"	75
Chilliwack	45	"	75

2. Average cost (estimated):

Project	House	Services	Total
Haney			
1½ storey	$5,442	$600	$6,042
Bungalow	5,174	600	5,774
Mission			
1½ storey	5,086	680	5,766
Bungalow	4,978	680	5,658
Chilliwack			
1½ storey	5,356	497	5,853
Bungalow	5,183	497	5,680

3. Overhead per house:

	Project	Total*
Haney	$462	$792
Mission	304	634
Chilliwack	301	631

*NOTE: Overhead which includes contractors' fee, and rental of equipment is included in total cost of houses.

PRINCE ALBERT NATIONAL PARK

Mr. KNIGHT:

1. Has a certain block of lake view subdivision at Waskesiu in Prince Albert National Park been thrown open for public entry?

2. Is this property offered for sale with a building condition attached? If so, what is the condition?

3. How many cottages is it planned to build on this space?

4. Has the department concerned received any letters of protest from the people who are to be displaced?

5. If so, what action has been taken in view of such protests?

Mr. GLEN:

1. Lots posted to be available for entry on and after April 1.

2. Property not for sale. Each successful applicant will be issued an agreement for one year under which he will be required to build a cottage according to plans and specifications approved by the department. Upon completion of the cottage a licence for the lot will be issued.

3. One cottage for each of the 26 lots posted.

4. No.

5. Answered by "4".

TIMBER LIMIT CONTRACTS

Mr. ZAPLITNY:

1. At what date did the Northern Trust company contract for timber limits 571 and 551D in the Riding Mountain National Park area?

2. What are the terms of the above contract?

3. When does the contract expire?

4. What other timber limits in Canada, if any, are there under contract between the Northern Trust company and the dominion government?

Mr. GLEN:

1. December 23, 1926, by transfer from United Assets Company of Winnipeg, Manitoba.

2. Contract by annual licence as outlined on pages 8-13 of the regulations.

3. The licence is renewable from year to year as long as there is merchantable timber as described in the licence in sufficient quantity to be commercially valuable.

4. None on dominion crown lands.

BICKLEIGH, SASK., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. JAENICKE:

1. Who is the present postmaster at Bickleigh, Saskatchewan?

2. Who was the postmaster at Bickleigh, Saskatchewan prior to the present incumbent, and how long did he hold this office?

3. Was the prior incumbent of the post office at Bickleigh, Saskatchewan discharged or did he resign?

4. If the prior incumbent of the post office at Bickleigh, Saskatchewan resigned, who requested his resignation?

5. Is the present postmaster at Bickleigh, Saskatchewan a returned soldier?

6. Who is the mail courier for the post office at Bickleigh, Saskatchewan; how was he appointed, and what is his remuneration?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier):

1. Joseph Mazzei.

2. (a) Daniel B. Brennan; (b) From 30th June 1917.

3. Resigned.

4. Because of unsatisfactory site the department was about to declare office vacant when word was received that Mr. Brennan had resigned.

5. No. The remuneration paid amounted to only $166 plus bonus of $14.88 per annum and no applications were received from returned soldiers.

6. W. Wade. Appointed originally in January 1938 as result of public tenders. On contractor's refusal to renew contract, temporary arrangements have been made with him to continue the service at $674.59 per annum.

*PENITENTIARY COMMISSIONERS

Mr. JAENICKE:

1. Has the government appointed one or more commissioners under the Penitentiary Act as amended by Chapter 28 S.C. 1945?

2. If such commissioner or commissioners have been appointed has or have they taken any action under subsections A to D of section 4A of the Act, and, if so, what action?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker, the act referred to, namely chapter 28 of the statutes of 1945, is to come into force in whole or in part by proclamation. The proclamation for putting into effect that part of the act which provides that the appointment of one commissioner may be made has been under preparation and consideration since March 8, and I hope within a few days to be able not only to announce that that part has been put into force, but that an appointment has been made under it.

RYE STORAGE, DELIVERIES AND SALES

Mr. FAIR:

1. How many bushels of rye were in storage in Canada on July 31, 1945?

2. How many bushels of rye were delivered to elevators in Canada during the period August 1, 1945, to March 1, 1946?

3. During the same period, how many bushels of rye (a) cash; (b) futures were sold on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. 1,505,607 bushels, exclusive of any rye that may have been stored on farms.

2. 2,667,560 bushels.

3. No information.

VETERANS LAND ACT—PURCHASE OF LAND IN ST. THOMAS DISTRICT

Mr. LENNARD:

1. How many acres of land were purchased by the government from Mr. P. H. Verheyden, in the St. Thomas district, for the Veterans Land Act administration?

2. How much was paid for the property?

3. Are there any buildings on the property?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. 72 acres.

2. $14,750.

3. No.

EXPORTS OF FLOUR AND BY-PRODUCTS

Mr. DORION:

1. During 1945, have any flour and/or flour by-products been exported to the United States?

2. If so, how many tons of (a) flour; (b) bran; (c) oatmeal; (d) middlings?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Flour, 13,416 tons; (b) and (d), bran, shorts and middlings are recorded under one statistical classification; Exports under this item amounted to 35,961 tons; (c) Oatmeal, 1,258 tons.

REOPENING OF ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE

Mr. KIDD:

1. When will the Royal Military College in Kingston, be re-opened?

2. When will instructions as to the academic qualifications required, be available?

3. How many cadets will be permitted to register in the first class?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The question of the re-opening of the Royal Military College in Kingston is at present under active consideration. Detailed information as to date of re-opening, academic qualifications required, and size of enrolment is not at present available but it is hoped will be announced soon.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

COCKSHUTT PLOW COMPANY—PLASTIC AIRCRAFT

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North):

1. What is the value of plastic aircraft and component parts, manufactured by thermo-setting method, by the government-owned plant and operated by Canadian Cockshutt Plow Company?

2. What was the value of all other similar plastic aircraft, and all other thermo-setting plastic parts purchased by the Canadian government?

3. What amounts were paid to Mr. J. Vidal of New York?

4. How much for royalties?

5. How much for management fees?

6. What amounts were paid to the Aircraft Research Limited, of New York?

7. How much was paid to Mr. H. Atwood of New Hampshire?

8. How much was paid to Mr. Atwood for travelling expenses from Vancouver to Ottawa?

9. How much for royalties or any other payments?

10. How much was paid to the Cockshutt Plow Corporation for management fees?

11. Was there any payment to Vancouver Sales and Appraisals Limited, for its work of introducing plastic processes to the Canadian government, namely, the Vidal and Atwood process?

12. If no payment has been made, what action has been taken by the government towards paying this company for any services rendered?

13. Did the Canadian government make use of Patent No. 366724 and Patent No. 384742; or U.S. Patent No. 2126711, or U.S. Patent No. 2373738?

14. Who owns these patents?

15. Has any payment been made for the use of these patents?

SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA SINCE 1941

Mr. POULIOT:

1. Since 1941 inclusive, what quantity of each class of (a) foodstuffs ,(b) fuel, (c) arms, (d) munitions, (e) vehicles and parts thereof, (f) planes and parts thereof, (g) other war material, (h) rubber, (i) other manufactured products was shipped each year to Russia by Canada, (1) direct, (2) via the United Kingdom, (3) via the United States of America?

2. What was the total value of such shipments?

3. What is the total of the payments made by Russia to Canada since the above-mentioned date?

CANADIAN INDUSTRIES LIMITED—SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION

Mr. MATTHEWS (Brandon):

1. Where are the head offices of Canadian Industries Limited located?

2. Is this company associated with any non-Canadian companies that are members of an international cartel? If so, what companies and what cartels?

3. Are any of the products manufactured by Canadian Industries Limited protected by Canadian tariffs?

4. Is the manufacture of small arms ammunition so protected? If so, at what rate?

5. What has been the total amount of small arms ammunition imported into Canada each year from 1943 to date?

Mr. MARTIN: Return tabled.

RELEASE OF TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. FRASER:

What instructions and/or directives have been given during the last twelve months to the heads of the different government departments in connection with the release of temporary civil servants?

WAR ASSETS—CORVETTES

Mr. FRASER:

1. How many corvettes have been sold by the government since the war closed?

2. What are their names and what price was received for each ship?

3. What was the cost of each such corvette and where launched?

Mr. ABBOTT: Return tabled.

RELEASE OF TEMPORARY CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. FRASER:

1. How many temporary (a) women civil servants; (b) men civil servants have been released during the last twelve months?

2. How many of the above were released (a) with a view to appointing qualified veterans in their place; (b) because they became additional to the need of the department in which they were serving; (c) because they were married women not dependent upon themselves for support?

CIVIL SERVICE—APPOINTMENTS

Mr. FRASER:

1. How many civil servants (a) male; (b) female, have been appointed in the last six months by the federal government?

2. How many were ex-service men or women?

GASOLINE TAX

Mr. FAIR:

1. What amount was collected in each province each year as a result of the imposition of ·03 cents per gallon war tax on gasoline?

2. During the same period, what amount was paid as a subsidy on crude oil?

Mr. MARTIN: Return tabled.

HOUSING—UNITS COMPLETED AND UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North):

1. What was the number of (a) housing units completed each month; (b) houses under construction during each of the last twelve months in Canada?

2. What was the type of construction of such houses?

3. What was the approximate average cost of such houses?

EASTEND, SASK., AIR CADET ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. McCUAIG:

1. What was the cost of operating (a) Air Cadet League; (b) Navy Cadet League; (c) Army Cadet League; (d) Air Cadet squadron at Eastend, Saskatchewan, in 1945?

COSTS OF FIRST WORLD WAR

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

What amount does Canada still have to pay each year to defray the cost of the first great war, such as pensions, general expenses or otherwise?

MOTOR VEHICLES—PRIORITIES

Mr. HANSELL:

1. What is the order of priorities to the purchase of new automobiles?

2. Are there any special cases apart from priorities? If so, what procedure is followed in dealing with them?

3. Are chiropractors considered in the same category as medical doctors? If not, has the government considered giving them any particular priority?

Mr. McILRAITH: Return tabled.

PRIVATE SECRETARIES

Mr. DORION:

On January 1, 1946, (a) Who were the private secretaries to ministers, and with what departments were they respectively connected; (b) what remuneration was paid to each one?

DEPUTY MINISTERS

Mr. DORION:

On January 1, 1946: (a) Who were the deputy ministers, and other persons having the rank of deputy minister, and with what departments were they respectively connected? (b) What remuneration was paid to each one?

WAR ASSETS—CLOTHING AND BLANKETS

Mr. BROOKS:

1. What number of the following articles is on charge to the several quartermaster generals' departments as of March 1, 1946: (a) boots; (b) battle dress; (c) walking-out uniforms; (d) fatigues; (e) blankets?

2. Are any of the above articles being turned over to War Assets Corporation?

3. Is the government considering the giving or selling of any of the above articles to the devastated countries of Europe and Asia?

REFUGEES—ENTRY PERMITS—ANTI-NAZIS

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf):

1. How many temporary permits for entry into Canada were issued by the Minister of Mines and Resources under order in council P.C. 9440 of December 10, 1943, to refugees transferred from the United Kingdom to Canada?

2. How many such permits were renewed?

3. How many such permits are still in force?

4. Were said permits issued (a) before, or (b) after the entry of such refugees into Canada, and how many were issued in each case?

5. How many such permits were issued to anti-nazi refugees who were in Canadian concentration camps?

NATIONAL DEFENCE—MISCONDUCT DISCHARGES

Mr. GILLIS:

1. Has the Department of National Defence, Army, Navy and Air set up a board of review to examine into all misconduct discharges?

2. If so, what are the names and rank of the personnel?

3. How many discharges have been examined to date?

4. How many of the number examined have been changed?

5. If a misconduct discharge is changed will the gratuity of the person affected be automatically granted?

IMPORTS OF SUGAR

Mr. MOORE:

1. How many tons of sugar did Canada import in each of the years 1943, 1944, 1945?

2. From what countries was this sugar imported?

3. Has Canada agreed to import sugar only from those countries who belong to the international sugar producers pool?

4. Has any of the sugar producing countries who do not belong to the sugar producers pool attempted to market sugar in Canada?

5. If so, what steps are being taken by the government to permit purchase of sugar from those producing countries who remain outside the producers pool?

ARMED FORCES—REJECTIONS FOR DEFECTS OF SPEECH

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. During the years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944 and 1945, how many applicants for service in the armed forces were refused because of nervous defects of speech such as stammering, stuttering, etc.?

2. Did the Department of National Defence provide any training facilities where persons suffering from nervous defects of speech might receive help and thus be able to serve in the armed forces?

3. If so, by whom were they provided, for what period and to how many in each service was the training or assistance given?

TIMBER LIMIT CONTRACTS

Mr. ZAPLITNY:

1. Are there at this date any timber limits in excess of one million feet under contract between firms or individuals and the dominion government?

2. If so (a) what are the locations of such limits; (b) what is the date each contract was entered into, and what is the expiry date; (c) what is the name and address of the firm or individual holding the contract in each case?

[Mr. P. Gauthier.]

DEPARTMENTS AND DEPUTY HEADS

Mr. DORION:

1. How many departments are there under the authority of each Minister of the Crown?

2. Which are these departments?

3. Who is the deputy head of each?

WILD LIFE

PROVISION FOR APRIL 10 AS JACK MINER NATIONAL WILD LIFE DAY

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport) moved the second reading of bill No. 2, respecting the Jack Miner National Wild Life Day.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I feel very humble in moving second reading of a bill which has to do with the perpetuation of the memory of a great Canadian, one who was recognized everywhere as the pioneer conservator of wild life not only in Canada but throughout America, and as the greatest naturalist on this continent.

A few days ago I read an article in a magazine which classed the late Jack Miner, who was a great pioneer, with other great pioneers, other men who blazed name and fame across the skies. His name appeared alongside names of men like Sir Henry Bessemer, who invented a process in connection with the production of steel, one which revolutionized steel production throughout the world. Then there was Luther Burbank, who was a great horticulturist. In the list was Louis Pasteur whose name is known throughout the world, and who has been recognized as a great French scientist. There was Graham Bell, who invented the telephone; Thomas A. Edison; Doctor Grenfell; Doctor Banting; Lord Kelvin; Remington, who invented the typewriter; the Wright brothers, who invented the aeroplane; Ford, who was the pioneer in low-priced motor cars, and Jack Miner himself.

This lists twelve great men; and as a Canadian I am proud that, through his great work, Jack Miner earned the right to have his name alongside the names of those other great pioneers. So many have spoken to me in support of the bill that I know I shall not have to speak at length at this time. On the other hand, so many have asked questions respecting its significance that I feel I should answer those questions as they have come to me.

Some have asked how the bill came to be introduced—who it was who suggested it. Well, this is the second bill I have introduced in this connection. The first was introduced in 1941. In the previous autumn I had been at Kingsville, upon which occasion I saw large buses—I do not remember how many—carrying signs along their sides indicating that they

had been chartered by the board of education of the city of Detroit. Kingsville is a beautiful town, situated in one of the finest counties in all America.

Mr. MARTIN: The best county.

Mr. MacNICOL: One of the finest, not only in Canada, but in America. It is situated in a perfect garden country, a fact which must be known to all who have been there. These buses turned at the main corner of the town of Kingsville for the purpose of going north for a distance of a mile or so to the sanctuary created by the late Jack Miner.

One of the men standing at the corner was Mr. Arthur Allen who, on several occasions, had proposed to the Kingsville council that they take steps to set apart a day. He had suggested that they should choose April 10, Jack Miner's birthday, as a day on which not only the children from Detroit, but those from all other parts of Ontario and the United States might visit the sanctuary. That is the origin of the bill. The idea was suggested to me while I was there, with the result that in the following year I introduced a bill. However, on account of the war, it was suggested to me that any action in connection with the bill might be deferred until after the war. I was glad to comply with the suggestion; I am always happy to cooperate if I can.

I know there is nothing I can add to either the name or the fame of Jack Miner. All the great men in America have done that; they have left nothing for anyone else to add. Therefore I shall not try.

I have been asked what states have wild life days. Perhaps I should explain that I have received literature from the United States. A tremendous amount of it has come to my desk, from all sorts of organizations. That to which I shall direct the attention of the house is the literature which reached me from that great American organization known as the National Wild Life Federation in the United States. From that literature I learn that it was the late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a very great friend of our own Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), who originated the idea in that country. I might say, in passing, that it is a blessing the President and our Prime Minister were such good friends during those days of struggle through which we have passed. I believe that our Prime Minister's influence with the President was most helpful in those negotiations which took place between the United States and the British empire.

It was in 1938 that the late President set apart the first day of spring as wild life day in the United States. They set apart the week of March 21—and had I known that when I drafted this bill, instead of mentioning a single day I would have inserted the words "the week of April 10". Some people have asked, "How are you going to hold to April 10, when it might fall on a Saturday or Sunday, and in that way would not be effective in the schools?" I note that in some of the states this difficulty has been overcome by setting apart a week or a month and, if this bill is accepted, the necessary change could be made in this direction by way of amendment.

In the United States they have what is known as national wild life week. This is the statement made by the National Wild Life Federation:

> National wild life week, originally proclaimed by President Roosevelt in 1938 as a period in which Americans should give thoughtful consideration to wild life, its restoration and preservation, will begin this year on March 21, the first day of spring, the National Wild Life Federation has announced.
>
> Sponsored by the federation, wild life week is featured by many kinds of educational activities carried on by various organizations, groups and agencies affiliated with the federation. In addition there will be lectures, radio talks, newspaper stories, school programmes, etc., throughout the country, devoted to an intelligent approach to conservation of soil, water, fields and forests as well as wild life.

I am assured by the Miner foundation that they, and the organizations with which they are closely associated in Canada and whose work in connection with wild life conservation they sponsor, will supply all the literature required, and I have no doubt that they will carry out this undertaking.

Most of the southern states in the United States have adopted wild life weeks. They have followed the federal government's programme and have selected the week of March 21. In the south the season is much more advanced; in fact the geese and ducks all left for the north early in March. A little different programme is followed in the northern states, and I shall refer to Ohio as an example. Arbour day, which as I remember is on a Friday, in April, is selected and the week in which that day falls is set aside as wild life week. I should like to read two or three paragraphs from a proclamation which was issued by the state of Ohio in 1943. These read:

> Whereas, for the past four years, the entire month of April has been set aside as conservation month in Ohio, thus kindling anew the interest of our citizens in all phases of conservation, and

Whereas, the teaching of conservation in the schools of Ohio has been commended in a joint programme of the state department of education and the Ohio division of conservation.

And further down:

Now, therefore, I, John W. Bricker, governor of the state of Ohio, do hereby appoint and designate the week of April 12 to 16 as conservation week in the schools of Ohio and Friday, April 16, as arbour and bird day and ask a general observance by all citizens of the state of the entire month of April as conservation month.

I understand that the state of Michigan takes arbour day as the pivotal day in their wild life conservation week. I shall not take time to give details of what that state does, but it is along the lines of what I have just read. There is nothing new in a wild life day or a wild life week, because as far as I know it is general throughout the states of the United States. Therefore I feel the time has come when Canada should do the same.

The United States does not have an outstanding conservationist or wild life advocate like the late Jack Miner was, and it seems to me that April 10, which is the anniversary of the birthday of this great wild life conservationist and this great naturalist, would be a fitting day to include in a wild life week, or to be set aside as a wild life day as the bill provides. There are many days in Canada that are fairly generally observed. There is a day for tuberculosis; there is apple day which is the Boy Scout day and which is a national day throughout Canada; there is fire prevention week and so on. All of these are good, and to set aside April 10 as a wild life conservation day would be a new thing in Canada and would place us in the same position as the United States. The bill says a day, but it can be amended, to week of April 10.

During this period speeches could be delivered over the radio and all those interested could spread far and wide the benefits which would accrue to this country from conservation along almost any lines, and, in this particular case, wild life conservation.

It has been suggested to me that perhaps we would be interfering with the educational systems of the provinces. The provinces are supreme in educational matters and the federal government cannot interfere. I do not feel that there would be any interference because there would be no compulsion upon any provincial department of education to follow the provisions of this bill. I presume they would do just the same as is done in the various states in the United States. The departments of education in all the provinces are thoroughly alive to the great value of conservation in all lines, and, in this case, the conservation of wild life. I do not fear any difficulty in that regard, although it is not for me to say.

I was a very close friend of the late Jack Miner. I often visited his sanctuary, and it is a little difficult for me to speak because I think of his lovely blue eyes and his lovely face which showed by its lines his love, not only for wild life but for humanity. Quite often when I was there children would come, and I used to stand back and watch the faces of the kiddies when they looked at Jack Miner. He was an institution to them and busloads of children would come to see him. They would show him their bird houses and he would pat this one on the head and that one on the back. I can see their lovely eyes and their lovely countenances looking at his.

He was a great conservator; he devoted his whole life to conservation. The hon. members from Essex county know this quite well. The hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll), who previously represented an Essex constituency in the provincial house, the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) and the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Clark) are all familiar with the work of this great pioneer, perhaps more so than other members in the house. I like to think of a pioneer being a man who blazes the way, who is not just a follower; a man who steps out and puts his name before the world. That is what Jack Miner did, and everything he did was done for Canada.

I have received many communications and I think I should refer to one or two. One was from the London Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. I often heard Jack Miner say, "If I can teach a child to make an outdoor birdcage, I have made a conservator of wild life." That was a great thought; that was his life, as opposed to useless destruction. Wild life means so much to this country besides sport; it can contribute so much in the way of food, and its preservation is of the utmost importance. I also had a very warm letter from Colonel E. S. Wigle, one of the oldest residents and a member of one of the pioneer families in that part of Ontario. He warmly approves the bill.

I also had a letter from a leading departmental store in Windsor, the C. H. Smith departmental store. Although I am not familiar with the store itself, I understand it is a very large store. I believe the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Brown) told me it was the largest store in Windsor. They are going to use their big show-windows, I am informed, to present to passers-by a demonstration of the value of wild life conservation. I think it is fine for a great merchant to use the show-

windows of his store to interest people in wild life conservation. It is an indication that people are thinking of more than merely profit.

I also had a letter from the Chrysler Corporation, of Detroit, Michigan; everyone knows who they are; also one from Doctor Perkins Bull, a great conservator himself. If I may digress for a moment, Doctor Bull has gathered together, in my opinion, the greatest collection of early pioneer farm equipment used in Canada that I have ever seen anywhere. He has it housed in a museum which is part of a school at Brampton, where there must be at least one-quarter of a million dollars worth of material. I appreciate his letter very much, coming from a pioneer himself.

I also received one from the Ottawa Humane Society and one from the National Parks Association of Canada, from which I quote this paragraph:

> Canada is so far behind the United States in practical wild life conservation that it could almost be said that we have not even made a start officially.

I think the Department of Mines and Resources has made a start and I wish to compliment the department on the distance it has gone in that regard. I am looking for great things along that line from the new Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen), because he comes from a province where there is much to be accomplished in conservation of wild life and summers in a very great park in Manitoba, Riding Mountain park, in which there is much wild life protected. So that I look for a lot from him in the development of wild life conservation.

I quote another paragraph from the same letter:

> The National Parks Association have a bulletin awaiting its turn at the printer's stressing the Americans' effort and many of this 5,000 edition should be in the mail before April 10.

The National Parks Association of Canada deserves unstinted credit and praise for going to the trouble of getting out and printing this bulletin. It is encouraging when you know that so many people are interested in promoting wild life conservation. Jack Miner was the pioneer in that field. There have been many others since and there were others during his time who have done a lot in that direction. I am looking at my friend the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette), whose name I deliberately picked out as seconder of the bill because he is more familiar than many others are with the conservation of the Canada goose. He himself I believe has quite a sanctuary near Cochrane and when I go out that way again I will visit him. When the geese leave Virginia and the Carolinas and Texas and Louisiana they fly north and cover six hundred miles the first day and then come down to rest. I believe it is the third day before they get to the sanctuary. I have seen 50,000 geese at Jack Miner's sanctuary at Kingsville, and all through the years, Mr. Speaker, the Miner sanctuary has fed those geese. It takes many thousands of bushels of No. 1 corn yearly to feed them. I have watched his men on many occasions distributing the corn when the geese have gone out to the lake. The sanctuary covers a very large area, about four hundred acres altogether, but where the birds go is about twenty-five to thirty acres, ponds included, and the corn is distributed all around these. It is most interesting to watch them. I was thinking this afternoon, when I was told that this bill might come up, of the many occasions on which I have gone with Jack Miner to the little house he had amongst the trees. You had to reach it by a ladder and peep out through a peephole at the geese. They are bright and intelligent birds. Jack used to say they were the wisest of all wild life; in fact he did not call them wild. In order not to frighten the geese there were pieces of coloured glass hanging in the peep-hole in front of the people through which you could get a good look at them without their seeing you. I do not like to think when I go back there that I shall not have the pleasure of the company of that great pioneer.

I had another letter from the department of street railways, Detroit. I value this letter because that is a great organization. They have written me approving the bill. I also received a letter from the Canadian Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Montreal, in which they warmly approve the bill. I quote this one paragraph from their letter:

> In the matter pertaining to the Bill representing "National Bird Day"—

That is not the right name:

> —I am pleased to state that our society appreciates the opportunity of concurring with you in your noble effort and may we hope that a favourable reception will be given your efforts.

I have another letter from a Windsor firm, Abbey Gray Limited, a motor car company, warmly approving the bill, and a very strong letter from the Essex county tourist association, signed by H. J. Lassaline, secretary-treasurer. I had the pleasure of meeting him at the Jack Miner sanctuary.

I have a clipping from the *Globe and Mail*, which quotes from the Calgary *Herald*, and I will read very briefly from it:

Following this war there will be a great increase in the numbers of hunters and fishermen. Millions of young men who have learned the thrill of outdoor living will join the ranks of those older sportsmen who are already devotees of the rugged life. Pressure on wild life resources will be terrific. The result will be the virtual exhaustion of our game, unless game management can solve the problems of providing annual crops of game animals, birds and fish in sufficient amount to satisfy the demands of this army of sportsmen.

That is the purpose of the bill, that all sorts of sportsmen's organizations should do in Canada as similar bodies do in the United States. At their dinners or banquets in the week of April 10, in Canada, they should have speakers who will tell their members, and through their members the public, of the great value of wild life conservation all along the line. If we do that we shall preserve for right use the wild life in Canada.

Perhaps I might quote another paragraph of the letter from the National Parks Association. I ought to have quoted this before. This has reference to the United States:

As you know, they have 178 water fowl refuges totalling 3,415,542 acres supported by the sale in 1945 of 1,750,352 one-dollar duck stamps to hunters and a few postage stamp collectors.

Since that time another 500,000 acres have been added to their wild fowl refuges. I do not know whether we have a tabulation of wild fowl refuges, but they now have 4,000,000 acres; and taking all their wild life, big game and wild fowl, they have altogether 13,600,000 acres. Speakers at various organizations should emphasize the necessity of Canada preserving some swamps and so forth. When the geese leave the Miner sanctuary I believe it takes them two days to get to the riding represented by the hon. member for Cochrane, and they go in thousands near the shores of James Bay, remaining there a week or ten days or more before flying to their nesting grounds in Baffin Land, Ungava and the Arctic islands. That is why I have referred to the hon. member for Cochrane as a conservationist. He is thoroughly familiar with the value of conservation.

I wish to say a word further with reference to Jack Miner. Among other titles, he had earned that of the great missionary of the air. He was the pioneer tagger of wild fowl. Others are now doing the same thing, and all credit to them, but he was the pioneer. That is the point I wish to emphasize above all others, and that is why so many honours have come to him. While I am on this point, let me give due credit to my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, who alone must have conferred upon Jack Miner the O.B.E. of which he was so justly proud. I have never seen anyone in my life so thrilled at receiving a title as Jack was when he received the O.B.E., and I may tell the Prime Minister that if at any time he visits the sanctuary he will find above the big fireplace in the living room three pictures, one of Edison, one of Henry Ford and one of our Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The big three.

Mr. MacNICOL: He counted all three among his warmest friends and he respected each of them in the highest way. Jack Miner told me that it was in 1904 that he conceived the idea of wild life conservation. He had been a hunter in that part of Essex where, in those days, there was much wild life apart altogether from geese, because there were fur-bearing animals. He was an expert marksman and no one could beat him. When he pulled the trigger, whatever he fired at sank to rise no more. One of his ideas was that in the schools, or wherever the question of wild life was discussed, teachers should instruct sportsmen and children, if they ever became hunters, to make sure that when they fired they hit the animal in the right place, and if they were not sure about it, it would be better for them to go and retrieve any wounded bird or animal than to pass on and shoot ten more. He was altogether opposed to wanton destruction.

It took about five years, he told me, before he got together enough wild geese. I have forgotten how he obtained the first one, but I suppose it may be assumed that the first one was wounded and became a decoy. It was not killed but was made a decoy, and from that commencement in 1904, until 1909, he accumulated a considerable start in wild life conservation in the sanctuary. In that year he conceived the idea of banding them.

There are two types of bands. In the United States the band has a number on it, and I am familiar with it. It gives all the information necessary to enable biologists at Washington to keep a complete record of migratory wild life, their habits, where they go, when they return and so on. Jack Miner's band does the same thing. In fact, it was Jack Miner who went to Washington to show the United States department how he did it, and on various occasions that department sent its officials to Canada to watch him banding the birds so as to learn exactly what he did.

In 1909 he began putting Biblical verses on the bands. I have told this before but it will do no harm to repeat it now. When I was in northern Manitoba in Moose Lake, a few years ago, late one evening an Indian came in with a goose. There were no white

men there but myself and one or two others who were with me. This Indian had shot a goose. I had a gripful of oranges, chocolates and so on to give to the Indian children, because I am very fond of Indian children. They were gathered round me when the Indian came with this Jack Miner band. I cannot quote him exactly, but the information he gave me was, "Jack Miner, him great man". He had the goose that he had shot and he said, "Jack Miner, him send food for tummy", and on the band there was a verse that said, "He careth for thee", "Food for the soul". The Jack Miner band is peculiar in that regard. No other country I know of has anything on its band except the number to be reported to the biological department.

From that time until his death Jack Miner banded 75,000 ducks and geese, and that is a lot of ducks and geese. If you go there you will find baskets full of bands. Thousands of bands have been returned. With these he has been able to advise our own government and the United States government about the migratory habits of wild life. That is one of the reasons why he was pronounced the great pioneer conservationist and naturalist of Canada and all America.

Knowing that all of us have to pass from this mortal scene sooner or later and that he had three fine sons, before he died Jack Miner legally set up the Jack Miner foundation to which all funds are contributed. If and when the sons pass on, the Prime Minister of Canada, whoever he may be at that time, the President of the United States, whoever he may be at that time, and the treasurer of the fund who, I believe, is a great banker in Detroit, will select the manager of the foundation. That will perpetuate the foundation; but I keep saying to myself that, if we pass this bill, it will go a long way to support those three young men, Jack's sons, in the great job which they are doing and to which they have devoted their lives. They get nothing out of it; they contribute everything to it. There they have a sanctuary, the like of which can be found nowhere else.

On numerous occasions Mr. Manly Miner, eldest and manager, has been offered a large salary to go to the United States and establish a sanctuary on lines similar to the one established in Canada. These three young men are following in the footsteps of their distinguished father. So long as they live, this country will be proud of their work and what they are doing to maintain the traditions of their father and to keep the Jack Miner sanctuary and the Jack Miner name as a great conservationist of wild life before the world. They are working for Canada, their home and their father's home, to keep it in the forefront of wild life conservation.

If the children in the schools and the members of clubs were told the value of bird houses and so forth in the conservation and protection of wild life and not to shoot uselessly to kill, but to shoot straight, it would be of great help to Canada in providing protection for wild life and sport for the hunters. At the sanctuary I have seen geese rise in the evening and fly to lake Erie. They are protected as they fly over the first 200 acres of land, but when they cross the Miner sanctuary they are peppered at by thousands of Detroit hunters and others. Occasionally the hunters get one. Many times in the past I have heard Jack Miner say that they like to shoot; that if one or two did get a bird they are satisfied. Think of what these sportsmen mean to Canada. Think of the tourist traffic that that brings into Canada. He was always thinking of Canada and of wild life conservation.

I am happy to have this bill supported by a great friend of Jack Miner, and himself no mean wild life conservationist, the hon. member for Cochrane.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): Before proceeding with my remarks I wish first of all to compliment the hon. member on presenting this bill for discussion in the house at this time. I realize now that he has fully implemented the purpose of the bill. By saying that, I mean that he has focused the attention of the Canadian people on the great lifework of the late lamented Jack Miner, and the meaning of his actions as a conservationist. I often visited his place, and I was greatly honoured by his friendship. I found that I had it naturally and spontaneously the very first time that I visited him when I told him of the wild duck and geese that had been feeding for a number of years in one of my lakes located in northern Ontario. That was the best way to reach his heart.

On several occasions it has been well said that he was a natural naturalist. It was true that he had no technical knowledge of these matters so far as a university education was concerned, but I believe that he was the greatest real naturalist that Canada has ever produced.

A few weeks ago there was a radio quiz in which it was asked who had been Canada's greatest naturalist, and it was unanimously stated through every section of the country that it was the late Jack Miner. To use his own language, he used to say that he was

not so much interested in the number of spots on a woodpecker's tail as in saving the species from extermination. He was more than a naturalist; he was also a conservationist, and if there is one lesson the Canadian people must of necessity learn it is more and more the policy of conservation.

I come from a section of the country where there is the finest treasure house known not only in Canada but also throughout the world. But we are doing the same as the pioneer civilization did in old upper and lower Canada; we are wasting to a great extent the natural resources and its wild life; we are wasting some of the wonderful gifts that have been given by a bountiful Providence, and in Jack Miner there is an example to be followed by every section of Canada.

I make this statement deliberately. I repeat that the presentation of this bill was properly timed, but at the same time a lesson must be understood by every Canadian citizen. In my own section we have slaughtered the wild fowl there; we have slaughtered our fur animals; we have slaughtered our fine game animals. We are going farther than that; we are polluting those big streams that are carrying their water into the great basin of the Hudson and James bays. Many of these big rivers like the Temiskaming, the Missanabi and the Abitibi, just to name a few that carry millions of gallons of water each hour, and to-day they are polluted. Where we had an enormous quantity of fine fish life there is practically no such life at present. The Canadian people must see that that water is again purified, is again returned to its natural state, so that the fish life can be restored once more as it was forty and fifty years ago, for the glory of God, and the welfare of our section and of our Canadian people.

I have seen the same thing happen with our wild life. It is true that neither the deer nor the moose were as plentiful as the bisons were on the western prairies and through the central states of United States. But we had them there by the thousands. These fine wild animals of our Canadian forests are decreasing too rapidly, and something must be done through education primarily, so as to preserve them from destruction. It is almost impossible to have conservation and all the things that Jack Miner stood for purely by legal statute. It must come primarily from the men and women of this country; it must be in their hearts in their actions if we want to preserve our wild life and our natural resources.

[Mr. Bradette.]

I may be out of order, but I should like to say a few words as to what we are doing at the present time to our natural forest resources in northern Ontario. We are doing exactly as was done in old Quebec and in the older sections of Ontario and the maritime provinces. How many people from this country and outside Canada after traversing every section of our country, and more particularly the four older provinces, are puzzled as to why some land was ever opened to cultivation, why it was allowed to be completely denuded of the great trees covering the land in those days, those great sylvan temples, where nature bloomed in its full glory. I well remember a place, for instance, like Sturgeon Falls, thirty-five years ago, when it was stated at the time of the inauguration of a fine big newsprint mill that there were enough forest resources in that area to enable the mill to function for at least two thousand years; yet after thirty years of that industry which meant so much to that section of the country it had to close its doors. Why? Because there had practically been wasted or extravagantly exploited most of the fine forest which had been given to people who were absolutely entitled to its exploitation but not to its destruction. I hope that governments, whatever they happen to be, whether at Queen's park or Ottawa or in any of the provinces, will realize what is involved in this unlimited, radical and unwarranted denuding of our forest reserves. I can speak with knowledge of my own section of the country. When, in 1909, I squatted on my lot the district was entirely forest; to-day, in very many sections, most of the farmers have to buy coal to supply their fuel requirements, the forest having entirely disappeared. There again something was wrong; there was not enough of this spirit of Jack Miner, the spirit of conservation and of preservation.

I wish to be brief in my remarks because I know that the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Brown) desires to say a few words about this important matter.

Mr. MARTIN: All hon. members do.

Mr. BRADETTE: Yes, all hon. members, because they are so vitally interested. Jack Miner did not belong to any particular section of Canada. To-day Jack Miner belongs to every section of this country; yes, every section of the world. The hon. mmeber who presented this bill spoke eloquently upon what our American cousins are doing at the present time in providing these sanctuaries which allow wild fowl to winter there. At the same time we must realize we have fine areas in the northern country where it is impossible for the

white man and most Indians to have access to the wild fowl during the summer months, so that the lessons of conservation should be heeded by both countries. But I have seen, in some of our own lakes, during the summer months, where there are hundreds of ducks and signs all over stating that they are not to be molested, but to be left alone, that if people have a ·22 rifle or a little gun they will not hesitate to shoot the ducks out of season or any wild game that they may meet. It is past my comprehension why such ideas are still in the minds of our people. I well remember that many of the homes of the rural district of old historic Charlevoix county, in my youth there were thousands of birds' eggs emptied and strung around on strings. One would see hundreds in every home. Thank heaven we do not see that any more to-day, because we realize that in doing so we are harming our own country; we are destroying the laws of nature. I have also seen in my youth that when attempts were made to plant some trees, the youngsters particularly saw to it that they were utterly destroyed in no time. A fine old schoolteacher we had, when one year the municipality decided to plant two thousand trees, gave one hundred to the children of our school, to look after them and see that they were properly protected. To-day those trees are a monument to the boys and girls who looked after them, a living thing, something for all to see and enjoy.

This is part of the message which Jack Miner has given to us Canadians. The hon. member who presented the bill brought to the attention of the house and of the Canadian people the wonderful work Jack Miner has accomplished. We realize that the late Jack Miner does not want a monument of granite or marble or bronze to commemorate his great work and memory, but he wants every Canadian to realize fully the import of his life work, the message that his own actions carried. As has been so well said by the previous speaker, it was a task to which he gave his life. What he undertook to do was, at great personal sacrifices, to educate in these matters the citizens of our country; and now he is ably succeeded in this great task by his three fine sons. I know that if he could hear this discussion he would be proud and pleased to realize that in our national Canadian forum we find it possible to tell the Canadian people, as well as ourselves, to continue his fine work and to be real Jack Miners in the matter of the conservation and preservation of our natural resources, that in the work of nature in its wild bird and wild animal life we see the handiwork of God, and to be true to his ideals is the greatest recognition that he ever aspired to receive as a reward.

Mr. D. F. BROWN (Essex West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to other hon. members for having permitted me to speak at this time. I have to catch my train in a few minutes, and I am grateful for their courtesy.

I desire to speak on this subject on behalf of the Essex and county tourist association, which has offices in Windsor, Ontario. It so happens that the Jack Miner farm and sanctuary are about twenty miles south of Windsor, and we are very much interested in this subject, owing to the fact that in 1945 over 17,000,000 tourists entered the country, over 5,000,000 of whom came to the city of Windsor. Many of these people went to see the Jack Miner sanctuary.

As the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette) has just said, Jack Miner is not a person whose fame is confined to any locality. He began his conservation procedure through the banding of birds, not with a number but with a verse of scripture. Jack Miner over a period of years has given much to us, and I think it is only fitting that we should commemorate him by passing this bill. I am very happy to state that not only will I support this bill but that I am sure that a great majority of the constituents I represent are very much in favour of it.

Jack Miner gave to us of his time. His farm was open several days a week and he spent his time in showing and explaining the various things he was doing. I recall distinctly visiting his farm, catching robins or some other birds, and he always permitted the visitor to take a bird and let it fly off into the air after a band had been put upon the leg. And he gave not only of his time, but of his money. During his lifetime his own funds were used in starting this sanctuary and keeping it in operation. He gave also of his knowledge. Jack Miner lectured through the United States and Canada, and, I believe, in some European cities, telling of the work he was doing.

My earliest recollection is, as a very small schoolboy at Petrolia, Ontario, a distance of some 120 miles from Jack Miner's sanctuary, having Jack Miner come to visit us, tell us something of his work and show his pictures, mostly slides—for in those days there were not many moving pictures—and imparting to us the knowledge he had obtained over a period of years.

More important, he gave of his love. Jack Miner not only loved the birds, but he loved man. Through the work he did in spreading the Christian principles he loved, he has not only helped animals but brought healing; he has brought love to people throughout not only North America, but the great part of South America.

This has the effect of bringing tourists, especially at certain seasons of the year, to our constituency. They pass through the constituency of Essex South, a distance of twenty miles, to the sanctuary. At certain seasons of the year one may see literally thousands of birds in the air. On many occasions on lake Erie I have seen and heard thousands of geese out on the lake. And when I say "thousands", I mean literally tens of thousands of geese out on the waters, probably beyond the vision of the eye.

Then, too, there have been literally tens of thousands of ducks and, even more interesting, great numbers of white swans. And when I refer to white swans, I mean white swans by the thousands, who have reached that point in their migration to the south, coming through by Point Pelee, and across to the Jack Miner sanctuary. At seasons of the year there will be literally thousands of those birds at the sanctuary.

I am sure my colleague the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Clark) will join with me in extending, on behalf of the city of Windsor, and the Essex county tourist association, a hearty invitation to come and see this beautiful and educational sight at the season of the year when the birds are migrating.

I hesitate mentioning such mundane things as money in this discussion, but speaking from a purely mercenary point of view I must point out that the tourists who come to the Jack Miner sanctuary bring with them and spend good, hard Canadian dollars, and the currency of other countries. Those dollars find their way into our retail stores and our manufacturing organizations. They help to purchase the cars, in the manufacture of which we are chiefly interested. In view of the fact that they will create work, they bring dollars and cents not only to the city of Windsor and to the county of Essex, but to all Canada. I say this because the automobile industry buys its materials from all parts of Canada. Recognition of this sanctuary will help not only my constituency but every constituency in Canada.

For these reasons I am happy to support the bill.

[Mr. Brown.]

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the bill because of a promise I made to the late Jack Miner, who gave us a week at our camp at lake Minaki. At the close of that camp, when he described the value of wild life in Canada, we promised we would support him in his endeavour.

I should like to mention one text from which he spoke at that camp, where he referred to the description of a sport who went out to shoot for the love of shooting. When he left the spoils in front of his tent door he went to sleep for two or three days, and he cooked not that which he took in sport.

In support of that text, I would say that no man has a right to go out and shoot wild life for the sake of fun. When we treat wild life as Jack Miner treated it, it will cease to be wild and become tame. There is one organization in Canada, of which I was an officer, namely, the Boy Scouts, who will welcome this bill with enthusiasm. I am sure the leaders, in particular, will be pleased to note its introduction.

May I commend the mover and the seconder for their foresight.

Mr. S. M. CLARK (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is needless for anyone in the house even to attempt to "sell" Jack Miner either to hon. members or to the people of Canada. He did that job much better than anyone else could do it.

I rise to support the bill proposed by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol), and I do so for one reason. The late Mr. Miner gave inspiration to this generation in connection with the conservation of wild life, an inspiration that has meant much to Canada. This is one way in which we can ensure that that inspiration is carried forward to the coming generation.

If some hon. members have not visited the sanctuary, I suggest their doing so at the earliest opportunity. I do not think anyone could adequately describe the scene when those clouds of wild fowl come in from the lake, or from the north at different seasons of the year. That sanctuary is being ably cared for by the Miner family. I would hope that for the sake of the younger generation it might be possible for the government to adopt the bill. Certainly I would support it heartily, as it is proposed by the hon. member for Davenport.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill, and perhaps I may do so more particularly because I am from a part of Canada other than that in which Jack Miner's life work was done.

I think all people across Canada owe Jack Miner a debt of gratitude for the manner in which he indicated to the people of Canada and of the world what bird sanctuaries could really do for wild life in our countries. When we look back over the years and realize that on this North American continent a century ago there were birds and beasts which are now extinct—and I have in mind particularly the migrating pigeon—we realize the importance of his work. Even before coming to this country I had read stories about the flocks of wild pigeons which flew down along the New England states to an extent that they obscured the sun. To-day there is not one specimen of the North American wild pigeon in existence. It is gone.

I look back to my own province of Saskatchewan and to the plains of western Canada. During my thirty-six years in the west I have seen that country almost depleted of the typical bird of the prairie land—the prairie chick. It almost disappeared. I remember the wanton slaughter of the prairie chick, and I remember, too, the slaughter of the ducks in the early days.

Slaughter, for the mere sake of slaughter, is, I believe, something which we should deprecate strongly and, where possible, punish effectively, because, as the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor) said a minute ago, any man who kills for the joy of killing is really not a good citizen of any country, anywhere. So that I am pleased to rise in my place in support of this bill.

I had the privilege some fifteen or sixteen years ago of spending a few days in Leamington, Ontario, which is in Essex county. When I was there I visited the bird sanctuary of Jack Miner with my, as they were then, young children. I remember how much interested they were in what Mr. Miner was doing. It was an education and inspiration to them.

It may be said that we have a number of days set aside now for various purposes and that perhaps we have a sufficiency of them. I happen to be a Protestant in religion and I belong to a church which commemorates some of the saints' days. I think of the lessons that those days bring back when one sees them recorded either on a calendar or in a prayer book. I think it is useful for boys and girls who are growing up, and for the older generation too, to remember exactly what some lives have meant to the world in which we are living to-day.

In the same way Jack Miner has given something to this country, to this continent and, indeed, to the world, because Jack Miner's birds have been found in every part of the world from time to time. I remember reading a few years ago how one of the birds he had banded had been picked up in Australia, another one in Africa, and so on. Each one was banded in Canada and carried the message of Canada across the world, giving, as it were, a challenge to other countries and other peoples to do what we were doing, to try to preserve wild life which is so beneficial to the human race.

I remember years ago reading a story about how a certain district—I have even forgotten where it was—seemed to be plagued with birds. The birds were killed, but when the birds were gone the insects came. Then the people who had killed the birds looked around to find other birds to kill the insects that were plaguing the vegetation in the neighbourhood. The birds and other specimens of wild life which we should preserve in this country are useful to the community and to society.

In spite of all that may be said about having too many days to commemorate this or that, I think this is a day that might be set aside. The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) does not intend it to be a holiday; it is intended as a day when through the press, the radio and, as the hon. member for Fort William has suggested, through the Boy Scouts organizations and other organizations of that kind, the life and work of this great citizen of Canada may be commemorated for generations.

I am glad to see that the government is placing in the estimates something a little more tangible than this bill indicates. I should like to see this amount made substantial enough that the work could be carried on or even expanded across Canada. In every province and region of this country we should have a preserve for wild life. I know there are others who wish to speak to-night, so that I shall close by saying again that I support this bill.

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the house will expect that as one of the three members from Essex county I should join with the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Brown) and the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Clark) in the tributes that have been paid to a great citizen of Canada and a citizen of the county of Essex. Jack Miner was not only a great Canadian, he was one of those Canadians who became a citizen of the world. Because of his great love of bird life and wild life his name was perhaps known better in most countries of the world than almost any other Canadian. Few Canadians, apart from men like the Prime Minister (Mr.

Mackenzie King) and others, are as well known in our neighbouring country, the United States.

In paying a tribute to the hon. member who has introduced this bill, I should like to pay a tribute also to another hon. member who through the years has silently and vigorously fought to preserve in government places the name of Jack Miner. I refer to the hon. member for Essex South, in whose riding the Miner sanctuary is to be found. Jack Miner was a great friend of the hon. member for Essex South, as well as being one of his neighbours.

I myself had a contact with Jack Miner which went over a number of years. I knew him well and my family summered not very far from where this sanctuary is. I wish to pay a tribute to-night as well as to express a word of thanks for what the name of Jack Miner has meant, not only to the citizens I represent but to the family of which I have the honour to be the male parent. My children speak of Jack Miner, as do the children of Essex county, with a pride and gratitude that I am sure would gladden the heart of any hon. member.

I remember having the privilege on one occasion of visiting the home of a great bird lover in England, Sir Edward Grey. When he found out that I had come from Canada he asked me if I knew Jack Miner. As the house will recall, Sir Edward Grey and Theodore Roosevelt, great bird lovers themselves, found in the work of Jack Miner a great satisfaction which came to them in the evening of their very busy lives.

Essex county is proud of Jack Miner. Essex county, as the hon. member for Davenport has said, is one of the great counties of Canada. With great respect I would suggest that it is the greatest county in Canada. The tributes which have been paid to-night to one of her great citizens are tributes, not only to Jack Miner but to that county itself. I know the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Skey) would have liked to join in these tributes to-night but for the fact that he had to leave the chamber. Jack Miner by his efforts has written the name of Canada in the skies of the world, and by the tributes we have paid him to-night we have written his name in the history books of our great country.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to-night to rise and support the bill proposed by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol). All my life I have been a sportsman of one kind or another; I am very fond of fishing and of shooting. I knew Jack Miner for a great many years. I have visited his sanctuary and have fed his ducks when they came around me. One thing he taught me and the youth and people of this country was that sportsmanship did not mean hogging everything; namely, shooting for the sake of shooting or fishing for the sake of fishing. Jack Miner has taught many people that the Christian religion far transcends any form of greed. He has taught the youth of this country the love of the outdoors; he has taught them how to be temperate in all things that they do.

I venture to say that Jack Miner had more to do than anybody else in the formation of Ducks Unlimited in the northwest territory, the organization which has had so much to do with the increase of the duck population in Canada. He taught people that the great thing was to play the game for the sake of the game and not just for the sake of winning. Thousands of people have been taught that lesson by Jack Miner.

There is another thing. Jack Miner has, I believe, been more responsible than any other man for plotting the flight of wild life between the north and the south.

I shall not take up any more time, except again to congratulate my hon. friend upon bringing forward this bill, because we all know what a great asset Jack Miner was to Canada. He was not only a great Canadian but an internationalist as well.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, there is little left for me to say except that I believe that if this house passes this bill it will be a fitting recognition by the members of the work of a great Canadian in this country. I believe also that the introduction of a Jack Miner day throughout Canada and its observance will focus the attention of Canadians from coast to coast upon the constant necessity of exercising great care in the conservation of our wild life. I wish to commend the hon. member for Davenport, (Mr. MacNicol) upon introducing this bill and to assure you, sir, and him through you, that I will give it my support.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, just before the minister rises to close the debate, may I at this late hour, without taking the risk of talking out the bill, simply say that we regard it as vital and that the Progressive Conservative party identifies itself with the moving of the second reading by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) and wholeheartedly supports the proposal he has made.

Hon. J. A. GLEN (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, since it is almost eleven o'clock I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. GRAYDON: Just say you will adopt it and we will get it through now.

Mr. GLEN: If the house will permit me to go on after eleven o'clock I shall be glad to proceed now.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Friday, March 29, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT

TABLING OF THIRD INTERIM REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Perhaps the house will allow me to table immediately copies in English of the third interim report of the royal commission established under order in council P.C. 411 of February 5, 1946. It is expected that copies of the report in French will be available for tabling shortly.

I may inform the house that appropriate action is being taken in accordance with the report in respect of such persons as are designated therein.

(On the orders of the day):

Mr. GRAYDON: I believe the tabling of the royal commission's third interim report is a matter of sufficient public interest to warrant some further elucidation from the Prime Minister. I take it that the report contains certain names of persons who have been apprehended or who will be charged later as a result of the report. It would be of interest to the house if the names of those persons, and the charges against them, were made public now rather than at the time of publication of the report itself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is my hon. friend asking for the names of those named in the report I have just tabled?

Mr. GRAYDON: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I can give them to the house. The names are: Eric Adams, Israel Halperin, Durnford Smith, J. S. Benning, and Squadron Leader F. W. Poland. That is the list.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) presented the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the standing committees of the house, as follows:

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messrs:

Baker
Benidickson
Brooks
Brunelle
Casselman
Coldwell
Cote (Verdun)
Cote (Matapedia-Matane)
Cruickshank
Diefenbaker
Fair
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Graydon
Green
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Jaenicke
Knowles
MacNicol
Manross
Marquis
Martin
Mutch
Parent
Pouliot
Raymond (Wright)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Richard (Gloucester)
Smith (Calgary West)
Winters—29

(Quorum 10)

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Messrs:

Adamson
Archibald
Ashby
Aylesworth
Beaudoin
Beaudry
Belzile
Bentley
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Cumberland)
Blair
Bonnier
Bourget
Breithaupt
Brooks
Campbell
Chevrier
Church
Cloutier
Drope
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Gagnon
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gourd
Grant
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Herridge
Hodgson
Irvine
Johnston
Knight
Lesage
Little
Maybank
Mayhew
McIvor
McCulloch (Pictou)
McKay
Michaud
Mullins
Mutch
Pearkes
Picard
Pouliot
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Robinson (Bruce)
Ross (Souris)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Shaw
Smith (York North)
Stephenson
Viau
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
White (Middlesex East)
Whitman
Winters—60

(Quorum 20)

PRIVATE BILLS

Messrs:

Black (Yukon)
Bonnier
Boucher
Bowerman
Brooks
Brown
Charlton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Cote (Verdun)
Croll
Dechene
Dubois
Ferguson
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gariepy
Gladstone
Grant
Halle
Hamel
Hazen
Healy
Hlynka
Laurendeau
Lennard
Little
Lockhart
Macdonald (Halifax)
MacLean
Matthews (Brandon)
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Maybank
Mayhew
McCuaig
McGregor
Murphy
Nixon
Parent
Picard
Probe
Richard (Gloucester)
Rose
Ross (St. Paul's)
Sinclair (Ontario)
Sinnott
Stokes
Townley-Smith
Webb
Whitman
Wylie—50.

(Quorum 15)

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Messrs:

Argue
Arsenault
Beaudry
Belzile
Black (Cumberland)
Blackmore
Bradette
Breithaupt
Cleaver
Cote (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Dechene
Dionne (Beauce)
Dorion
Fleming
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser
Fulton
Gour
Hackett
Harkness
Harris (Danforth)
Hazen
Ilsley
Irvine
Isnor
Jackman
Jutras
Lesage
Low
Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario)
MacNaught
Manross
Marier
Marquis
Maybank
Mayhew
McIlraith
Michaud
Murphy
Nixon
Picard
Pinard
Quelch
Rinfret
Ross (Souris)
Sinclair (Ontario)
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Strum (Mrs.)
Thatcher
Tucker—50.

(Quorum 15)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Messrs:

Argue
Arsenault
Beaudry
Black (Yukon)
Boucher
Bradette
Burton
Case
Cleaver
Cockeram
Cote (Verdun)
Cote (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Diefenbaker
Dionne
Ferguson
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gladstone
Golding
Grant
Green
Hamel
Harris (Danforth)
Homuth
Howe
Isnor
Jackman
Jaenicke
Johnston
Kirk
Marshall
Maybank
McCubbin
Picard
Pinard
Raymond (Wright)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Rinfret
Rowe
Smith (Calgary West)
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Stuart (Charlotte)
Thatcher
Warren
Winkler—50.

(Quorum 15)

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Messrs:

Argue
Arsenault
Barrett
Beaudoin
Belzile
Bentley
Bertrand (Prescott)
Black (Cumberland)
Black (Huntingdon)
Bryce
Burton
Cardiff
Charlton
Clark
Cloutier
Cote (Matapedia-Matane)
Coyle
Cruickshank
Dechene
Desmond
Diefenbaker
Douglas
Drope
Dubois
Fair
Farquhar
Fontaine
Gagnon
Gardiner
Gibson (Comox Alberni)
Golding
Gour
Hackett
Halle
Harkness
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hatfield
Jutras
Kirk
Lapalme
Laurendeau
Leger
Lesage
Matthews (Brandon)
McCubbin
McGarry
McLure
Menary
Michaud
Quelch
Ross (Souris)
Senn
Sinnott
Townley-Smith
Tucker
Warren
Webb
Whitman
Wright
Wylie—60.

(Quorum 20)

STANDING ORDERS

Messrs:

Bertrand (Prescott)
Bowerman
Brunelle
Cardiff
Daniel
Denis
Hamel
Jaques
Knowles
Lapalme
MacLean
Marier
Murphy
Pinard
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Sinnott
Smith (York North)
Stokes
Stuart
Tustin—20

(Quorum 8)

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Messrs:

Archibald
Arsenault
Ashby
Baker
Belzile
Benidickson
Blair
Bridges
Brooks
Bryce
Cote (Matapedia-Matane)
Farquhar
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gillis
Hazen
Kirk
Kuhl
Langlois
Lafontaine
Leger
Lennard
Little
MacInnis
MacNaught
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McLure
Merritt
Pearkes
Reid
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Stanfield
Stirling
Stuart (Charlotte)
Winters—35

(Quorum 15)

MINES AND FORESTS

Messrs:

Adamson
Black (Yukon)
Blackmore
Boivin
Cockeram
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Gagnon
Gariepy
Gour
Gourd
Hodgson
Kuhl
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Lapalme
Little
MacNicol
Maloney
Matthews (Kootenay East)
McCann
McCulloch (Pictou)
McCullough (Assiniboia)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McGarry
McMaster
Moore
Raymond (Wright)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Ross (Souris)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Viau
Webb
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Zaplitny—35

(Quorum 10)

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Messrs:

Archibald
Baker
Beaudry
Belzile
Black (Cumberland)
Blackmore
Brown
Case
Cote (Verdun)
Croll
Daniels
Dechene
Ferguson
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gillis
Gingues
Homuth
Johnston
Lalonde
Lapalme
Lockhart
MacNicol
Maloney
Maybank
Merritt
MacInnis
McIvor
Moore
Pouliot
Raymond
Reid
Ross (Hamilton East)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Smith (Calgary West)
Viau—35

(Quorum 10)

DEBATES

Messrs:

Barrett
Brown
Desmond
Dubois
Hlynka
Knowles
Matthews (Brandon)
Pouliot
Richard (Gloucester)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Rinfret
Rowe—12.

(Quorum 7)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Messrs:

Beaudoin
Benidickson
Boucher
Bradette
Claxton
Coldwell
Cote (Matapedia-Matane)
Croll
Diefenbaker
Fleming
Fraser
Graydon
Green
Hackett
Jackman
Jaenicke
Jaques
Kidd
Knowles
Lapointe
Leger
Low
Macdonald (Halifax)
MacInnis
MacLean
Marquis
Mayhew
McIlraith
Mutch
Picard
Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie)
Reid
Sinclair (Ontario)
Tremblay
Winkler—35.

(Quorum 10)

PRINTING

Messrs:

Adamson
Arsenault
Aylesworth
Baker
Beaudry
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Boivin
Bradette
Bradshaw
Brunelle
Campbell
Castleden
Church
Clark
Cote (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Dubois
Emmerson
Fontaine
Fraser
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Golding
Halle
Hansell
Healy
Henderson
Hlynka
Kidd
Kuhl
Lacombe
Lalonde
Lapalme
Lapointe
Lennard
MacLean
MacNaught
Maloney
McCuaig
McCullough (Assiniboia)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McGregor
McClure
McMaster
Nicholson
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Strum (Mrs.)
Tustin
Viau
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Winters—54.

LIBRARY

Messrs:

Adamson	MacLean
Aylesworth	Marier
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)	Marshall
Bruce	Matthews (Brandon)
Cardiff	McGarry
Castleden	McIlraith
Cloutier	McKay
Dion	Menary
Douglas	Mitchell
Eudes	Mullins
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)	Nixon
Gauthier (Nipissing)	Pearkes
Gourd	Probe
Gingues	Reid
Herridge	Richard (Ottawa East)
Henderson	Ross (St. Paul's)
Howe	Skey
Jaques	Smith (York North)
Kidd	Stephenson
Knight	White (Middlesex East)
Lapalme	Winkler
Leger	Zaplitny—44.

RESTAURANT

Messrs:

Black (Yukon)	Lesage
Bradshaw	Marshall
Breithaupt	Mayhew
Cote (Matapedia-Matane)	McGregor
Coyle	McIvor
Gariepy	Murphy
Gladstone	Richard (Ottawa East)
Jutras	Rose
Kirk	Strum (Mrs.)
Laurendeau	Tustin
Leger	Wright—22

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

POWERS OF COMMITTEES

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the standing committees of this house shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the house, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the following be appointed to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the library so far as the interests of the Commons are concerned and to act as members of a joint committee of both houses on the library:

Messrs. Adamson, Aylesworth, Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon), Bruce, Cardiff, Castleden, Cloutier, Dion, Douglas, Eudes, Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Gauthier (Nipissing), Gourd, Gingues, Herridge, Henderson, Howe, Jaques, Kidd, Knight, Lapalme, Leger, MacLean, Marier, Marshall, Matthews (Brandon), McGarry, McIlraith, McKay, Menary, Mitchell, Mullins, Nixon, Pearkes, Probe, Reid, Richard (Ottawa East), Ross (St. Paul's), Skey, Smith (York North), Stephenson, White (Middlesex East), Winkler, Zaplitny.

Motion agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That Messrs. Black (Yukon), Bradshaw, Breithaupt, Cote, Coyle, Gariepy, Gladstone, Jutras, Kirk, Laurendeau, Leger, Lesage, Marshall, Mayhew, McGregor, McIvor, Murphy, Richard, Rose, Strum (Mrs.), Tustin and Wright be appointed to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the restaurant, as far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a joint committee of both houses on the restaurant.

Motion agreed to.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—CHANGE OF PERSONNEL

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

That the name of Mr. McKay be substituted for that of Mr. Probe on the committee on veterans affairs.

Motion agreed to.

WAR EXPENDITURES

Mr. GORDON B. ISNOR (Halifax) moved that the first report of the special committee on war expenditures and economies, presented on Wednesday, March 27, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

MILITIA ACT

PROVISION FOR PERMANENT FORCE—EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL IN DEMOBILIZATION

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Militia Act whereby provision will be made for a permanent force of officers and men in number as may be authorized by the governor in council, and for the employment during the period of demobilization of such members of the military forces as may be deemed necessary for the orderly carrying out of such demobilization.

He said: His Excellency the Administrator, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

The bill to be founded upon the resolution will contain only two sections. One will amend section 22 of the Militia Act, to remove the present limitation of 10,000 placed upon the permanent force, and authorizing such number as may be authorized from time to time by the governor in council. The second section will amend section 63 of the act by adding a subsection to provide that members of the militia who are now on active service within the terms of the Militia Act, and who continue to be employed for a time in demobilization, may continue to receive the present rates of pay and allowances, including dependents' allowance, though they cease to be on active service within the terms of the Militia Act; and will be subject otherwise to the same provisions as though they were on active service, except for matters of discipline.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

EASTER ADJOURNMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That when the house adjourns on Wednesday, April 17, it stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 24, 1946.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): In looking at this motion one thing about it strikes me; that is, that we are to close on a half day and meet again on a half day. It seems to me the house would be pretty well depleted if we closed on one half day and opened on another. Perhaps it would have been better to close on Tuesday and resume the following Tuesday or to close on Thursday and resume the following Thursday, or the following Tuesday, as the case may be. The two half days would seem to make it inadvisable to pass the motion as it is now worded, and I bring that matter to the attention of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thought that in drafting the resolution in these terms I should be meeting the convenience of the house. If, however, hon. members would prefer to have the house adjourn on Tuesday, April 16, and stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 23, I should be quite prepared to alter the motion accordingly.

Mr. MacNICOL: The trouble is we have bought our railway tickets for the other dates.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I really think it would be wiser to hold to the original motion. As a matter of fact it is a half day, but we can arrange the business of the house accordingly.

Motion agreed to.

LOAN TO UNITED KINGDOM

APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL AGREEMENT SIGNED MARCH 6, 1946

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to come into force in whole or in part on proclamation for the purpose of approving the financial agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the United Kingdom signed on March 6, 1946, and of granting authority, (a) to advance to the government of the United Kingdom before December 31, 1951, amounts not exceeding in the aggregate one thousand two hundred and fifty million dollars ($1,250,000,000); (b) to continue until January 1, 1951, the interest-free provision of the loan to the government of the United Kingdom under The War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act, 1942; (c) to cancel the amount owing by the government of the United Kingdom to the government of Canada with respect to the British Commonwealth air training plan being the sum of four hundred and twenty-five million dollars ($425,000,000); (d) to borrow for the purpose of paragraph (a) under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, 1931, sums not exceeding one thousand two hundred and fifty million dollars ($1,250,000,000); and (e) to carry out the other provisions of the said agreement.

He said: His Excellency the Administrator, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. LaCROIX: On division.

Motion agreed to.

ATOMIC ENERGY

STATEMENT AS TO INTERNATIONAL CONTROL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): With regard to the statement issued at Washington last evening that uranium and other material used in the production of atomic power, together with the scientific development of atomic energy, may be placed under international control and the manufacture of atomic bombs discontinued, I should like to ask if Canada gave prior consent to this statement being issued, which I think is a fairly satisfactory announcement if it means what it says.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend was kind enough to send me notice of his question.

I understand the statement to which my hon. friend refers is a report which was presented to the Secretary of State of the United States, for his consideration, by an advisory committee on atomic energy. The proposals in this report, to judge from the summary which has appeared in the press, are of great interest and importance. So far as I am aware they have not been adopted as the policy of the government of the United States, and the Canadian government was not consulted by the committee which prepared the report. Until the full text of the report has been received and studied in Ottawa, it would be inappropriate for me to say anything more about the proposals contained in it.

RADIO BROADCASTING

APPLICATION FOR TRANSFER OF MOOSE JAW STATION TO CROWN COMPANY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Reconstruction concerning a matter which I believe still remains under his jurisdiction. Has a decision been reached with regard to the application made on January 28, 1946, to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the transfer of radio station CHAB, Moose Jaw, to a crown company established by the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): The application referred to was duly received, and involves an important matter of government policy. It is now receiving the attention of the government, but no decision has been arrived at.

Mr. COLDWELL: May we expect an early decision?

Mr. HOWE: I hope so.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

QUESTION AS TO SETTING UP OF SENIOR ADVISORY COUNCIL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. E. LENNARD (Wentworth): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence. Has the minister considered the setting up of a senior advisory council for defence, similar to the one set up recently by the President of the United States?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): The minister will consider anything. However, I have not had notice of the question; I shall take the matter into consideration.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

CANADIAN ARMY

RATES OF PAY FOR PERMANENT FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JAMES SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence. At the last session he promised that before March 31 he would announce the rates of pay for members of the permanent force. Is he in a position to do that to-day?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): I thank my hon. friend for his question, and would say that a statement was issued to the press to-day. A special committee set up to inquire into rates of pay has completed its report. It has been under consideration by treasury board. It was found necessary to refer the matter back to the committee for clarification in certain respects. and it may be a few days before the report is available in its final form. I therefore can state, as I have in the press statement issued to-day, that it may not be possible for me to make that announcement before April 15. I should hope it might be sooner, but I have given myself just that little extra time.

SUPPLY

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL

Mr. ILSLEY moved:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $273,197,945.73, being one-sixth of the amount of each of the several items to be voted, as set forth in the estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1947, and $3,333,333.33 being an additional one-sixth of certain items of the said estimates, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, be granted to His Majesty on account for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1947.

He said: In this resolution the government is asking for an amount equal to one-sixth of the estimates. It would be impossible of course for the estimates as a whole to be voted within two months. Meantime moneys will be required to meet obligations of the government, and it was thought reasonable to ask for two months' supply.

I am afraid that the seasonal character of some of these commitments makes it improbable that one-sixth will be sufficient for two

months. However, I have never asked for more than that, and I am not asking for more to-day.

Mr. GRAYDON: This is the usual resolution offered at this stage of the session. It provides for the financing of the government service for the period prior to the passing of the supply bill. If my memory serves me correctly, in previous sessions the amount granted to the government by way of interim supply has been an amount for two months, unless circumstances arose requiring a different procedure. In this case the official opposition is prepared to allow the government one-sixth of the total estimates for the fiscal year 1946-47.

I should like, however, to make the reservation which is always made by those in the opposition under similar circumstances; that is to require from the minister and from the government an undertaking in clear terms that by consenting to the passing of this interim supply we are in no way consenting to the general estimates being passed without criticism of government policy in connection with the expenditures proposed. We should like to have a clear statement from the minister so that our position may be preserved and we may be assured that by making these grants we shall not be prevented from having a full and thorough and untramelled criticism of the estimates. With that reservation, this party is prepared to accelerate and facilitate the business of the house by providing the funds necessary for the public service for this interim period.

Mr. ILSLEY: I have pleasure in giving the assurance that is given every year when interim supply is applied for. The voting of this interim supply does not prejudice the right that every member of the house has of opposing or criticizing any item in the estimates. It is not an admission that all the items of the estimates are justified or anything of the kind.

Mr. COLDWELL: With that assurance we agree to it.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): How soon does the minister expect to bring down the budget?

Mr. ILSLEY: The date of the bringing down of the budget will be announced in due course. I am not in position to announce the date as yet. I should say with regard to the one-sixth that is being asked for that there are two items for which an additional one-sixth is being requested.

Mr. GRAYDON: A third is being requested?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: What are the items?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is to provide, subject to the approval of the treasury board, for miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses, $10,000,000. Then item 611 is to provide recoverable advances for working capital, et cetera, $10,000,000. It might be necessary to use more than one-sixth of those items in the early part of the year.

Mr. MacNICOL: What is the number of the first item?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is a Department of Finance item which will be found on page 67 of the estimates. It will be understood that we are moving from one system to another. The system prevailing for the present fiscal year was to have main estimates for non-war purposes, plus a large vote for war demobilization and reconversion purposes. That system was completely flexible. But we have taken away all flexibility, with the exception of this item of $10,000,000. I am afraid that other contingencies we could not foresee will arise and it may be found that this item is too small. At any rate it is certainly small enough. This item is for only $10,000,000 and hon. members will remember that previously these items amounted to something like $3 billion and they could be applied to any purpose. This is the only item that could be applied to any purpose. The item reads:

> To provide, subject to the approval of the treasury board, for miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses; for supplementing any of the appropriations in the demobilization and reconversion estimates; and for the temporary provision of recoverable advances for working capital purposes and for the re-advancing of any such advances repaid.

We cannot say that this item will be spent evenly over the next twelve months of the fiscal year. It may not be spent until the end, and it may be necessary to spend it nearly all at the beginning, but we must have a little more leeway than one-sixth.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think the minister is asking the house to go farther than the house is prepared to go. We are giving the government two months supply, or one-sixth. If at the end of that two months' period it is found that the $10,000,000 has been spent or that the proportion which we are now voting, that is one-sixth, has been spent, then the government can come back to the house and seek further interim supply, and parliament can decide whether or not the request should be granted.

It does seem to me that this is the thin end of the wedge. The government is asking for something that I have never seen in my ten years of parliament. I have never seen interim supply of one-third granted to any government. I suggest to the minister that he leave the matter as we originally agreed, which is the agreement normally made by the parties in the house to facilitate government business, that is, allow one-sixth of the estimates. I may point out to the minister that there has been a good deal of argument and a great deal of debate as to whether we should allow to the government even one-sixth, having regard to the circumstances. I have argued on many occasions that even in war time perhaps only one-twelfth should be granted. We have been asked to agree to one-sixth, but in connection with one or two items the government seeks to increase that to a third. If it were a question of holding up the government on their expenditures it would be a different thing, but that is not involved. All it means is that it may be a little more inconvenient for the government, and that it provides perhaps another opportunity for the opposition to raise some questions on matters of public importance when these items are brought in again because the house is now in session.

The house will be in session for the next two months. If the government find that this appropriation is not enough to cover the exigencies of the circumstances, they can then come back and ask for more. I think on reflection the minister will not wish to change what has been a regularized practice, the voting of one-sixth to cover all items. Personally I am not satisfied that we should go any further, because the next time—I am not suggesting that this is the sin of any government in particular—they may want more. When you give a government an inch, they want a mile. In this case we do not want to give them that inch.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Like the opposition.

Mr. GRAYDON: There are some oppositions that look like governments and I take that compliment as being well meant. I think on reflection the minister will understand that I am not attempting to place a stumbling block in his way. But I do not want to set a precedent which in the days to come we might have to overcome. The time to stop it is before it begins.

Mr. COLDWELL: I agree with what the acting leader of the opposition has said. Unless the Minister of Finance can advance some better reason than that which he has given, I do not think the vote should be increased. If the house were not sitting I could understand that we might be justified in doing what he suggests. The minister may have in his mind some very urgent reasons why we should do it, but unless he can give some reasons more urgent than the ones we have heard already I shall be in agreement with the acting leader of the opposition in saying that we should stick to the one-sixth.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not want to spend too much time over this. I spoke to the leader of the opposition and told him that I would want more than one-sixth of two items, and I understood it would be all right. I made the mistake in not speaking to my hon. friend who has made such a powerful speech. I want to assure him that this is not something extraordinary. Nearly every year there are some items on which we ask for more than we are asking for generally. I have been held up several times just on that point. I have sought a twelfth or a sixth, as the case may be, and then there were certain supply items on which I would want more. It is all right, though. I may have to come back in a month's time—

Mr. GRAYDON: That will do you no harm.

Mr. ILSLEY: Except that it will mean another afternoon and evening taken up.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think it is the proper thing to do.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is to save time that I am asking for one-sixth instead of one-twelfth. As I said before, we have two $10,000,000 items here that are elastic. Last year the whole three billion dollars was elastic. But now we are moving from one system to another, which the house wanted us to do, and it would make it safer if we could have a little more than one-sixth of these two items to work on. It would obviate the necessity of coming back earlier than we otherwise would have to do. But it is just as the committee says.

Mr. GRAYDON: It would perhaps remove the minister's difficulties and ours if these two particular items were taken up early in committee of supply and adopted after due debate. This would obviate the necessity of asking for interim supply again so far as these particular items are concerned.

Mr. ILSLEY: You would have to have a bill based on those two items.

Mr. HOWE: I am particularly interested in the second item No. 611.

May I point out that its purpose is to provide recoverable advances for working capital purposes. There are several enterprises that would be without sufficient working capital if we do not provide these recoverable advances. I suppose we could go to the chartered banks and make arrangements, but certainly we cannot operate without working capital.

Mr. GRAYDON: But you could come back to the house and get it.

Mr. HOWE: Working capital is something that we need right away.

Mr. GRAYDON: If that is so, these estimates have been wrongly compiled. Here are two ministers who say that they expect to use all this money now. Surely this is a twelve-months year, and surely the minister has some idea of what he requires. If he is asking for only one-third of this particular item, how does he know that that will be enough? There is no guarantee in connection with it that I can see. If he wants to come back in two or three months' time and submits that he has used the money, parliament will grant him more. but I do not think we should give him a blank cheque.

Mr. COLDWELL: I take it that this is a case of using money in a revolving fund, and if that is so the minister has put an entirely different complexion upon the item. If what the Minister of Reconstruction says is correct and I believe it is, I think the Minister of Finance is making a mistake in asking for only one-third. I think we should deal with these two particular items on an entirely different basis from the ordinary estimates, and, instead of authorizing only a relatively small proportion, vote the whole ten million dollars.

Mr. ILSLEY: The other item, No. 505, also provides, for recoverable advances, but it is not limited to that. It provides also for miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses. We think it reasonable to ask for a little more latitude on these two items because we are moving from one system to another and we do not want these arguments too often. I do not think the house wants to see us back within two months asking for interim supply. I doubt if this will last for two months. We would have asked for more of these recoverable advances if we had dared, but we are asking for only one-third, which will give us more latitude than one-sixth. No precedent is being set here. Let me make myself clear. Very often parliament is asked to grant one-twelfth or one-sixth, and sometimes a greater proportion is asked because of the seasonal character of the demands under certain items. Money may have to be spent early in the summer for some purpose, and so you pick out two or three items and in that way get quite a proportion of your expenditure by way of interim supply. But here we are asking for one-sixth of everything except of these two items, where we want more leeway.

Mr. COLDWELL: The second item, No. 611, is of an entirely different nature from the other item.

Mr. HOWE: It is not an expenditure because the money is to be returned.

Mr. COLDWELL: No, it is not an expenditure.

Mr. STIRLING: Would one of the ministers explain the recoverable advances a little further? Am I to understand that the money so recovered passes into consolidated revenue and consequently is tied up and cannot be used for further expenditures? Is that the difficulty?

Mr. HOWE: The difficulty is that we require working capital. We have several businesses operated by crown companies—Polymer Corporation, for instance—which require working capital, temporary funds perhaps for inventory and purposes of the kind. This working capital is being advanced in the form of recoverable advances.

Previously the advances were made from the war appropriation. We have advanced at different times between two and three hundred million dollars, which has all been recovered except for a comparatively small sum. These items are not expenditures. They are simply accountable advances. Without them it would be necessary to operate through the banks.

Mr. FRASER: The Minister of Finance said that it was not setting a precedent to ask for special items to go through, but I do not think that we have done it in the last five or six years.

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, yes.

Mr. FRASER: When?

Mr. ILSLEY: We will send out and get the books. We have done it within the last two or three years; we have done it nearly every year.

Mr. FRASER: I do not remember any such item going through last year.

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: I agree with the Minister of Finance on one point, that perhaps there is no necessity of having a lengthy debate over this matter, and I simply want to state

that the official opposition is not prepared to give consent to granting more than what we originally agreed to do, which I understand was one-sixth of the estimates; then if the government wants to come back for more we shall receive them with respect and with such leniency as the situation warrants. We are not holding anything up. We are just making our position clear, and I do not think anybody could ask us to do less than that.

Mr. ILSLEY: I have to accept that, of course. It will mean that I shall have to come back earlier than I otherwise would, but I cannot help it. I ask that the resolution be amended accordingly, by striking out the words "and $3,333,333.33, being an additional one-sixth of certain items of the said estimates".

Mr. COLDWELL: What we are interested in is a thorough discussion of the expenditures which the government makes. The two items are not on the same footing. The first, No. 505, is an expenditure, and I agree with the leader of the opposition that we might limit that to one-sixth. The government is engaged in very important business operations. The minister mentioned the Polymer plant, and that organization and others like it come to this house and ask for what is in effect working capital, a revolving fund. It seems to me that this second item, which is not an expenditure if it is recoverable capital, is on a different footing, and we may be in effect making it very difficult for the minister to reconvert in some instances and carry on the important business operations involved in some of the institutions under his direction. I think the resolution might distinguish between the two, and we might treat each separately, dealing with 505, and then considering the other, 611, on an entirely different basis. I should be prepared to do that.

Mr. ILSLEY: I thank my hon. friend, but 505 also provides for recoverable advances. It foes further, I will admit, and provides for expenditures and recoverable advances. But they should both be treated in the same way. However, I am in the hands of the hon. member for Peel in this matter.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am glad you are in my hands. We had better pass it with the amendment.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): The resolution will now read:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $273,197,945.73, being one-sixth of the amount of each of the several items to be voted, as set forth in the estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1947, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, be granted to His Majesty on account for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1947.

[Mr. Graydon.]

Mr. MacINNIS: By how much is the amount asked for reduced by the amendment that has been made?

Mr. ILSLEY: By $3,333,333.33.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I did not get an answer to my question. We are voting money now for carrying on the business of Canada and every business man in the country has a real interest in knowing just how soon the budget is coming down and what it will mean when it does come down. I should like to have an answer to my question as to how soon it is coming down and what it will be all about. Will it be next September or December?

Mr. ILSLEY: I will announce the date of the budget as soon as I am able to do so, and I shall have to leave the announcement of its contents until the day I bring it down.

Mr. MACKENZIE: There is precedent for that.

Mr. BENTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we cannot hear what is going on. This conversational tone between the minister and members directly opposite him is all very well, but we do not know what is taking place. We are not clairvoyant, the minister is not clairvoyant, and we do not know what he is talking about.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

INTERIM SUPPLY

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Mr. ILSLEY moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1947, the sum of $273,197,945.73 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Ilsley thereupon moved for leave to introduce bill No. 11, for grant-

ing to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1947.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On the preamble:

Mr. GRAYDON: It would be helpful if we had the bill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Shall the preamble carry?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Where is the bill?

Preamble agreed to.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I object to the title passing until we know what is in the bill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): This act may be cited as the Appropriation Act No. 2, 1946.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. ILSLEY: That is the section that has been deleted. Renumber section 4; make it section 3.

New section 3 and section 4 agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. ILSLEY moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Before the bill is read a third time I should like to say a word in connection with it. We have passed a bill giving the government authority to expend a certain sum of money. We had some debate on whether or not we would allow the government to have that privilege. I doubt whether there is a member in this chamber who knows exactly what is in the bill just passed—I am certain that I do not. I doubt whether there is anyone who knows anything about it except the Clerk. He directed the chairman and the chairman read the sections in a tone of voice that could not be heard more than a few seats from where he was sitting. We should be more businesslike in putting these bills through the house if we are going to put as much emphasis on what we are to give the government authority to do as was indicated when the resolution was before us. As a matter of fact anything could have gone into the bill and I doubt whether any hon. member would have been any the wiser.

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

Mr. BENTLEY: On division; I do not know what it is all about.

Mr. SPEAKER: On division.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Administration service—

648. Departmental administration — further amount required, $14,795.

Mr. MacNICOL: Would the minister tell us what this is all about?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have a word to say. I did not get an answer as to when the budget was to be brought down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Hon. members may laugh, but there are a lot of business men in this country who are not laughing. They want to know what is going on. What I want to know is when the budget is coming down. The business men of Canada want to know what they are going to have to provide for. Has the government any idea of what it is going to do, or is it still wandering along in the same foggy nebulous atmosphere? We want to know what is going to happen. Are we to have the budget early or not? How can business men carry on if they do not know what is to happen? How can you go on with your work if you are uncertain about what is to happen in the future? Unless a business man knows what is coming in regard to taxes, how is he to continue to carry on? We gave money to the government a little while ago; we are going to give it some more in a few months. As representatives of the people, before we vote this money we want to be assured that our rights will not be taken away from us so far as taxation is concerned.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat. I have a question to ask about an item which I understood was to be in the supplementary estimates. It has to do with a grant to the Canadian Seed Growers Association. I have had some correspondence with farmers in my riding who were

under the impression that an item of $6,100 was to be brought down in the supplementary estimates last fall, but for some reason or other it was overlooked. It was thought it would be included in the supplementary estimates before the end of the year. I have a letter which indicates that the association is entirely dependent on a grant from the dominion government. In 1928 the grant was $13,000. The number of varieties serviced was thirty-three. In 1932 the grant was raised to $18,900 and serviced 79 varieties and 1,400 individuals. On the same grant the management is endeavouring to furnish service to 295 varieties grown by 3,102 individuals.

Here the department is voting some additional money; in the estimates for the year ending March 31, 1947, I understand there is a new item of $5,000 for the Canadian Hunter, Saddle and Light Horse Improvement Society. I have no special quarrel with those who are interested in saddle and hunting horse development, but it would appear to me that money expended in promoting the work of the seed growers throughout the country would be much more usefully spent. I wonder if whoever is acting for the Minister of Agriculture can give some information as to whether this amount of $6,100 might be provided for the association next year.

Mr. ILSLEY: The Minister of Agriculture is not here, but that increased grant is not provided for in the present fiscal year. It is, however, provided for in the coming year; that is, there is an additional $6,100 in the main estimates for the coming year, as I think the hon. gentleman will find if he looks at those estimates. This now is up to a fairly substantial amount. There was an application during the present fiscal year for that grant, which was denied last fall and again when these supplementary estimates were being prepared.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The item will be included for the coming year?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is there.

Mr. NICHOLSON: How about making some provision for the expenses they have incurred in the past on the understanding that these funds would be made available?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is not provided for, and they could not have had any firm understanding. Perhaps they had an understanding from the Department of Agriculture that it would be recommended, but many grants are recommended that never find their way into these estimates.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Marketing service—

650. Subsidies for cold storage warehouses, under the Cold Storage Act, and grants, in the amounts detailed in the estimates—further amount required, $31,846.31.

Mr. STIRLING: Would the Minister of Finance explain the difference between a subsidy and a grant under the Cold Storage Act? We are accustomed to see the grants every year, but I do not understand what a subsidy is under that act.

Mr. ILSLEY: Subsidies are provided for, and I think under the name of subsidies, in the Cold Storage Act. The part of this item which relates to subsidies relates to those statutory subsidies paid under the act. There are cases which cannot quite qualify under the terms of the act, and frequently in those cases grants are made by specific items in the estimates. It is for that reason that the two terms are used, subsidies and grants. I may say that grants are never paid except on the same scale as the subsidies; there is the most complete uniformity of treatment of enterprises, whether they get grants or subsidies. In some cases they get subsidies and in other cases they get grants.

Mr. STIRLING: Year after year in these estimates, and the explanations which are given, we see a list such as we have here; and they are under the head of grants. Under the Cold Storage Act, if my memory serves me right, fifteen per cent is paid the first year and other proportions in subsequent years. Year after year they come under the head of grants.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. STIRLING: If that is the normal way in which these amounts are paid, then in my opinion a subsidy must be something quite different. It looks as if it went back to the earlier days, when subsidies were paid.

Mr. ILSLEY: No. If my hon. friend followed me I think he will find that I stated the case with complete accuracy. If he will look at page 6 of the details of the supplementary estimates he will find, under the heading "Marketing Service":

Subsidies for cold storage warehouses under the Cold Storage Act and grants.

Subsidies

Owen Sound Cold Storage Limited, Owen Sound, Ontario, $5,363.37.

That is a subsidy.

Mr. STIRLING: But the grants are ones that appear year after year.

Mr. ILSLEY: But there are subsidies which are payable under the act, and grants; and it is the grants, as I have always understood the

matter, which are frequently paid when the enterprise cannot qualify under the Cold Storage Act. Perhaps it was started before the plans were approved.

Item agreed to.

Marketing Service—

651. Fruit, vegetable and maple products and honey—further amount required, $50,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am not rising to oppose this item, which is fairly substantial, but can the minister give the house any idea why such an amount was required for temporary services?

Mr. ILSLEY: The item for temporary assistance amounts to $35,000. The explanation for that item is as follows. A carry-over of $6,837.51 of 1944-45 salaries paid out of the 1946-47 appropriation; unusually heavy shipments of potatoes from the maritimes and Quebec from April to June, 1945, necessitating the retention of inspectors in this area for longer than usual periods; pear psylla investigations in British Columbia; the establishment of a maturity inspection service on all fruits entering British Columbia shipping warehouses, and the return of a number of inspectors from military service, all resulted in the amount provided for temporary salaries proving insufficient.

Item agreed to.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

652. Passport office—administration—further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. FULTON: I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question in connection with this item. I recall that I asked him a question last session, when I first came down, and it is still unanswered. I hope the right hon. gentleman may find this one a little less controversial. It has to do with the granting of permits for travel to the United Kingdom. I think all hon. members are in receipt of numerous inquiries from people as to why they cannot be allowed to go there. Can the right hon. gentleman tell us whether there is any possibility of relaxation shortly in the restrictions on travel to the United Kingdom, or what is the present position?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As my hon. friend doubtless knows, the question is largely one of transportation and of priorities in regard to certain classes that are necessarily given first consideration. From day to day the restrictions are being somewhat relaxed, but it has not been possible to remove them all thus far.

Mr. MacNICOL: Before the item carries I do not think it is out of place to say a word by way of compliment to the passport office for the way it carried on during very trying times in the last few years. I doubt if any other office in the public service was so crushed with overwork as was the passport office. I had a great many contacts with that office, and always experienced the utmost civility. While sometimes I may have thought they were a little slow, when I would go down and see the enormous amount of work they had to do I knew I was being impatient in making an effort to rush them. I want to congratulate the Prime Minister on the way this particular branch of his department carried on during very trying times.

Mr. FRASER: I understand that during past years the salaries paid to those employed in the passport office have been about as poor as those in any department of the government, if not poorer. Employees in the passport office are trained until they become efficient, and when they reach that stage they find jobs in some other departments, and obtain transfers. These changes of personnel in the passport office have made matters extremely difficult for those in charge. Is there any possibility of offering them some incentive to stay in the passport office.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There have been times when the passport office has been heavily pressed, and also times when other branches of the government service have been even more pressed to obtain the necessary assistance to carry on the work during the war. There was a time when matters eased up to some extent, so far as passports were concerned, with the result that some transfers were made from the passport office to other branches of the public service.

I agree with my hon. friend that salaries which have been paid for certain classes of work in the public service, and particularly in the passport office, have not been—well, to say the least, anything out of the way. However, the whole question of salaries is one that will have to be gone into more completely than has thus far been possible. This is being done at the present time by the government. It is related to the whole matter of the regulation of wages, during the period of the war, and in the present transition period. I believe the reason some salaries have not been changed lies in the relationship between salaries in the civil service and salaries in industry. However, the whole matter will come up for further review, now that the period of the war is over.

Mr. FRASER: Just one further point about the passport office. It certainly is a dismal looking place. One goes up those back stairs

—I have been up and down many times. I have always received good service, but I realize that they are working under difficulties. Some change should be made, so far as their office space is concerned.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am very glad the hon. member has raised this point. I wish the passport office were the only dismal place in the service. As hon. members know, practically all departments of government are overcrowded, and lacking adequate space. However, we hope that when we ask for some additional sums to construct necessary public buildings we may have the support of hon. members opposite.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I should like to associate myself with the hon. member for Peterborough West in what he has said respecting the passport office. They have functioned well during these years, and deserve the commendation of hon. members.

Mr. COLDWELL: What progress has been made in connection with the exchange of views regarding passage across the border between our two countries?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A committee of our officials has been meeting with officials of the United States. I cannot say, however, just what the present status of their negotiations is.

Mr. COLDWELL: But the negotiations are proceeding, are they?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, they are.

Mr. FRASER: Women proceeding to Great Britain have to have exit permits, on which they must state that they are going to reside in Great Britain either permanently, or for at least one or two years. However, in the event of something happening in Canada before the expiration of that time, those persons have to apply in Great Britain to the high commissioner for transportation back to Canada. On such occasions they are treated not as Canadians, but rather as immigrants, and must take their chances on the quota. What is the present situation?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Regulations respecting admission to Great Britain are made by the British government, not by this government, but we require at present an exit permit before women are permitted to leave Canada. Persons coming to Canada fall under the general regulations. I am unable to say whether or not persons such as those described by the hon. member are covered by them. I should not think, however, that there have been any special requirements, other than those having general application.

[Mr. Fraser.]

Mr. FRASER: A Canadian woman may visit Great Britain to see relatives she may not have seen for ten years. While there, however, a close relative may die here in Canada, requiring her return. She has to apply for permission to come back to Canada, but upon her return is not treated as a Canadian. She is treated as an immigrant.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot say offhand what the immigration regulations are. The minister might help on that point, but I shall try to secure the information for the hon. member.

Mr. REID: I believe the passport office is the only important office in Ottawa in which the chief has not a telephone of his own. When one telephones the chief of the passport division he must wait for some time until that official is hunted down and brought to the telephone. I should hope that the chief of a branch as important as the passport branch should at least have a telephone of his own.

Item agreed to.

External Affairs—

654. To provide for expenses of the Canadian delegation to Bermuda for discussions with delegates from the United Kingdom and Newfoundland on civil aviation, $1,500.

Mr. JACKMAN: Why is this item not included in the supplementary estimates for the Department of Transport, or some department other than External Affairs? It seems to me it might more properly belong at some other point.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is an amount spent in connection with a delegation visiting another part of the world. The Department of External Affairs has had general supervision over all delegations which have been travelling. I should think this would be the most appropriate place to have the item.

Mr. JACKMAN: Will it be the policy of the government to charge to the Department of External Affairs the cost of all delegations visiting international conferences? It seems to me that this is a most exceptional circumstance, and that the estimate should be included among those of the Department of Transport Is it to be the policy of the government that all moneys spent abroad for the attendance of members of this government, or of its appointees, at international conferences, shall be charged to the Department of External Affairs?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I believe each case will have to be considered on its merits

or attendant circumstances. In some cases, expenses will be charged to a particular department of government, and in other cases it might be more appropriate to charge them against the Department of External Affairs.

Item agreed to.

Canada's contributions to the maintenance of external organizations—

656. Contribution towards the operational expenses of the intergovernmental committee on refugees for the year 1945—further amount required, $215,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: I rise to support the item, because I believe the work of the organization is excellent. This is the first opportunity at this session I have had to speak about refugees, and on this occasion I shall be brief.

A few days ago a gentleman got in touch with me about his brother who is in Sweden. That brother is the last living relative of the family in Europe; all the rest are dead. Other members of the family are in Canada. I might point out that the person about whom I am speaking is of Jewish origin and, as the committee knows, no race in the world's history has endured the calamity endured by the Jewish race during the war. Is there to be any loosening of the regulations so that that brother, or others in similar positions—and undoubtedly there are numbers of them—may reunite with his family?

I have another case of a girl who is now in Munich who happens to be the only living relative of another family I have in mind. I was wondering if we could not open up our hearts as Christians should and allow that girl, and others like her, to come here to join her family. I know of many of these people, and I am sure all hon. members have similar knowledge. I have a great deal of sympathy for them in view of what they have gone through and what those here with single relatives still living in Europe are suffering in mind.

Yesterday I had lunch with a doctor and he told me he was going to inspect a Jewish hospital. He was loud in his praise of what the Jews in Canada have done for medicine. If these last living refugee relatives in Europe of families in Canada are permitted to come in they may bring something with them to help to build up this country. They will bring intelligence and ability and all those things that go to make a nation. Could the Prime Minister tell us if there will be any loosening up of the regulations?

Mr. COLDWELL: Could not the government consider adopting the policy which was recently adopted by Great Britain? Displaced persons or refugees who are relatives of persons living in Great Britain are permitted to enter upon request being made and certain assurances being given by those persons in Great Britain. It seems to me that if the British people with their many problems can open their hearts in this way, a country like Canada with its sparse population can give refuge at least to persons in the situation just referred to by the hon. member for Davenport.

I also have knowledge of cases of this description. From time to time I have brought them to the attention of the department of immigration, and I must say that the officers of the department have always given the most courteous consideration to those cases. However, it is difficult to get a decision favourable in all respects even though many representations have been made over a considerable length of time. Yesterday the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mrs. Strum) brought a phase of this matter to the attention of the house, that having to do with refugee children. I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but we are most anxious to see our country give refuge to those who have suffered, regardless of race or religion, particularly when they are relatives of persons in Canada who can offer them a home and a new beginning in life.

Mr. GRAYDON: I rose originally to make an observation in connection with the intergovernmental committee on refugees. The present refugees commission was the subject of a great deal of controversy at the united nations preparatory commission and again at the general assembly. At that time discussion was had as to the advisability of setting up such a commission for the purpose of taking over the work of the old league of nations, and that would seem to be envisaged by this item having to do with the intergovernmental committee on refugees.

Perhaps the Prime Minister may desire to get further information in connection with the question I intend to ask, but I should like to know if he has any knowledge as to whether or not this is the last grant that will be made to this committee and if from now on this work will be covered by our contribution to the united nations organization. There must be some time when the work of the intergovernmental committee will cease and the work of the new refugees commission will commence under the economic and social council of the united nations. As I said a moment ago, the Prime Minister may want to reinforce his information from departmental sources, but it would be interesting to know just when the one ends and the other starts.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had anticipated that the committee would ask for an explanation of this item and I can give the departmental view on the matter. The intergovernmental committee on refugees, of which Canada is a member, was organized in 1938 with the primary object of facilitating the emigration from Germany and Austria of persons who were victims of nazi persecution. The scope of the committee's work is defined in article 2 of the rules for the constitution of the committee:

> The mandate of the committee extends to all persons wherever they may be, who, as a result of events in Europe have had to leave or may have to leave their countries of residence because of the danger to their lives or liberties on account of their race, religion, or political beliefs.

The outbreak of war and consequent military operations drastically limited the activities of the committee, yet vastly increased the problems for which it had been created. By the summer of 1945 the United Kingdom government, in particular, came to the conclusion that the intergovernmental committee, even as reconstituted in 1943, was inadequate to deal with the tremendous problem of refugees and that the establishment of new international machinery was imperative.

At the recent meeting of the united nations in London, therefore, the United Kingdom government urged that the refugee problem should be referred to the economic and social council for "thorough examination in all its aspects". This resolution was adopted by the general assembly on February 12, 1946.

On February 20 the economic and social council established a committee to examine the problem of refugees and displaced persons "of all categories" and to make a report thereon to the council at its second session, in May of this year. This committee was to be known as the committee on refugees and displaced persons and was to consist of one representative from each of twenty member nations, including Canada. On March 2 the Canadian government was advised that the first meeting of this committee would be held in London on April 8. Mr. J. G. Turgeon, as representative, and Mr. R. G. Riddell, as alternate, have been appointed to represent Canada at this meeting.

In establishing this new committee on February 20, the economic and social council decided that the director of the intergovernmental committee on refugees should be invited to sit with the new committee in a consultative capacity. Pending the establishment of new machinery for dealing with the refugee problem by this committee, the intergovernmental committee will carry on with its functions.

[Mr. Graydon.]

Then, in regard to the moneys which are required, on September 17 last it was approved that a contribution of £11,368 be made to the intergovernmental committee on refugees as Canada's share in the operational expenses of that organization for 1944. It was subsequently decided that Canada should not be asked for a contribution for 1944, but that our share of the 1944 budget should be included in a contribution for 1945.

The operating expenses of the intergovernmental committee on refugees for 1945 have been estimated as £1,100,000, and the Canadian representative at the plenary session of the committee has suggested that we base our contribution on this estimate. On the assumption that we should meet the same proportion of the operational expenses as we do of administrative expenditures for this organization, our contribution on this account for the year 1945 would be £48,263, or $214,770.35 Canadian. An amount of $215,000 was submitted. This amount may be compared with a contribution of £350,000 which is made by France.

As my hon. friend is aware, the whole matter is in the state of transition at the moment. I cannot say to him any more than that the new organization is being formed to take over the work of the old one. In regard to what the hon. member for Davenport has said, I would tell him, as he is aware, that the whole question of refugees is about the most difficult problem with which any administration is faced at the present time. So far as Canada is concerned, the one pressing feature is the question of transportation and what is involved there, as well as the number of cases which, so far as Canada is concerned, must be carefully examined in relation to the existing situation. We have at the present time a committee of the cabinet specially charged with going into the whole matter of the position of refugees but up to the present time we have not been able to admit any large number. Transportation difficulties, as I have said, would of themselves prevent that, but as the situation in the world changes we hope to take a more liberal attitude than it has been possible to take in the past.

Item agreed to.

Canada's Contribution to the maintenance of external organizations—

657. Contribution to the united nations organization working capital fund to provide working capital for the operations of the organization pending assessment and collection of regular contributions, $1,205,302.50.

Mr. FRASER: This is just to meet the requirements pending assessment? It will come off our regular contribution later?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The item makes it clear. It is a contribution to the united nations organization working capital fund to provide working capital for the operations of the organization pending assessment and collection of regular contributions. Once the regular contributions are agreed upon, this item of course will be dropped.

Mr. FRASER: It will be taken off?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: Can the Prime Minister inform the committee what is the likely amount which Canada will be obliged to contribute next year, for instance, toward the finances of the united nations organization?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That also is a question that I expected might be asked and I have the information.

Under the working capital fund arrangement adopted at the first session of UNO Canada's contribution (advance) will be 4·362 per cent of the $25,000,000 (U.S.) total or $1,090,500 (U.S.)

Basis of allocation.—The basis of allocation of contributions to the working capital fund is the average between the scales for the first and second financial years of the food and agricultural organization. This basis was adopted as a pure matter of convenience, and is well and thoroughly understood to constitute no precedent for the regular UNO allocation of expenses amongst members. The latter will be determined by the general assembly of UNO at the session in September following report of a ten-member committee on contributions. The factors to be taken into account with reference to the regular allocation will include national income and per capita income.

Working capital fund.—The working capital fund was fixed at $25,000,000 (U.S.), notwithstanding that the provisional budget was eventually cut to $21,500,000 (U.S.). The purpose of the working capital fund at this stage is to finance the expenditures included in the provisional budget, that is, expenses of the preparatory commission and of the first meeting of the assembly up to January 31, 1946, and expenses of the united nations organization for the year 1946. These were estimated at $21,500,000 under the provisional budget, which will be superseded at the next session of the assembly in September by the first regular annual budget, which may be more or less than the provisional figure of $21,500,000. The excess of the working capital fund total over the provisional estimate figure was considered desirable to allow for possible delays in working capital fund advances on the part of some members. While, as noted hereunder, 1946 contributions will also be called in 1946 following approval of the 1946 regular budget in September, the amount of these contributions which will be received before the end of the calendar year is problematical.

Advances to the working capital fund are just that—advances, and will stand as credits to the respective members. Presentation of regular estimates to the next session will be followed by calls for contributions to finance the 1946 appropriations. Under the resolutions adopted the assembly will decide at the September session the amount at which the working capital fund will be established on a permanent basis. However, the only adjustments contemplated against 1946 contributions to the regular budget are those involved in readjustment of working capital fund advances into line with the regular scale of contributions adopted at that time. Estimates for 1947 will be approved at the same session (September 1946) and contributions will be assessed in accordance with the regular scale, payable, however, only after January 1, 1947. Any reduction of the level of the permanent working capital fund might operate at that stage as a set-off against 1947 contributions.

Capital expenditures.—It might be that if a capital construction programme involving purchase of lands and construction of buildings is inaugurated in late 1946 or in 1947, any major adjustments in working capital fund advances would operate against assessments for capital expenditure, and would not effect any appreciable reduction in contributions for current account expenditures. According to very tentative estimates such capital expenditures for land and buildings might reach some $40,000,000 over a three-year period. The actual plans are very undecided at the moment. Consideration was given at one stage to financing the capital items by a loan from one of the international financial agencies, the plan being that properties in the prospective 45-acre site would remain with former owners or others on a rental basis until required to assist with amortization of the loan.

On the credit side Canada will qualify for substantial book credit on the UNO books consequent upon transfer of the league's

material assets to UNO slated for August 1, 1946. It must be appreciated, however, that the amount of transferable or usable credit involved in this transaction will be limited to something less than the book credit. In the first place book credits will be established in respect not only of a few but of several of the UNO members, (i.e. internal adjustments between UNO members will be limited) and the credits will be covered off not by cash available for expenditure but by material assets assessable against all members, including Canada.

Mr. BROOKS: Do we pay the expenses of our own delegates to meetings of united nations organization, or are they paid out of the general fund raised by assessing each member nation?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: For expenses in general, the situation varies. I know of some cases where representatives of Canada have gone to the United Kingdom and the United Kingdom has not only requested but insisted that she should meet the expenses of the delegates. On the other hand the expenses of our delegates to the united nations organization have been met by the government of Canada.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Does that mean that in addition to this contribution for which Canada will be assessed, we also pay the cost of sending our delegates to the united nations meetings?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, we will pay the cost of sending our own delegation.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Can the Prime Minister give us some idea of what that would be?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I could not, at the moment.

Item agreed to.

FINANCE

658. Bank inspection (inspector general of banks' office)—further amount required, $75,000.

Mr. FRASER: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is to pay the cost of the increased work in examining the records of banks and keeping closely in touch with the banks.

Mr. FRASER: This amount of $75,000 is quite a jump from last year's estimate of $27,000.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, a lot of special work is being done in connection with examining the books and records of the banks.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. FRASER: Is that on account of the banks having to pass on to you information re interest? Has that any anything to do with it?

Mr. ILSLEY: No, not with regard to interest. A new inspector general of banks was appointed within the last year, and it was found that the banks were keeping their books in different ways, that their practices were not uniform, so that the new inspector general instituted a thorough examination of the books and records of the banks mainly for the purpose of getting their accounting practices uniform so that we could compare the information we get about one bank with the information we get about another.

Mr. FRASER: This $75,000 will be the same next year?

Mr. ILSLEY: I doubt it.

Mr. FRASER: Will it be reduced?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not anticipate that this particular work will have to go on very long. As a matter of fact, a good deal of the work is being done by what are known as shareholders auditors who are reporting to the inspector general and working under his direction. That is not necessarily permanent and I do not think it will be.

Item agreed to.

General—

660. To provide for the expenses of the comptroller of the treasury's office—further amount required, $190,000.

Mr. PROBE: Does the auditor general's department come under the comptroller of the treasury's office?

Mr. ILSLEY: No. The auditor general does not. He is an officer of parliament, appointed by parliament, and reports to parliament through the Minister of Finance, but he is not an officer of the Department of Finance.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is pretty nearly the same thing. What is the difference between the government appointing him and parliament appointing him?

Mr. PROBE: Does the comptroller of the treasury exercise any control over cheques issued by the government of Canada?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. PROBE: Assuming that a cheque has been issued on the basis of a request from a department, the comptroller of the treasury is responsible to the auditor general?

Mr. ILSLEY: The comptroller of the treasury is responsible to the Minister of Finance. He is an officer of the Department of Finance and he does not report to the auditor general. The auditor general exercises an independent position by virtue of the fact that he is an officer of parliament, and he reviews such practices and operations of the comptroller of the treasury as he wishes to do.

Mr. PROBE: In the auditor general's report, at the end of the public accounts for the year 1945, I see quite a number of items that are queried. Does the comptroller of the treasury take steps to recover improper payments or anything of the sort when they are drawn to his attention?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not know what my hon. friend means by improper payments. If payments are legally recoverable, of course we would. I do not know whether it is the comptroller of the treasury or myself, but somebody goes right after them at once. I think the criticisms of the auditor general are criticisms, not of illegal expenditures—I do not think there are any illegal expenditures—but rather of the advisability of expenditures.

Mr. PROBE: It might have been better to say inadvisable or unauthorized expenditures.

Mr. ILSLEY: What the auditor general states in his report is naturally of much concern to the government. We do not want to be criticized by the auditor general more than we can help, but sometimes the opinion of the auditor general differs from that of the government as to what is advisable.

Mr. PROBE: Does the minister as Minister of Finance, when a financial matter is called to his attention, follow it through and get the action that is suggested? I wish to call attention particularly to an expenditure which has been given some publicity in the press and which appears on page 41 of the auditor general's report, section 157. I quote:

> Mr. Justice G. B. O'Connor of Edmonton is chairman of the Wartime Labour Relations Board, and Mr. Justice M. B. Archibald of Halifax is chairman of the National War Labour Board. Ottawa is headquarters of the boards. Order in Council P.C. 80/5000 of June 29, 1944, accepts the following submission by the Minister of Labour:
>
> The undersigned has the honour to refer to orders in council P.C. 1895 and 1896 of March 16, 1944, appointing Mr. Justice G. B. O'Connor, Chairman of the Wartime Labour Relations Board and to P.C. 1986 and 1987 appointing Mr. Justice M. B. Archibald, Chairman of the National War Labour Board;
>
> And to report that while authority has been granted to pay the travelling and living expenses of the chairmen above referred to while absent from their places of residence, the undersigned arranged with Messrs. Justice O'Connor and Archibald that Mrs. O'Connor and Mrs. Archibald's necessary living and travelling expenses while absent from their places of residence, while accompanying their husbands in the discharge of their duties, would be paid by the department;
>
> The undersigned, therefore, begs to recommend that authority be granted to pay the necessary living and travelling expenses of Mrs. O'Connor and Mrs. Archibald while away from their homes accompanying their husbands while they are discharging their duties as chairmen of the boards to which they have been appointed.
>
> The order in council is silent as to the authority relied on for the making. Attention is drawn to the provision for payment of expenses of Mesdames O'Connor and Archibald, as it is an exception from practice. In the fiscal year $8,658.33 was paid to Judge O'Connor and $6,150.01 to Judge Archibald by way of travelling and living expenses. These sums include claims paid with respect to travel and living expenses of Mrs. O'Connor and Mrs. Archibald when travelling from home to Ottawa, at Ottawa, and when travelling with their husbands to various points in Canada.

The point I wish to make is this. Does the comptroller of the treasury investigate any criticisms such as the one made here?

Mr. ILSLEY: No. The comptroller of the treasury could not do anything in these cases except to comply with the order in council or the treasury board minute authorizing payment of these judges on that basis. The comptroller of the treasury would simply look at the order in council or the treasury minute and follow that. The criticism of the auditor general is not a criticism of the comptroller of the treasury but of the government in that case for making that arrangement for these two judges. I remember the expenditure well, and I recall the sequence of events. One of the departments of government made that arrangement with one of these judges. They had to make that arrangement in order to get him to come. As the auditor general says, it is out of line with the general practice, but, after all, there was authority to pay the judges—

Mr. PROBE: I am not querying the payment of the judges.

Mr. ILSLEY: No, but there was authority to pay them. Ordinarily, in time of peace, there is no authority to pay judges, but there was under the War Measures Act such authority to pay them for doing special war services. It did not seem to make very much difference whether a judge was paid 50 per cent more per diem for himself—or thereabouts—or whether his wife's expenses were paid. That arrangement was made in one case, and in another it was exactly similar. At a certain stage the treasury board made up its

mind that this type of remuneration should not be extended but should be cut out, and therefore when other cases started to come before us, where a similar arrangement was recommended by a department, we sent them back and said, "Either pay them more per day or do something, but do not pay the wife's expenses." There are two or three judges—I do not know whether it is confined to these, but there are two or three in exactly comparable circumstances, who were paid on that basis. There have been many other judges in respect of whom a similar matter came up when the treasury board decided not to extend the practice. We did many exceptional things under stress of circumstances in time of war. Sometimes one tries desperately to get some man to take hold of something or another the next day and he attaches importance to some peculiar arrangement like that. After all, it does not make much difference financially which method is followed. I agree with the auditor general that it is an unusual practice and one which should not be extended.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is amazing that a person in Judge Archibald's position, who every day turned down requests for increased wages by people who were barely getting enough on which to exist, insisting on his own travelling expenses; that he would not undertake a position of this kind when the nation needed a person to do this work, unless he received his expenses. I am not at all convinced that Judge Archibald was just the man to do it. As a matter of fact, the consensus of the two large labour bodies is that if the national war labour board is to continue with Judge Archibald as chairman it might as well be abolished. Every day he turned down requests for increased wages, and yet he made it a condition of his serving the government that his wife should receive her expenses while she was here, and that he should receive his. It is an astounding state of affairs.

Mr. ILSLEY: I know Judge Archibald well; I have high respect for the quality of the service that he has rendered. I am not now talking about his decisions as head of the national war labour board, although I have no criticism of the decisions of Judge Archibald. During the war he put in a great deal of hard work and I certainly do not think that he has been overpaid in any particular.

Mr. MacINNIS: Neither were the workers whose requests for increased wages he turned down.

Mr. ILSLEY: Here again I do not think the hon. member's criticism should be directed to Mr. Justice Archibald or to the national war labour board. If it is valid criticism it should be directed to the persons who are responsible for framing the order, namely, the government. The national war labour board had to carry out the order. I do not want to take all the burdens and attract all the blame, but I not not think it is just to attack boards and officials who are administering orders in council. If there is anything wrong it is in the order in council itself. We think the orders in council were all right. We thought they were necessary as part of our anti-inflation policy. The national war labour board tried its best to carry out these orders according to the letter, spirit and intent. At any rate I do not think it shoud be criticized for what is in the orders in council.

Item agreed to.

FISHERIES

Department of Fisheries—

661. To provide for transportation, dressing and dyeing, and other expenses incidental to receiving and disposing of fur seal skins accruing to Canada pursuant to provisional fur seal agreement between Canada and the United States by exchange of notes dated December 8 and 19, 1942—further amount required, $100,361.34.

Mr. McLURE: Year after year this committee goes on voting money and I do not believe one-half of the members in the committee know what it is for. This is money voted to a partnership which is doing business, and have possibilities of doing a large business running anywhere from $6,000,000 to $25,000,000 annually. Canada is a one-fifth partner in this two-partner business. Can the minister tell us what Canada's net profit was in last year's business? There must be a record. If there is no net profit, why should we continue voting hundreds of thousands of dollars annually without knowing whether this business is on a paying basis. The item says that this amount is to provide for transportation, dressing and dyeing, and other expenses incidental to receiving and disposing of fur seal skins. Should we not have a breakdown of these different items? To whom are they paid? Are they all paid direct to the company or to the different companies that do the manufacturing and disposing of the skins? We were practically promised the information during last session. I should like to hear from the minister in regard to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have a small amount of information with reference to this item. Its purpose is to provide for a book-keeping entry. It had been the practice where fur seal skins were processed and dyed and then

sold in the United States, for the department to receive the net proceeds with a statement showing the gross proceeds and expenses.

The treasury officers have ruled that the expenditures should really be shown as such in the record. The amount shown herein covers expenses on skins sold in the United States in 1944 and 1945. The gross revenue was $242,537.53 or a net gain to Canada of $142,176.19.

Mr. McLURE: I take it the minister has given us a full report for 1945. On how many skins was that based? I understand that the take-off was very large last year and that this year it will be much larger, because a larger amount is being asked for, for this business. Out of a business of over $7 or $8 million worth of raw material taken from the ocean it is strange that there should be a profit of only $142.000 to the one-fifth partner. There is something radically wrong with that amount of net profit. If the minister had given $1,142,000 as the net profit I should say he would be nearer to being correct. In the interest of Canada I think this is one item that should be revenue producing. I believe that we should look into it more carefully. We sit here in the committee and pass items for hundreds of thousands of dollars and we do not know whether it is of benefit to us; yet it is the taxpayers' money that we are voting away. I shall not be satisfied until I see a break-down of items similar to this one, and this one in particular, showing whether the business is properly conducted by the authorities who are handling it and that we as the one-fifth partner in it are getting our rightful share of the profits.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I shall take careful account of the hon. member's remarks and convey them to my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, who is unavoidably absent to-day. I shall see that the information the hon. member has asked for is obtained as soon as possible.

Mr. McLURE: May the item be allowed to stand?

Mr. ILSLEY: No; this is a further supplementary estimate. If items are to be allowed to stand we might as well let them all stand, because the whole purpose of going ahead now is to pass them.

Mr. McLURE: Continue with the remainder.

Mr. PEARKES: This item refers to skins of the fur seals which are slaughtered on the islands of the Bering sea. Are they transported by Canadian or United States boats? Is all the processing done in the United States? Is it not possible for us to transport our share of the skins from the islands in Canadian boats? Could not the processing be done in part in Canada instead of its all being done in Chicago?

Mr. MACKENZIE: As my hon. friend indicated, for many years an arrangement existed with the United States government whereby the Canadian share of fur seal skins accruing to Canada under treaty provisions, from the take at the Pribilof islands, was processed and marketed with the United States government skins. Consequently, instead of receiving fifteen per cent of skins in kind, the Canadian government received the equivalent of fifteen per cent of the net proceeds.

Mr. McLURE: Twenty per cent.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Fifteen per cent; this information comes from an official of the department. Under this arrangement no appropriation was necessary for expenses of processing. marketing and so on, of the skins, because all such expenses were taken care of by the United States government prior to division of the net proceeds.

Since 1933 Canada has been taking the annual share of skins in kind, and they have, with the exception of some skins during recent war years, all been sent to London for processing. Appropriations have been made available annually to provide processing and marketing costs. For 1945-46 the appropriation is $300,000.

As above indicated, arrangements were made during several of the war years for part of the Canadian share of skins to be processed and marketed along with United States government skins and that Canada should receive the net proceeds. The treasury officer has ruled, notwithstanding that all expenses were handled by the United States government and that no accounts therefor have been received, there should be cognizance of them when the net proceeds come to hand. Expenses covering sales made in 1944 and 1945 amount to $100,361.34. The appropriation for the present year will be fully expended on current year accounts. The gross revenue for the sales of seal skins covered by the request herein was $242,537.53. During the present fiscal year to date, the gross revenue is $626,987.30.

Mr. MacNICOL: Was that $242,000 to Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes, gross revenue; less expenses giving a net profit of $142,176.19.

Mr. McLURE: I should like to have this item stand over in order to get a little more information.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. McLURE: We ought to know what our one-fifth share of the raw material amounts to; that is, the number of skins. In some years 100,000 skins are taken; I think last year something like 80,000 skins were obtained. Canada was supposed to get one-fifth of those as her proportion; and from the report we had last season part of those skins were processed in the United States and a small part in Great Britain. There is no processing plant for them in Canada; consequently they have to be processed elsewhere. When the ceiling was removed from these skins last season the selling price went up by more than fifty per cent, and I understand that those sold on the United States market averaged something like $72 gross per skin. Well, with a total of 75,000 or 80,000 skins, how does it come that we have such a small net profit?

Item agreed to.

LEGISLATION

House of Commons—

663. Estimates of the sergeant at arms—further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): Again I am going to bring to the attention of the house a matter I have brought up on several occasions; that is, the case of the protective, cleaning and messenger staffs of this house. The basic wage of these employees is $4 a day in each category, though I should think that according to responsibility and the worth of the work done there might well be a distinction as between these three groups sufficiently great to merit some differentiation in the basic wage. I would go further and say that for the parliament of Canada to be employing men at $4 a day is rather absurd. Last year I urged the government to review the wages paid. At that time His Honour the Speaker said that the matter would be taken into consideration, and that if it should be possible to do something in order to be fair to these men it would be done with pleasure. I should like to know what has been done between last December and the present time in order to be fair to the employees of this house. Furthermore, the day this house rose last December I pointed out that ex-service men were to be laid off just before Christmas by a government which was supposed to be keenly desirous of aiding returned men. I said that it was callous and heartless. The Minister of Veterans Affairs got rather wrathy and said that the case of these men had been brought to his attention and that he had taken action instead of talking about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is right.

[Mr. McLure.]

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): Those words of the Minister of Veterans Affairs were full of sound and fury but signified very little, because the action the government took was similar to its inaction in other respects. Fourteen ex-service men were laid off from their employment in this house last December. Their average service overseas was almost four and a half years. Seven were married; seven were single. The government promised it would do its best to look after these men, but it did not do so. Three of the fourteen obtained employment; I do not know what happened to the other eleven until they came back to the house. That is no way to look after the employees of this House of Commons, and I should like to know what is going to happen to these employees during the Easter recess. Are we to lay them off again in the same callous way, men who have given four and a half years of their lives to fighting for us? What plan does the government have for these men when this house prorogues later in the year? I think we are entitled to know now just what plans the government has in mind in order to see that employees of this house are given satisfactory employment when the house is not in session.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. member. He and all other hon. members may be sure that the officers of the House of Commons are doing everything possible to be agreeable to the employees; and the Speaker of the House of Commons, in dealing with the employees, never forgets that he is the representative of members on both sides of the house. Whenever we have to take on a new employee the first question asked is, "Are you a returned soldier?" We do not take on any new employee who is not a veteran. No one likes to dismiss employees who have given good service. The Speaker of the house and the officials feel the same way; we do not like to dismiss anyone, veteran or not, who has served for many years. Unfortunately, however, some of our employees have advanced in years, and it has been suggested throughout Canada that on reaching a certain age men should withdraw from employment in order to provide work for younger men, veterans and so on.

In regard to the wages paid, particularly to the constables. I am informed that the salaries paid in the House of Commons are as good as, if not better than, those paid in the different departments of the government. I should not like to resume my seat without seeking to impress upon hon. members that their Speaker is doing everything possible to give the house the best possible service at the

lowest possible cost, at the same time remembering that veterans should have the first opportunity to get jobs in this house.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I should like to inform Your Honour that there has never been any complaint, at any time, as to the nature of the service. I think we are all agreed that the service we get from the employees of this house is excellent. To some extent I accept the assurance of Mr. Speaker, but I wish to remind the government that assurances of employment do not fill babies' milk bottles, and I should like to know from the Minister of Veterans Affairs specifically what plans he has in view to give work to these ex-service men who are to be laid off from the service of this house when it prorogues, or during the Easter recess.

Mr. McILRAITH: I might add something on this subject which would be helpful to hon. members. It seems to me there is a little misapprehension about the pay being received. The actual pay of the cleaning staff in the House of Commons now works out at about $138 a month. The way it is computed is by taking $4 a day for each day of the week, for the year round, if they are on a yearly basis, or during the whole of the session if they are on a sessional basis, plus a bonus. It works out at a more substantial item than would be indicated in the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

There is one further point which in my view should be drawn to the attention of hon. members, namely, that it has been the practice, when there have been short recesses, such as we have at Easter, that these employees are kept on. They are not laid off for that short time.

One other point which ought fairly to be presented to hon. members is that it has been the practice that when sessional employees are hired, particular care has been taken to point out to them that they are hired only as sessional employees. I have not heard of any misunderstanding having arisen on the part of an employee, as far as that point is concerned.

I offer these observations in the hope that they may serve to give a better understanding of the problem.

Mrs. STRUM: In this connection I should like to refer to the pay received by people working in the restaurant. Last year I served on a subcommittee on wages, of the committee dealing with the restaurant service. I tried hard to bring about an increase in the pay of the lower-salaried people. I found there were great numbers of people whom hon. members using the restaurant do not see and who, as a result, do not receive tips. There are those who wash the dishes and the girls who carry the trays. All these have been receiving less than $2 a day or $50 a month. They get some meals, it is true. But anyone who goes out and looks for a room in Ottawa these days knows one cannot begin to pay rent and buy clothing for that amount.

We have no right to expect the parents of these girls to subsidize the government of Canada. It is no excuse to say that they live at home, and that the old man pays the rent. We have no right to chisel on the parents of those girls, nor have we any right to take them on and force them to accept such low wages.

Some of the attitudes I discovered respecting this matter of wage scales came as a great surprise to me. I tried hard to get a $10 raise for those who were receiving only $50. I find that if one is getting $200 it is an insult to offer an increase of anything less than $25. However, if one is getting only $50 a month, he should be satisfied to get only $5 a month more. I say that $5 on $50 as compared with $25 on $200 does not make sense to me.

We must remember that these people, who are valuable to us, are providing an essential service. If you and I do not eat, we cannot work. Food is a basic essential, and those who are engaged in handling it are important. We should be more concerned with the lower-paid employees in the government service. People should not be expected to go through a ten-year period of service, during which time they have had to meet rising living costs, and to get no adjustment in their wages. I would hope, therefore, that this appropriation is broad enough to give increased pay to these lower-paid workers.

Mr. GLEN: I should like to reply to the hon. member for Winnipeg North. During my term as Speaker of the House of Commons we had occasion to revise the salaries of the constables in the house. A committee was appointed, and we saw the civil service commission. The Clerk of the House and I dealt with the commission in the discussions respecting the salaries of the constables. I believe this was done in answer to a request by the then leader of the opposition, the present hon. member for Peel.

We gave increases to the staff, and I believe they were satisfied that they were being properly dealt with. However, many of the constables had left for service overseas, and their positions were being retained for them by some who were serving only on a temporary basis.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North has made a striking attack upon the administration of the house, and I suggest he must substantiate his charge by giving more particulars than he has done. I am sure the board of internal economy, as well as the officers of the house, including His Honour the Speaker, will be only too glad to rectify any errors which might have been made. I suggest, however, that the hon. member ought to give more detail.

Then, speaking to what has been said by the lady member of the house in connection with those who serve in the restaurant, let me say this. In the first place, they are asked to take the position, and at that time they are told definitely what the remuneration will be. I heard no complaints during my five years in office from any of the services in the house with regard to their remuneration—

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): They are scared.

Mr. GLEN: --and it is true that some meals are included while they serve here. I suggest that these complaints which have been made should be the matter of inquiry by the committee on the restaurant. They have been dealing with this matter, and they will deal with it in a way which will ensure justice being done to every person in the employ of the house. I am sure the committee on the restaurant would be very glad to listen to any complaints made.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I am going to answer the minister, and in doing so I shall repeat the charge made last December, as it appears at page 3748 of *Hansard:*

> I should like to draw the attention of the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the Minister of Labour to the fact that there are several messengers on this staff, men who were in the army for four or five years and who served overseas, who are going to be out of work when this house rises; and as far as I know no provision is being made by the government for their employment.

Mark you, that was just before Christmas.

> That is a heartless and callous way to treat these men.

What the hon. member for Ottawa West said is correct. They do get $138 a month. But I do not know to whom that would appear to be a large sum.

Mr. McILRAITH: That is a minimum.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): That minimum is to permanent help.

Mr. McILRAITH: No, it is to temporary help.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): Temporary, too. But there are 157 employees, thirty-three of whom are permanent. We are giving people $138 a month as income, when the average wage-earner in that group is probably unemployed for many weeks. His average income falls far below $138 a month. I wish to repeat that there are only thirty-three permanent employees out of a total of 157, and they get a minimum of $138 a month.

Mr. GLEN: Has the hon. member the names?

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I got this list from His Honour the Speaker. I can secure them from His Honour.

Mr. PROBE: May I, in as kindly a way as possible, draw to the attention of the committee the fact that this figure of $138 a month does not apply right across the board.

I have before me the *Labour Gazette* for February, which discusses the case of an employee in one of the departments at Ottawa. It may or may not deal with a member of the protective staff, or anything of that sort. This deals with the claim of a widower, aged sixty-eight years, who was employed as a messenger by one of the government departments at a salary of $89.12 a month, for a period of about a year and a half. These are the facts relating to his claim:

> The claimant is a military pensioner in receipt of a pension of $77.53 per month. On November 14, 1944, the claimant was advised that he could not receive a salary from the dominion government and at the same time draw his military pension. He was also advised that his pension would be reduced to the extent of his salary. The claimant therefore resigned voluntarily on November 14, 1944, and made application for benefit.

He was refused immediate treatment by the unemployment insurance commission, but he ultimately got it. It appears that if this man had elected to work in private industry he would have been entitled to continue to receive his pension in full as well as his salary. Had he remained with the government, in effect he would have been working for $11.59 a month.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order. The item we are considering is that dealing with the estimates of the Sergeant-at-Arms and hon. members should confine their remarks to that item.

Mr. PROBE: This might well be an employee of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): That is the item we are dealing with.

Mr. PROBE: I think this case should be investigated by the house. If he is an employee of the Sergeant-at-Arms then I am

bringing it up in the proper place. No employee of the government or of anyone else should have to work for $11.59 a month. I think it is scandalous.

Mrs. STRUM: In reply to the minister I just wish to say that the people to whom I refer are employees who get less than $2 a day. They are not in a position to take tips and they have no agency through which they can channel complaints. They have no labour union to make representations on their behalf. Anyone working for less than $50 a month must be pretty much afraid of losing his job or else he would not be working for that. If these employees had a union then they would have available the proper mechanism through which to make representations. There is only one place in this Dominion of Canada where government employees have a proper trade union, and that is the province from which I come.

Mr. GILLIS: I should like to ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs a question relating to the statement just made by the hon. member for Regina City. He claims that an ex-serviceman of this war employed—

Mr. PROBE: I did not say of this war.

Mr. GILLIS: Is he a war veteran?

Mr. PROBE: He is a military pensioner.

Mr. GILLIS: He was drawing a pension, but in 1944 he was told that he would have to relinquish either the pension or the job. Is that not a contravention of the Pension Act?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have not the details of the case before me. What was the total amount of the pension?

Mr. PROBE: It was $77.53 a month. The case is No. CU-B43 of June 27, 1945; that is the unemployment insurance commission investigation number.

Mr. GILLIS: I consider that a flagrant violation of the Pension Act and I suggest that the Minister of Veterans Affairs should look into it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is why I got the number.

Mr. MITCHELL: Let us get the record straight in connection with this case. The hon. member does not even know the facts except what are set out in the *Labour Gazette*.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: They are supposed to be right.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just listen a moment. I am trying to be helpful. There are 2,300,000 people who come under the Unemployment Insurance Act. To pick one case out of the blue and expect an answer from the minister is not, if I may put it in that way, being quite fair. I understand that is the decision of a board of referees made up of a representative of the employer, a representative of labour and an impartial chairman. I think my hon. friend should have secured all the facts before he raised the matter in this chamber, and he should have given the Minister of Veterans Affairs an opportunity of looking into the case, or given me that opportunity if it comes under my jurisdiction. I think that is the best way to clean up those cases. What we all want is to be just to the people under our jurisdiction. There is no politics about it.

Mr. PROBE: This was brought to the attention of the minister.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): We are dealing with the estimates of the Sergeant-at-Arms and I do not think this discussion is relevant.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I have just one word to say and that is I regret very much that the jurisdiction under this roof is so scattered. For instance, the reporters who take down my speeches come under the civil service commission; they are not under Mr. Speaker. The elevator men are not under the Sergeant-at-Arms; they are under the Department of Public Works. When we want to do something for them we have to go all around. This is not the fault of the Minister of Public Works because it is a situation which has existed for a long time. I think all men who do this kind of work should be under the Sergeant-at-Arms.

In this building there is a veteran of the first war who had a bullet enter his cheek and go out through his neck. He lost four ribs; he has a wooden leg, and he suffers from cancer of the stomach. He is operating an elevator in the building. I think that is most inhuman and the department of pensions should give this man a full pension. He is only getting $15 a month and it is very hard for him to open the doors of the elevator. I take another elevator in order to give him a chance.

These things should not happen. I do not blame any minister; I do not blame Mr. Speaker; I do not blame the Sergeant-at-Arms, but I do blame the heartless bureaucrats in the Department of Veterans Affairs who do not look after their own men and who force civilians to come and fight for them. It is a shame. I brought this matter to the attention of the most able parliamentary assistant to the minister. He took

the matter up with those concerned a few days ago, but it has not yet been settled. I want the minister concerned, whoever he is—I do not know; I cannot run after all the ministers at the same time—to see that this man is given a chance. He should be sent home with enough money on which to live until he feels better.

There is another man who works on the first floor of this building and who has won the Victoria Cross. That man should have some sort of honorary post, a soft job which carries a decent salary. He should be a doorman or messenger in uniform so that he could wear his decorations. He is a modest and humble man. One of the former members for Ottawa looked after him and I had to do the same. I have assured him that he has the sympathy of the whole house. While the position he now holds may not be humiliating in itself, it is not a position worthy of a man who has won the highest military distinction.

An hon. MEMBER: Maybe he was not a brigadier.

Mr. POULIOT: He is much better than the brigadiers we have in M.D. No. 5.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Earlier in the afternoon we decided that we would try to close at six o'clock and it is now about twenty minutes to six. May I suggest that there is not a subject in these supplementary estimates which could not be discussed when the main estimates are before the committee. Perhaps it could be understood that in speaking to the remaining items we will confine ourselves as closely as possible to the item with a view to getting through all items by six o'clock, or if we do not, to sit on until we do finish.

Item agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

668. Miscellaneous maintenance and adjustments (war of 1914-18)—further amount required, $800.

Mr. PEARKES: May we have an explanation how grants to McGill to cover the years from 1942 to 1945 have anything to do with the war of 1914-18?

Mr. ABBOTT: This is the annual grant of $200 to McGill for maintenance of the Canadian army museum. The curator of the museum died in September, 1940, and through an oversight the government was not billed for the $200 grant from 1942 to 1945. The amount was voted each year, but under our system of parliamentary appropriations it lapsed at the end of the year. The situation was brought to the attention of the government by McGill early this year and this $800 covers the grant for the years I mentioned.

Mr. GREEN: I should like to place before the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence a suggestion which is really a repetition of a suggestion made last year; that there should be set up a standing committee of the house on the defence forces. We are moving into a new era in the defence of this country and the defence problems are largely new. The policy is to raise a larger body of men for each of the three services than has ever been raised before. I think there will be some difficulty in raising the required number and it would be of great help if we had a standing committe of this house before whom the chiefs of staff could come and where the defence estimates could be discussed in a thorough manner. Not only would that be more efficient, but it would result in getting the members of the house back of the defence forces to a far greater degree than hitherto, and through them be of help in getting the Canadian people as a whole behind our forces. I can see nothing but good from such a move. In the United States, as the Prime Minister knows, they have in the house of representatives and also in the senate a committee on naval affairs and a committee on military affairs, and I suggest that a committee of that kind should be set up right away in this house. I think it would be of great benefit.

Mr. COLDWELL: We supported the suggestion last year and we do so again this year.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think I assured my hon. friend last year that his suggestion would receive sympathetic consideration, but I pointed out that the time was too short to do anything about it last session. But I did promise consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the suggestion of my hon. friend is a very good one and, as the Minister of National Defence has just said, it is one that he is prepared to consider sympathetically. But once again the house will have to ask itself how many committees it can stand. We are enlarging the number and it will have a bearing on the attendance in the house. I think my hon. friend's suggestion of that particular committee is a very good one.

Mr. COLDWELL: There might be a reorganization of the committees. Some of them never sit at all.

Item agreed to.

POST OFFICE

670. Post offices, including salaries and other expenses of headquarters and staff post offices and supplies and equipment for revenue post offices—further amount required, $1,234,720.

Mr. BURTON: I do not wish to delay the passing of this item, but there is something I wish to say that I could not say on the regular estimates. It will be recalled that it was only a few months ago that we passed estimates for all the departments, and I would have thought that a department like the Post Office would have been able to get much closer to its requirements than it evidently did. This supplementary vote is for $1,234,720. This seems to show that they did not use good business judgment in preparing their estimates, and I would suggest that when their estimates come up they try to get a little closer to their requirements for the year.

Mr. MacKINNON: The Postmaster General is unavoidably absent this afternoon, but one of his senior officials got in touch with me and furnished me with a very good explanation of the point just raised by the hon. member. I would suggest, however, that the explanation be deferred until the main estimates are before the committee.

Item agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS

Chief engineer's branch—

676. Dredging—British Columbia and Yukon —further amount required, $62,000.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What does this mean? I see that there is also an item for new construction. Does that mean a new dredge?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): We have purchased from War Assets Corporation "gate vessel No. 5" for use as living quarters in connection with the double shift for dredge No. 305.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Buy another and put on three shifts.

Item agreed to.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946, the sum of $4,938,873.32 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Ilsley thereupon moved for leave to introduce bill No. 12, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1946.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that the house do now adjourn. My hon. friend who is leading the opposition will probably ask about the order of business on Monday. Monday is private members' day, and the order will be private bills, senate amendments to public bills, questions. notices of motions, public bills and orders, government notices of motions, government orders.

If the house will allow me a few minutes, I should like to say a word about private members' day. I do so in the expectation that what I am about to suggest may be taken exception to by some hon. members. I would call the attention of hon. members to the desire, already strongly expressed, that we should proceed rapidly with the business of the house so as not to have the session prolonged unduly. If hon. members will look through last year's proceedings they will find that one of the reasons why the business was so considerably delayed was the length of time taken in the discussion of private members' resolutions; a length of time wholly out of proportion to the importance of the resolutions in relation to government business. The British house has found it impossible to get through important public business and at the same time have any private members' resolutions.

I have before me the British *Hansard* of last session, and at page 133 of August 16, 1945, I find the following resolution:

The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison): I beg to move,

"That during the present session:

(1) Government business shall have precedence at every sitting;

(2) The following provisions shall have effect as respects public bills:

(a) no bills other than government bills shall be introduced;

The parliament in Great Britain found it necessary to adopt that course in a post-war period because of the growing importance of public measures as distinguished from private members' resolutions and bills. I am told that it has been found necessary to follow the same course this year. An appeal has been made to, and accepted by the house that, the importance of public measures being so great, they should be considered to the exclusion of other matters.

This house has set up a committee for the revision of the rules. It is perhaps not for me to suggest how the rules should be revised, and hon. members may take strong exception to what I am going to suggest, but I should hope that the question might be considered whether some arrangement could not be made either to bring on private members' resolutions near the end of the session rather than at the beginning, or to fix a limit of time to be devoted to any single resolution. I should think that private members might introduce their respective resolutions, have one or two speeches made upon them, and then allow the house to proceed with the consideration of other motions. To take up three or four days in discussing a private member's resolution does seem to me to be a waste of time when time is very precious in view of the urgency of public matters.

I throw out that thought at the moment because it is something in which we are all interested. I do not wish to take away any rights from private members, but I think that the nature of public business in parliament to-day is such that if the government has important measures that should be proceeded with expeditiously, and is prepared to proceed with those measures, some way ought to be found of giving public business priority.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): If I may suggest it to the Prime Minister, in the British house the private member has an opportunity, limited no doubt, but an opportunity nevertheless, during the first hour of each session, from 2.15 to 3.15 p.m. of seeking information orally from the government across the floor of the house. I realize that it begins with written questions, but the supplementary debate that takes place afterwards gives the private member a wide opportunity to discuss a variety of issues which normally are present in the private member's mind, and in regard to which he can seek information from the government.

I intend at another stage of the proceedings to make some reference to this question having relation to the setting up of a committee on rules, because it seems to me that we are gradually departing from this practice in this house. I am not suggesting that anyone in particular is responsible for it, but I think the house ought to give consideration in the committee on rules to providing some system whereby private members may be enabled to make oral inquiries of the government on a much wider range of subjects, urgent and otherwise, than are permitted in the discretion of the Speaker at the present time. One day in the British house I noticed that eighty-two questions were asked and answered and supplementary questions were asked at the same time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yesterday we answered about sixty.

Mr. GRAYDON: They were not answered in the way in which they are answered in Britain, and that is my point. In addition to questions being permitted for a whole hour in Britain, there are hundreds of questions in the same position as the questions to which the Prime Minister has just referred, questions which do not reach the House of Commons at all in the ordinary verbal debate.

I suggest that more latitude should be given because I feel the restrictions at the moment are far too pressing with respect to those seeking information from the government. I do not wish to reflect upon Mr. Speaker who is courteous to us all, but I feel that we ought to have wider latitude on questions. Far too many questions are ruled out on the ground that they are not urgent, that there has not been notice given and that they are too long. I believe these are bases which will not always commend themselves to the members of the house. Now that the rules of the house are to be revised, I suggest that with reference to questions wider latitude be given, and I make that suggestion to the rules committee.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I say one word? I think our rules need a thorough revision. In addition to what the hon. member for Peel has just said, the British house has the custom of giving notice of a question which may be raised for discussion at adjournment; therefore they are able to debate it in some manner.

I am in agreement that private members' days, as we have them in the rules, involve a greater amount of time than is warranted under the circumstances under which we meet here; nevertheless we feel the private members have so few opportunities in the house to

discuss problems that are pressing to their constituents and to themselves, that we are loath to relinquish any of the rights of private members.

In this house there has been the custom of introducing two or three departments and going into supply thereon, and then have a number of departments go into supply at the end of the session. They could be spaced during the session to give private members an opportunity of raising certain matters that they think would be helpful. The point I have in mind is that if we are to conduct the business of this country as it must be conducted, with all the variety of business we have here, the rules must be revised. There is no question about that in my mind. I hope that the committee now set up will revise the rules.

It is perfectly true that in the British house the government plays a much greater part in deciding what shall be done in the house than does the government of this country; nevertheless the members there, as was said by the hon. member for Peel, have two wonderful opportunities, one at the question period and the other at the adjournment.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

Monday, April 1, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT

REVOCATION OF P.C. 6444—REFERENCE TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE—CASE OF MRS. EMMA WOIKIN

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I desire to table a copy of order in council P.C. 1262 of April 1, 1946, which is to-day, approved by the Administrator, revoking order in council P.C. 6444 of October 6, 1945, for the interrogation and, for that purpose, detention of certain persons; also a copy of a letter to the Minister of Justice from counsel to the commissioners, advising the Minister of Justice that it will not be necessary to request further orders under P.C. 6444. As this order is a matter of special interest to the house I might read it so that it will appear in *Hansard:*

At the Government House at Ottawa, Canada, the 1st day of April, 1946.

Present, His Excellency the Administrator in Council.

Whereas the Prime Minister reports that the interrogation of the several persons detained pursuant to orders under the order in council made on October 6, 1945, P.C. 6444, under the authority conferred by parliament by the War Measures Act, as being persons suspected of communicating information to agents of a foreign power, has now been completed and that counsel for the commissioners inquiring into the matter pursuant to the Inquires Act have now advised the Minister of Justice that it will not be necessary to request further orders for detention and interrogation under the said order in council;

Therefore His Excellency the Administrator in Council on the recommendation of the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister, is pleased to revoke the said order in council P.C. 6444, and it is hereby revoked accordingly.

(Signed) A. D. P. Heeney,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The letter to the Minister of Justice is dated Justice Building, Ottawa, March 29, 1946, and is as follows:

Dear Sir,

Following our discussions of to-day with regard to the probability of requests for further orders under the provisions of P.C. 6444, as indicated in our letter to you of February 23, 1946, we confirm that, particularly in view of the various prosecutions now pending, and that in such proceedings much evidence, documentary as well as oral, is necessarily being made public, we have advised you that it will not be necessary to request further orders under P.C. 6444.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) E. K. Williams,
G. Fauteux,
D. W. Mundell,

The letter is addressed to the Minister of Justice at Ottawa.

I should like to make one statement to the house on this matter which I am sure hon. members will be pleased to have. It is in reference to an impression respecting the civil service of Canada to which the espionage inquiry may have given rise, but which is quite erroneous and which I feel, in justice to the honour, integrity and good name of the public service of Canada, should be speedily eliminated.

Of the persons whose detention under P.C. 6444 the commission felt it necessary to recommend, and on whom the royal commission has to date reported adversely, not one has been a regular permanent member of the Canadian civil service. All twelve were persons either appointed during the war to temporary positions in the civil service, or temporarily commissioned in the armed forces. I need not remind the house that during the years of war the Canadian people provided hundreds of thousands of men and women for our armed forces, also provided manpower for greatly expanded production in industry and in agriculture, and at the same time personnel for the expanded war-time needs of government administration and public service. During these years the filling of war-time needs was stretched to the limit. In these circumstances, temporary appointments may occasionally have been made to

some branches of the public servcie on a basis of qualifications less rigid than is customary in selecting personnel for permanent positions in peace time. This would not be surprising. So far, however, as I have been able to ascertain, there is no evidence to date of any carlessness in this matter, among those who were charged with making appointments. In administration and in research, as in production and on the battlefields, Canada's wartime record stands second to none.

I should like to add a word about one of the persons named in a report by the royal commission of inquiry, in reply to a particular question raised in this house.

On Thursday, March 21, the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), enquired as to how Mrs. Emma Woikin, who is at present under arrest in connection with the current investigation, came to be in the cypher section of the Department of External Affairs.

Mrs. Woikin was employed by the civil service commission, after examination, in precisely the same way as are other stenographic and clerical personnel who join the government service. I want this to be clearly understood, since the hon. member referred to the fact that Mrs. Woikin is from the constituency of Prince Albert, and it is possible that some persons who do not understand the procedure in these matters might be led by the question to believe that patronage or favour of some sort was involved.

In 1943 the commission was encountering some difficulty in supplying the need for stenographers and typists to meet the war needs of various departments, and travelling examiners were sent throughout the country to recruit suitable persons wherever they could be found available. At one of the examinations held by the civil service examiner in the prairie provinces, Mrs. Emma Woikin of Blaine Lake was a candidate, and was found suitable for work as a typist grade 1.

The usual references were required of Mrs. Woikin and the normal investigation of her background was conducted. The information was that she was born in Canada, came of a good family and the report on her was favourable. As a result, Mrs. Woikin was appointed a typist grade 1 in the passport office of the Department of External Affairs on September 10, 1943.

At the time of Mrs. Woikin's appointment the pressure upon the passport office was severe. However, later in the year it grew less, and five stenographers and typists were released for use elsewhere in the department.

Mrs. Woikin's work and record were good, and she was assigned to the cypher section as a typist.

So far as present information discloses, the associations and influences that led Mrs. Woikin to become involved in the network occurred after, and not before, her employment. The possibility of this has to be recognized as one of the limitations upon the protection afforded by any investigation that may be conducted as a prerequisite to employment.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: If the Prime Minister will allow a question arising out of the order in council that he has placed before the house revoking P.C. 6444, may I say first that I think the people of Canada will appreciate the revocation of that order and the restoration to this country of the due processes of law. Does this new order in council mean that the commission will not continue to sit, or will it continue with open sittings, and will the ordinary processes of law now be followed? Is the Prime Minister in position to say whether or not, upon the evidence that has been taken before the commission to date, further prosecutions will be instituted, and whether any that are instituted will follow the ordinary course of law in the courts of the country?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope I may be able to recall all the questions my hon. friend has asked. First, the commission will continue to sit. The commissioners have not concluded their work, and I understand they will be issuing another report, possibly in a week or a fortnight. Other persons will be heard before the commission, but I am unable to say whether the commission will sit in camera or in public. The inquiries act under which the commission is carrying on the inquiry allows the commission discretion in the matter of sitting in camera or in public; it is for the commissioners themselves to decide on that point. As to what further prosecutions may take place, I am unable to say. That will depend upon what further investigations there may be, and also, I assume, upon the opinion of the legal authorities as to what further information, if any, should be laid.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Are any other persons now held on orders issued under that order in council, or have they all been disposed of?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are no other persons held under that order. Those who were so held have all been examined.

INQUIRY AS TO THIRD INTERIM REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether it is the intention of the government to distribute copies of the third interim report of the royal commission on the espionage affair? We have received copies of the first two interim reports, but not the third.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Yes. I gave instructions at the time the report was handed to me to have copies printed. I shall make inquiries as to why they have not been distributed, if they have already been printed.

HOUSING

RESTRICTION OF USE OF BUILDING MATERIALS

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Mr. Speaker, I desire to table copy of order in council P.C. 1184, of March 27, 1946, passed under the powers of the National Emergency Transitional Powers Act, 1945, the Department of Reconstruction Act, 1944, and the Department of Reconstruction and Supply Act, 1945.

The order in council provides a method of restricting the use of building materials for purposes that may be inconsistent with Canada's paramount requirement for an adequate supply of materials for housing. I have previously stated that the number of houses that are to be built during the year 1946 will in all probability be limited by available supplies of building materials. While sources of building materials have been enlarged, the demands for housing, together with the enormous expansion in other types of building, are likely to absorb materials faster than they can be produced.

Steps have already been taken to make the best possible use of available supplies. I have previously called the attention of the house to priority officer order No. P.O. 11, which requires the supplier to fill orders for government housing projects and for houses of individual veterans whose houses are 75 per cent completed. This order will later be enlarged to give priority to all housing for veterans, whether built by the government or by the individual veteran. Nevertheless, priority orders cannot be filled unless the supplies are in the hands of local dealers.

The special committee of the Canadian Construction Association that has been studying the building supply situation has recommended that steps be taken to restrict certain types of building during the period in which acute shortages will prevail. Certain municipalities and a large number of organizations, including veterans' organizations, have recommended that all types of construction other than housing be prohibited or controlled.

During the war years, the Department of Munitions and Supply maintained a rigid control of construction for the purpose of providing material for the war. During that period our citizens accepted this control as necessary for the successful prosecution of the war and its regulations were observed. However, after the end of the war, construction control regulations were no longer observed to the same degree. It was recognized by the department that it was impossible to judge from Ottawa the essentiality of different projects and the local conditions which necessarily must govern each decision. For these reasons, construction control was abolished on December 5, 1945.

In considering ways and means of giving effect to the recommendations for reestablishing the building control, we must again face the problem of a method by which due weight can be given to local conditions in deciding what buildings are to be authorized and what buildings are to be prohibited in different localities. The housing problem is not one that normally lies within the jurisdiction of the federal government. The intervention of the federal government in this field was brought about by war conditions. In this transitional period it seems desirable, wherever possible to arrange that the authority which normally exercises jurisdiction in the field of housing shall exercise the additional powers necessary by reason of the housing emergency.

In the matter of prohibiting the construction of buildings where deferment of the project will cause no serious hardships to the public, there is the added advantage that the decision can be made most effectively by the municipality. As hon. members know, a building permit must be obtained from the municipality before any building can be erected within its borders. The most appropriate time and place effectively to curtail unnecessary building is prior to the issuance of the building permit. The authority that issues the building permit is in the best position to determine whether the permit should be issued or deferred, having regard to the possibility of shortages of housing in the area, and having regard to employment conditions in the area.

The order in council therefore provides that—

> . . . every municipal body and every officer, employee or agent thereof having authority in relation to building permits shall, in the exercise thereof during the current calendar year, have power

(a) to refuse to issue a permit for the erection, alteration or repair of any building or structure; and

(b) to revoke, cancel or suspend any permit which may have been issued for the erection, alteration or repair of any building or structure.

The order in council further provides that—

Where, in any place, a permit from a municipal body or any officer, employee or agent thereof is required by law for the erection, alteration or repair of any building or structure, no person shall erect, alter or repair any building or structure in such place unless such permit shall have been issued therefor and is in full force and effect.

Effective means have been instituted to bring about a fair distribution of building material in all parts of Canada. Steps will be taken to maintain the same equitable distribution. It will then be the duty of each municipality to determine whether its quota of material should properly be used for housing, for industrial projects or otherwise. Should the municipality decide to use its building materials to build motion picture theatres or other places of amusement, that municipality can hardly complain if a shortage develops in materials for construction of houses. I feel certain that every municipality will be impressed with the necessity to provide adequate housing for its population, even if this involves deferring projects that would otherwise be desirable. Therefore I am confident that the right to control issuance of building permits will provide an effective means of building control.

There is still a need for low-rental housing for veterans and, therefore, Wartime Housing Limited is prepared to consider applications for veterans' houses for rent, provided they are received from the municipalities not later than June 1st. I suggest that each municipality should arrive at an early decision as to whether or not wartime houses are desirable under the standard conditions that govern such construction. During 1945 the Wartime Housing building programme was not undertaken until July, and, in the case of certain municipalities, not until late in the autumn, with the result that practically all the building extended over the winter months. It is to avoid this that the deadline of June 1st has been established for applications during 1946.

Mr. FLEMING: Would the Minister of Reconstruction permit a question arising out of the statement he has read. He indicates that an attempt will be made to effect an equitable distribution of building materials among the municipalities. Will he indicate to the house the basis upon which that distribution will be made? Will it be on the basis of population, or are steps being taken to ascertain the needs of the particular municipalities?

Mr. HOWE: The pattern of distribution for the past two or three years will be taken as the pattern for the following year; that is the shortage of building materials in the locality will govern the distribution in 1946.

EXIT PERMITS

CONDITIONS AFFECTING TRAVEL TO GREAT BRITAIN AND RETURN TO CANADA

Hon. J. A. GLEN (Minister of Mines and Resources): On Friday last the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser) asked the following question of the Prime Minister, as reported on page 394 of *Hansard:*

Women proceeding to Great Britain have to have exit permits, on which they must state that they are going to reside in Great Britain either permanently, or for at least one or two years. However, in the event of something happening in Canada before the expiration of that time, those persons have to apply in Great Britain to the high commissioner for transportation back to Canada. On such occasions they are treated not as Canadians, but rather as immigrants, and must take their chances on the quota. What is the present situation?

The regulations provide that all women and children under the age of sixteen years proceeding to destinations outside the western hemisphere must have exit permits as a condition of departure from Canada. The issuance of permits is restricted to certain classes, as provided by P.C. 1841. Women and children proceeding overseas for permanent residence come within these classes. All applicants are required to state the purpose for which they desire to leave Canada.

Persons other than those of Canadian birth who have not become aliens, upon leaving Canada for permanent residence abroad, relinquish Canadian domicile, and any who may subsequently apply for readmission to Canada must be dealt with as immigrants as required by the provisions of the Immigration Act. As immigrants are not entitled to priority rating for steamship accommodation, there is no possibility of such persons securing passage to Canada for many months owing to the acute shortage of westbound transatlantic passenger space.

For some time steamship companies required all passengers to sign a statement to the effect that they—the passengers—understood return transportation would not be available for two years; this was later reduced to one year. No doubt the purpose of this procedure was to impress upon travellers the fact that there was no possibility of an early return to Canada.

The only difficulty in the way of a person who had secured an exit permit and had gone to England or the United Kingdom temporarily and wished to come back earlier would be simply the lack of transportation accommodation. There would be no loss of his status as a Canadian citizen.

Mr. FRASER: That applies also to a person on whose exit permit it is indicated that he is staying over there for a year or two years?

Mr. GLEN: The immigration regulations apply only to those who desire permanent residence abroad, in which case if they desire to come back they come back as immigrants, such as the hon. member has in mind. But the person who wishes to go over for humanitarian reasons, say to see relatives in the United Kingdom who are seriously ill, and obtains an exit permit, is entitled to return to this country. The difficulty is that there is no steamship accommodation available for them and they may have to wait some time before they can get it.

Mr. FRASER: They have no priority?

Mr. GLEN: No priority.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this house has appointed the Honourable the Speaker and Messieurs Adamson, Aylesworth, Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon), Bruce, Cardiff, Castleden, Cloutier, Dion, Douglas, Eudes, Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Gauthier (Nipissing), Gourd, Gingues, Herridge, Henderson, Howe, Jaques, Kidd, Knight, Lapalme, Leger, MacLean, Marier, Marshall, Matthews (Brandon), McGarry, McIlraith, McKay, Menary, Mitchell, Mullins, Nixon, Pearkes, Probe, Reid, Richard (Ottawa East), Ross (St, Paul's), Skey, Smith (York North), Stephenson, White (Middlesex East), Winkler, Zaplitny, a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the library of parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a joint committee of both houses on the library.

Mr. COLDWELL: Was not a similar motion passed on Friday last, as reported at page 384 of *Hansard*? Is this a different matter?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That motion was to appoint the members of the committee. This motion is to acquaint Their Honours with the fact that the committee has been appointed, and with the names of its members.

Mr. COLDWELL: Two bites at a cherry.

Motion agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this house has appointed the Honourable the Speaker and Messieurs Black (Yukon), Bradshaw, Breithaupt, Cote (Matapedia-Matane), Coyle, Gariepy, Gladstone, Jutras, Kirk, Laurendeau, Leger, Lesage, Marshall, Mayhew, McGregor, McIvor, Murphy, Richard (Ottawa East), Rose, Strum (Mrs.), Tustin, Wright, a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the restaurant, so far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a joint committee of both houses on the restaurant.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this house will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both houses on the subject of the printing of parliament, and that the members of the standing committee on printing, viz., Messieurs Adamson, Arsenault, Aylesworth, Baker, Beaudry, Bertrand (Prescott), Bertrand (Terrebonne), Boivin, Bradette, Bradshaw, Brunelle, Campbell, Castleden, Church, Clark, Cote (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville), Dubois, Emmerson, Fontaine, Fraser, Gauthier (Nipissing), Gibson (Hamilton West), Golding, Halle, Hansell, Healy, Henderson, Hlynka, Kidd, Kuhl, Lacombe, Lalonde, Lapalme, Lapointe, Lennard, MacLean, MacNaught, Maloney, McCuaig, McCullough (Assiniboia), McDonald (Parry Sound), McGregor, McClure, McMaster, Nicholson, Robinson (Simcoe East), Ross (St. Paul's), Sinclair (Vancouver North), Sinnott, Strum (Mrs.), Tustin, Viau, White (Hastings-Peterborough), Winters, will act as members on the part of this house, on the said joint committee on the printing of parliament.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

WAR ASSETS—COMMISSION ON SALES OR EXCHANGES

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. What persons or companies, if any, have been paid or allowed commission by Surplus War Assets Corporation on sales or exchange of goods by that corporation?

2. What is the amount of commission to each person or company?

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Speaker, this question refers to a matter that is before the War Assets Corporation. I would have no objection

to answering it if I knew how to distinguish between commissions, price spreads, and various other rewards. My hon. friend will appreciate that War Assets Corporation deals on a wholesale basis, and that it is difficult to distinguish commissions from price spreads. I would refer him to Campion, page 130, who has a ruling on this point, as follows:

> The following are out of order as raising matters for dealing with which the rules provide a more convenient method, viz.—
>
> Questions reflecting on the conduct of certain persons whose conduct may only be challenged on a substantive motion;
>
> Suggesting amendments to bills, or asking for information which should be moved for as a return—

I call particular attention to this:

> —or dealing with matters before a parliamentary committee.

I ask that this question be dropped. The same applies to three subsequent questions, Nos. 54, 62 and 65, all of which are difficult to answer and all of which refer to matters that are being dealt with by a parliamentary committee.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister has evidently been reading another kind of literature lately.

Mr. COLDWELL: What was the authority quoted?

Mr. HOWE: It is Campion's "An Introduction to the Procedure of the House of Commons".

Mr. GRAYDON: Just an introduction.

Mr. HOWE: I am assured that G. F. M. Campion is one of the leading authorities.

Mr. COLDWELL: Have we not rules of our own in this house? If we are going to hunt all over the shop to find various authorities we can find one to support anything. This would seem to make the rules of parliament like the bible, subject to individual interpretation.

Mr. HOWE: I am glad to refer my hon. friend to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, second edition, citations 664 and 665, which cover the same point.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I placed this question on the order paper last October or November and it was not answered last session although I was promised an answer right up to the last day of the session. It simply asks:

> What persons or companies, if any, have been paid or allowed commission by surplus War Assets Corporation on sales or exchange of goods by that corporation?

I understand that commissions have been granted, and whether you call them commissions or price spreads I think the house is entitled to know what commissions have been granted to these companies on the sale or exchange of goods through War Assets Corporation. The minister says that the matter came before the parliamentary committee last year. I withdrew my question last year because the matter was supposed to be gone into by the committee, but nothing was done about it. The committee met only eight times, and we were unable to get the information. I want this question to stand. I do not intend to withdraw it unless ordered to do so by the house.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend I think is a member of the committee, and it meets tomorrow.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. HOWE: It is a perfectly proper question to go before the committee. The officers are there to furnish answers to questions asked. If my hon. friend does not want to distinguish between commissions and price spreads, if we include both, it would run into several hundred transactions and it might not be possible for our people to sort out all the transactions where either commission or price spreads were allowed.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I understand that sales were made by War Assets to companies and commissions allowed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The answer given by the minister is not debatable.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to debate the minister's answer, but have I not the right to find out why a perfectly reasonable question like No. 65, to which none of the statements made by the minister apply should be dropped? The question reads—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It is the rule and practice in this house that an answer given by a minister to a question is not debatable, but if hon. members wish to amend the standing orders of the house, that is their privilege. So far as the two other questions mentioned by the minister are concerned, the hon. member can ask for an explanation when we reach them. Question dropped.

NATIONAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION CONVERSION PLAN

Mr. LENNARD:

1. Is the National Housing Administration conversion plan being extended in Canada?

2. If not, when did the extension cease, and why?

3. How many homes were converted in Canada under this plan to December 1, 1945?

4. How many in the area of Hamilton, Ontario, and at what street addresses?

5. What has been the cost of conversion of such houses in the Hamilton area?

6. How many inspectors, janitors and other persons are or have been employed in connection with the operation of this plan in the Hamilton area?

7. Who are they, and what amount is being or has been paid to each of them in salary and expenses?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1 and 2. The Home Conversion Plan is still in effect but few conversions are taking place because of the lack of availability of large houses suitable for conversion.

3. Conversions completed as at December 1, 1945, were 246, providing 1964 housing units. Houses in the process of being converted on that date were 14, providing 144 housing units.

4 and 5. Twenty located at:

Address	Total Conversion Cost	Owner's Contribution	Net Cost to Crown
46 Arkledun Ave.	$ 12,066 21	Nil	$ 12,066 21
166 Main St., West	13,795 75	$ 1,400 00	12,395 75
68 Arkledun Ave.	13,011 16	Nil	13,011 16
79 Arkledun Ave.	15,721 56	Nil	15,721 56
415 King St. East	12,018 37	Nil	12,018 37
576 Main St. East	9,359 99	1,812 00	7,547 99
72 Victoria Ave. South	12,487 98	150 00	12,337 98
70 Main St. West	10,690 62	215 00	10,475 62
28 Myrtle Ave.	7,108 48	Nil	7,108 48
51 Blake St.	13,730 56	500 00	13,230 56
800 Main St. East	9,877 61	Nil	9,877 61
11 Torrance St. (Burlington)	11,587 42	809 00	10,778 42
268 James St. South	22,544 31	1,125 00	21,419 31
610 King St. East	24,122 70	Nil	24,122 70
393 Aberdeen Ave.	10,597 18	Nil	10,597 18
258 Bay St. South	18,105 01	1,144 00	16,961 01
1078 Beach Blvd.	23,042 89	1,139 00	21,903 89
78 Victoria Ave. South	11,455 75	Nil	11,455 75
609 Beach Blvd.	18,322 97	Nil	18,322 97
157 Hughson St. South	14,244 69	1,494 00	12,750 69
Totals	$ 283,891 21	$ 9,788 00	$ 274,103 21

6 and 7.

JANITORS—

Address—Name—Date Employed—Monthly Salary.

46 Arkledun Ave., A. Hammond, Feb. 3/44-Sept. 30/44, $18.00.

46 Arkledun Ave., Victor Lyle. Oct. 10/44-July 19/45, $20/25. (Jan. 1/45)

46 Arkledun Ave., William Haist, July 20/45-Aug. 31/45, $25.00.

46 Arkledun Ave., James Hall, Sept. 1/45-Dec. 1/45, $25.00.

166 Main St. West, Samuel Foss, Aug. 12/44-Dec. 1/45, $23.00.

68 Arkledun Ave., A. Hammond, Mar. 6/44-Sept. 30/44, $16.00.

68 Arkledun Ave., Victor Lyle, Oct. 10/44-July 19/45, $20.00.

68 Arkledun Ave., William Haist, July 20/45-Aug. 31/45, $20.00.

68 Arkledun Ave., James Hall, Sept. 1/45-Dec. 1/45, $20.00.

79 Arkledun Ave., A. Hammond, Mar. 1/44-Sept. 30/44, $16.00.

79 Arkledun Ave., Victor Lyle, Oct. 10/44-July 19/45, $20.00/$25.00 (Jan. 1/45)

79 Arkledun Ave., William Haist, July 20/45-Aug. 31/45, $25.00.

79 Arkledun Ave., James Hall, Sept. 1/45-Dec. 1/45, $25.00.

415 King St. East, A. Hammond, Apr. 1/44-Sept. 30/44, $18.00.

415 King St. East, Mrs. D. Earnshaw, Oct. 1/44-Dec. 1/45, $25.00.

576 Main St. East, A. Hammond, Apr. 20/44-Sept. 30/44, $12.00

576 Main St. East, Victor Lyle, Oct. 10/44-May 7/45, $20.00.

576 Main St. East, Alec Shearer, May 8/45-Dec. 1/45, $20.00.

72 Victoria Ave. S., Mrs. A. Bolton, Apr. 15/44-July 31/45, $14.00/$20.00 (Oct. 1/44)

72 Victoria Ave. S., Mrs. M. Haist, Aug. 1/45-Sept. 30/45, $20.00.

72 Victoria Ave. S.. James Hall, Oct. 1/45-Dec. 1/45, $20.00.

70 Main St. West, Victor Lyle, Oct. 10/44-July 19/45, $20.00.

70 Main St. West, Kathleen Ward, Aug. 1/45-Dec. 1/45, $20.00.

28 Myrtle Ave., Mrs. Alma Williams, Apr. 1/44-June 30/45, $10.00/$12.00 (Oct. 1 44)

28 Myrtle Ave., Mrs. L. Whiting, July 1/45-Dec. 1/45, $12.00.

51 Blake St., James Tedford, Aug. 15/44-Aug. 31/44, $18.00.

51 Blake St., Mrs. J. Laverdiere, Oct. 1/44-Dec. 1/45, $22.00.

800 Main St. East, James Tedford, Aug. 8/44-Aug. 31/44, $15.00.

800 Main St. East, Victor Lyle, Oct. 10/44-May 4/45, $20.00.

800 Main St. East, Mrs. E. Eley, May 5/45-Dec. 1/45, $20.00.

11 Torrance St. (Burlington), F. W. Watson, Nov. 20/44-Dec. 1/45, $23.00.

268 James St. South, Victor Lyle, May 1/45-July 19/45, $25.00.

268 James St. South, William Haist, July 20/45-Aug. 31/45, $25.00.

268 James St. South. James Hall, Sept. 1/45-Dec. 1/45, $25.00.

610 King St. East, A. Hammond, Mar. 16/44-Sept. 30/44, $25.00.

610 King St. East, Mrs. Vera Clark, Oct. 1/44-Dec. 1/45, $40.00.

393 Aberdeen Ave.. Mrs. Helen Cullen, Jan. 8/45-Dec. 1/45, $12.00.

258 Bay St. South, Victor Lyle, Jan. 1/45-July 19/45. $24.00.

258 Bay St. South, William Haist, July 20/45-Aug. 31/45, $24.00.

258 Bay St. South, James Hall, Sept. 1/45-Dec. 1/45, $24.00.

1078 Beach Blvd., Mrs. W. Warden, Feb. 3/45-Dec. 1/45, $22.00.

78 Victoria Ave. S., Mrs. E. Westley, Mar. 16/44-Dec. 1/45, $12.00/$20.00 (Oct. 1/44)

609 Beach Blvd., Mrs. Edith Pilling, Apr. 13/44-Dec. 1/45, $18.00.

157 Hughson St. S., Edith Scriver, May 5/45-Dec. 1/45, $20.00.

Note: Dates in brackets indicate effective date of increased remuneration.

It is not possible to state the names of inspectors and other persons employed in Hamilton in connection with the operation of the Conversion Plan, as such persons were engaged in other activities of the National Housing Administration.

Note to answer to question No. 1: That part of part IV of the National Housing Act, 1944, which deals with home extensions, has been proclaimed in effect on April 1, 1946.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

AIR TRAINING PLAN

Mr. POWER:

1. From the date of the closing of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan, namely, March 31, 1945, to date, how much was expended by Canada on behalf of the United Kingdom for the training of R.A.F. air personnel?

2. Was an agreement outside of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan, and apart from the said plan, entered into during the year 1945, whereby after the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan had been wound up, namely, on March 31, 1945, United Kingdom personnel were to be trained in Canada on a contract basis, at a price per capita?

3. Will the amount due by the United Kingdom under the contract mentioned in No. 2 above be cancelled through the operation of Article 7 of the Financial Agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom?

4. How much money was expended by Canada under the terms of this contract: (a) in keeping open schools, units and establishments on full, partial, or shadow basis which otherwise would have been closed as a consequence of the termination of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan; (b) in retaining in the service personnel who otherwise would have been demobilized; (c) for any other purposes connected with this contract; (d) in actual training of R.A.F. personnel?

5. How much money was paid to Canada by the government of the United Kingdom in liquidation of debt arising out of this contract?

Mr. HOWE:

1. During 1945-46-fiscal year, officers of RCAF Headquarters assessed the capitation charges under the provisions of article 17 of the agreement dated 5 July, 1945, referred to in Question 2. The capitation fees so assessed amounted to $17,240,407.25 and it is considered that this represents the amount expended by Canada on behalf of the United Kingdom for the training of RAF and RN air personnel, since the agreement included both classifications.

2. Yes.

3. No. Under the terms of the agreement noted in question 2 above, the United Kingdom was allowed to discharge this debt by the amount of contributions of equipment, etc., and in fact contributed $18,772,647.85 made up as follows:

Equipment furnished directly ..	$10,855,243 55
Equipment furnished indirectly through Lend-Lease Act	5,917,404 30
Cash paid for RAF and RN pay	2,000,000 00
	$18,772,647.85

As the amount expended by Canada on behalf of the United Kingdom for the training of RAF and RN personnel amounted to $17,240,407.25 (Answer 1) the United Kingdom became entitled to a net credit in the amount of $1,532,240.60 concerning the Third Air Training Plan and Canada will not be called upon

to reimburse the United Kingdom for this amount under the terms of articles 1 and 7 of the agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom on the settlement of war claims.

4. See answer 1 above.

5. $2,000,000.

CANADIAN LOANS TO OTHER COUNTRIES SINCE 1939

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

1. To what countries has Canada made loans since September, 1939?
2. What is the rate of interest on such loans?
3. What is the repayment date of said loans?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1, 2 and 3.

	Authorized	Advanced	Balance outstanding March 15, 1946	Average interest rate	Repayment period
Under the War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act, 1942					
United Kingdom	$700,000,000	$700,000,000	$561,279,709 22*	Nil	Being paid by proceeds of sales or redemptions of British - owned Canadian securities.
* Since reduced by repayment to $538,564,403.57.					
Under the Export Credits Insurance Act					
Belgium	$ 25,000,000	$ 25,000,000	$ 25,000,000	3%	1947-76
China	60,000,000	....	....	3%	1948-77
Czechoslovakia	19,000,000	3,191,551	3,191,551	2½%	1950-54
Netherlands	125,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	3·05%	1950-76
Netherlands-Indies	15,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	2¼%	1950-54
Norway	13,000,000	8,995,000	8,995,000	2¾%	1951-59
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	3,000,000	2,775,500	2,775,500	2%	1950
Special loan for purchase of wheat, 1943 and 1944 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	10,000,000	10,000,000	7,500,000	3%	1946-49

Temporary advances under section 3 of War Appropriation Acts	Balance outstanding Feb. 28, 1946
Australia	$ 8,091,076 00
Belgium	5,745,472 00
Czechoslovakia	912 04
France	67,425,559 00
Greece	189 00
India	48,522,130 03
Netherlands	12,517,232 39
Newfoundland	6,908 30
New Zealand	201,640 00
Norway	14,046 00
Poland	8,227 36
Portugal	255 00
Union of South Africa	4 00
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	9,161,871 16
United States	3,231,397 40

Advances to the United Kingdom under section 3 of the War Appropriation Acts were included in the claims of Canada against the United Kingdom which were offset by claims of the United Kingdom against Canada and the balance of which is to be settled by the payment of $150,000,000 by the United Kingdom to Canada under agreement signed March 6, 1946. The indebtedness of the United Kingdom to Canada under the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan Agreements, the disposition of which is covered by Article 7 of the financial agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom, was carried in the accounts of Canada as an advance under section 3 of the War Appropriation Acts.

Temporary advances under section 3 of the War Appropriation Acts do not normally have any specific maturity date and are normally payable on demand when the necessary documents are ready for presentation and payment. When it is known that the country

benefiting from the advance will not wish to pay it off until some later date, for example, following an agreement on the long-term credit, they are requested to agree to the payment of interest except in those cases where the advances made by Canada are offset by arrears of payments owing by Canada to the other country in question. The rate of interest requested by Canada is an appropriate short-term rate where the advance is to be repaid in cash and the rate applicable under a long-term credit agreement, where the advance is to be repaid out of a credit provided by Canada. In accordance with this policy agreement has been reached with the government of France for the payment of interest on the advances made to France at the rate of 3 per cent per annum and the government of the U.S.S.R. has been requested to pay interest on the advances made to it, the rate depending on whether the advances are to be paid in cash or from the proceeds of the credit.

SURPLUS WAR ASSETS

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. What was the total value of the buildings, equipment, supplies, and other materials (a) sold; (b) exchanged; (c) loaned; (d) leased; (e) otherwise disposed of, by the Minister of Munitions and Supply as of February 1, 1946, under the Surplus Crown Assets Act?

2. What was the total amount received by the government for the materials referred to?

3. Who are the members of the Crown Assets Allocation Committee?

4. Will the Minister of Munitions and Supply provide this house with a complete accounting of the operations of the Crown Assets Allocation Committee and the disposal of surpluses under the Surplus Crown Assets Act?

5. What is the total amount allowed to manufacturing and other firms in double depreciation in the reconversion plans to date?

Mr. McILRAITH: It is impossible to answer the first question as it is worded. I discussed the matter with the hon. member and I understand that he is prepared to drop the first and second questions without prejudice to his right to reword the questions at a later time.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That was agreed.

Mr. McILRAITH: The answers to 3, 4 and 5 as are as follows:

3. Chairman: J. H. Berry, President, War Assets Corporation.

Members: Percy Bengough, President, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada (Representing Labour). J. F. Desmarais, Iberville, P.Q. (Representing Agriculture). W. D. Matthews, Chief Administrative Officer Department of External Affairs. E. P. Murphy, Deputy Minister, Department of Public Works. B. G. McIntyre, Comptroller of the Treasury. A. Ross, Deputy Minister, Department of National Defence (Army). Finlay Sims, Secretary, Department of Trade and Commerce. Mrs. C. H. Thorburn, Ottawa (Representing the Householders of Canada). I. T. Earl Walker, Department of Transport. W. S. Woods, Deputy Minister, Department of Veterans Affairs.

4. Under the Surplus Crown Assets Act an annual report, prepared in such form as the Auditor-General may prescribe and containing in reasonable detail particulars of surplus crown assets sold or otherwise disposed of is tabled each year as soon as possible after the 31st of March.

5. Double depreciation has been allowed on capital expenditures amounting to $270,930,-979.12 as of March 23, 1946.

WAR ASSETS CORPORATION—PRINCE RUPERT AREA—EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Mr. ARCHIBALD:

1. Has War Assets Corporation any American citizens in its employ in the Prince Rupert area?

2. If so, what is being done to replace such persons with Canadians?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes; two.

2. One of them has applied for naturalization papers; the other will be replaced on resignation.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—SASKATCHEWAN—CROP FAILURE BONUS PAYMENTS

Mr. McKAY:

What crop failure bonus payments have been made to mortgage or trust companies directly or through their agents in the province of Saskatchewan under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act during (a) 1944; (b) 1945?

Mr. GARDINER:

(a) None; (b) none.

STEVENSON FIELD AIRPORT, WINNIPEG

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Have any definite plans been made for enlarging the airport at Stevenson Field, Winnipeg (a) immediately; or (b) by successive stages?

2. If the answer to question 1(b) is yes, what are the various stages contemplated?

3. Has an estimate been prepared as to the cost of the same?

4. When will work commence on the first of these stages?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No definite plans have been approved but studies, of a preliminary nature, have been made and are continuing.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by 1.

JAPANESE FARMS—FRASER VALLEY

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. How many Japanese farms have been sold in the Fraser Valley?
2. What is the legal description and the price obtained for each property?
3. When will the balance of Japanese farms be available for purchase, under the Veterans' Land Act?
4. What steps are being taken to keep them in production pending sale?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I should like to have permission to have Nos. 1 and 2 dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: 1 and 2 dropped.

Mr. McCANN: 3 and 4, order for return.

SHIPMENTS OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. JAQUES:

How much Canadian wheat, if any, has been shipped to Russia during the past twelve months?

Mr. MacKINNON: 7,132,471 bushels.

WAR ASSETS—EQUIPMENT FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Have requests been received from school boards, or other educational bodies, for surplus equipment in the possession of War Assets Corporation which would be useful in schools and colleges?
2. Has consideration been given to such requests?
3. What is the result of such consideration?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. War Assets Corporation, in the disposal of surplus equipment and material to educational institutions, proceeds as follows: (a) Equipment and material which is saleable may be obtained on purchase, at going market prices; (b) Surplus equipment and material which is not saleable as commercial articles but which has educational value is made available to educational institutions on a basis of indefinite loan, plus the cost of packaging and freight. Furthermore, order in council P.C. 16, dated January 4, 1946, authorizes the Minister of Labour to contribute, to the extent of 75 percent of the purchase price, towards the purchase of machinery and other training equipment from War Assets Corporation by a province or municipality, for the replacement of machinery or other vocational training equipment which has been used in provincial or municipal vocational training schools or institutes for the training of tradesmen for the armed forces or workers in war industry pursuant to a war emergency training agreement and subject to conditions laid down in the order in council.

WAR ASSETS—AIRCRAFT AND EQUIPMENT

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia):

1. How many aircraft of various makes are held by War Assets Corporation at Estevan airport?
2. (a) How many airplane tires and wheels have been sold to date by War Assets Corporation; (b) when and to whom were they sold and what was the price in each case?
3. What is the last date at which aircraft stored at Estevan airport have been dismantled or destroyed?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. 160.

2. (a) Prior to January 15, 1946, a detailed record of sales of airplane tires and wheels was not kept. Since January 15, 1946, sales have been as follows:

Tires	87
Complete wheels	138
Hubs	17
Tubes	74
Main wheels	766

(b) The following is a record of sales from January 15 to March 25 inclu., 1946:

Name of purchaser	Quantity	Unit price
Tires		
Aircraft Mechanical Salvage, Montreal, P.Q...	1	$ 7 50
Aircraft Mechanical Salvage, Montreal, P.Q...	62	7 50
Modern Plastics Company, Vancouver, B.C....	18	2 50
Charles H. Babb Company, 444 Madison Ave., New York	4	6 30
Charles H. Babb Company, 444 Madison Ave., New York	2	2 22
Complete wheels		
General Equipment, Quebec, P.Q.	138	15 00
Hubs		
H. Aubin, Vancouver, B.C.	16	1 00
Aircraft Mechanical Salvage, Montreal, P.Q...	1	7 50
Tubes		
Aircraft Mechanical Salvage, Montreal, P.Q...	62	5 00
Modern Plastics Company, Vancouver, B.C....	9	1 75
Charles H. Babb, Company, 444 Madison Ave., New York	1	1 87
Charles H. Babb, Company, 444 Madison Ave., New York	2	.53

Name of purchaser	Quantity	Unit price
Main Wheels		
Sair's Tire Exchange, Winnipeg, Man.	36	7 50
Prenco Engineering, Toronto, Ontario	529	7 50
Fefferman Hide and Fur Company, Limited, Lethbridge, Alta.	201	7 50

The variance of prices for tires and tubes is due to difference in size and condition.

3. March 19, 1945, is the last date at which aircraft stores at Estevan have been dismantled.

*RHEUMATIC DISEASES — RESEARCH

Mr. BENTLEY:

1. Does the government carry on constant and extensive research and experimentation with a view to finding a cure or cures for the various rheumatic diseases, particularly arthritis?

2. If not, does the government make financial contributions to voluntary medical or other organizations devoted to such work?

3. To what organizations and in what amounts?

4. What is the government doing, specifically, to (a) find ways of eradicating arthritis; (b) assist others to find ways; (c) to help people who suffer from arthritis?

Mr. CLAXTON: Mr. Speaker, since many hon. members are receiving and sending me form letters urging the government to make a contribution to the Canadian Rheumatic Diseases Association, it might be of interest if I answer the questions orally and make a brief statement on this subject.

The answers to questions 1 and 2 are in the negative, and the answer to question 3 follows from the answer to question 2.

Question 4 is covered below.

As hon. members know, matters of health and welfare are primarily the concern of the provinces, and it is considered that research into medical conditions in Canada can best be conducted by hospitals and other institutions actively operating in these fields.

The national research council through its associate committee on medical research does, however, make grants-in-aid for the promotion of medical research. Projects approved by the committee must be carried out under competent direction in unversities or hospitals and medical schools where adequate facilities for such studies are available.

When the associate committee on medical research of the national research council was set up in 1938, rheumatism and arthritis were recognized as being among the diseases to be studied. Due to the intervention of the war active steps could not be taken in these fields.

The committee is, however, prepared to give consideration to applications for assistance in any project that gives promise of adding to knowledge regarding the cause, methods of prevention or treatment of arthritis in the same way it does to other medical research projects. No such application is pending at the present time.

With regard to the question of financial contributions to voluntary organizations, I should say that in November, 1945, the Department of National Health and Welfare asked the Dominion Council of Health for advice as to whether or not a grant should be made to the Canadian Rheumatic Diseases Association. The Dominion Council of Health consists of the deputy ministers of health of the dominion and provincial governments and others, and its purpose is to advise the dominion government on health matters. The council found that the association's activities had been largely suspended during the war and that the association had not yet established a programme of activities or secured sufficiently wide support to justify a grant at that time.

As part of its programme of health and social security measures, the dominion government's proposals to the dominion-provincial conference include assistance for complete medical, hospital and nursing service which, if carried out, would provide for the active treatment of rheumatism and arthritis.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the minister if he has offhand the information as to the number of sufferers from arthritis in the dominion? I heard within the last week that the number was very high.

Mr. CLAXTON: I think some of the representations which have been circulated to hon. members suggest that the total number of people who have been crippled from arthritis or rheumatism totals 600,000. My information is that the figure is not anything like that. There may be 600,000 people who suffer in some degree or other from arthritis and rheumatism, the number of people who are actually crippled is very much less than that. When a motion concerning arthritis, which is on the order paper comes before the house I shall be glad to give full information on it.

Mr. COLDWELL: May consideration not be given to establishing a research medical division which would look into all these chronic diseases? There are many persons suffering from them in Canada; and it seems to me that isolated provinces trying to do this work are not nearly as effective as one central organization dealing with all these chronic diseases, including sclerosis.

Mr. CLAXTON: There is an associate medical committee of the national research council which has been established since 1938 expressly for that purpose, among others.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I did not get the minister's answer as to who the persons might be who sought assistance; that was in the part of his statement referring to consideration to applications for assistance. Who does the applying?

Mr. CLAXTON: Workers who would be wanting to undertake research work in arthritis or rheumatism ordinarily, doctors and professors at hospitals and medical teaching institutions.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): In other words it is just individuals; there are no organizations that may do this. The reason I am interested is that I have this thing myself, and I have forty-seven letters from people about it, so I would like to know. I am not going to apply, though.

Mr. BENTLEY: As I asked the question, I should like to ask for a little more information.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BENTLEY: Others have been asking questions on this matter, and I just want to get a little more information.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BENTLEY: Thank you very much.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member cannot ask any further question.

HOSPITALIZATION OF EX-SERVICE PERSONNEL—DEFECTS OF SPEECH

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. Is any training given at Christie Street hospital or Scarboro Hall for servicemen and women who suffer from nervous defects of speech and stuttering?

2. If so, when was this training first initiated and on whose authority?

3. (a) What methods are used; (b) how long does the training continue in each case; (c) by whom were these methods prepared; (d) are insulin injections given stutterers at Scarboro Hall? If so, in what amounts and for how long a period?

4. Since this project was initiated (a) how many stutterers have enrolled to date; (b) how many have been discharged as corrected; (c) what is the average length of time required for the course of training?

5. What are the names and salaries of the persons employed in the training of stutterers, and for what period of time has each of these people been employed?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. Yes.

2. October, 1944; under the authority of the Department of Veterans Affairs Act.

3. (a) Speech training classes; (b) duration varies according to the nature and length of standing of the condition, of which the speech defect is one of the signs; (c) by the medical service of the Department of Veterans Affairs which follows accepted methods of treatment; (d) not directly for stuttering, although in some cases stutterers have received insulin injections in the course of treatment of their general condition. The amounts given and the duration of such treatment vary according to the nature of the condition being treated.

4. (a) Forty-eight cases with functional speech defects, in which are included stutterers, have been treated by speech therapy since October, 1944; (b) forty have improved to the point where speech therapy was discontinued; (c) in functional cases, six weeks.

5. Miss Margaret Christie McCurdy is the speech therapist and cerebral re-educationalist. Monthly salary: $175 plus $6.51 cost of living bonus. Employed by the Department at Ste. Annes Hospital, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Que., on April 3, 1945; transferred to Christie St. Hospital, Toronto, on September 14, 1945.

INCOME TAX—CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. JAENICKE:

1. Have any income tax payers refused to file their income tax returns or to pay income tax on the grounds that there is no constitutional power in the dominion government to collect income tax or that the act is ultra vires the dominion parliament?

2. If there have been any such refusals as mentioned in paragraph 1, how many in each province?

3. Has any action been taken or is any action contemplated against such persons referred to in questions number 1 or number 2 hereof?

4. If any such action has been taken what was the form of such action, and what was the result?

Mr. McCANN:

1. Yes.

2. Taxpayers refusing to file returns or pay tax on consitutional grounds have not been segregated from those who refused or neglected to comply with the Income War Tax Act for other reasons.

3. Actions are continually instituted against persons who fail to file the required returns under the provisions of sections 41 and 79 of of the Income War Tax Act and proceedings to obtain payment of the tax are continually taken under part IX of the Income War Tax Act against those who refuse or neglect to pay their tax.

4. Actions taken as described in 3 above have never been successfully defended on constitutional grounds.

INCOME TAX—$2,500 AND UNDER

Mr. DORION:

What amount was received by the government, during the last five fiscal years, from taxes on incomes of $2,500 and less?

Mr. McCANN: Statistics of taxes received by fiscal years are not maintained by income levels of the individual taxpayers. Statistical estimates projected on the basis of assessments levied provide the following information for the undernoted five calendar years.

Calendar year	Estimated total tax payable by individuals having incomes of $2,500 or less
1945	$248,000,000
1944	308,000,000 (1)
1943	350,000,000 (2)
1942	160,000,000 (3)
1941	100,000,000 (4)

(1) Including $48,000,000 refundable to the taxpayers.
(2) Including $100,000,000 refundable to the taxpayers.
(3) Including $43,700,000 refundable to the taxpayers.
(4) Consisting of $40,000,000 general income tax and $60,000,000 National defence tax; no portion of this amount is refundable.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—HOUSING—ONTARIO

Mr. STEPHENSON:

1. When will the four houses being constructed under the Department of Veterans Affairs, small holdings, on No. 2 highway about two miles east of Bowmanville, Ontario, be completed?
2. Have any of these houses been sold yet?
3. If so, to whom and at what price?
4. Who is the district officer in charge of the Department of Veterans Affairs, small holdings, in the Bowmanville district?
5. Where is his office located?
6. What are the boundaries of this district?
7. How many inspectors are employed to inspect these houses while under construction?
8. What are their names, their duties and salaries?
9. When will the houses now under construction at Welcome, Ontario, be completed?
10. Have any, as yet, been sold and how many houses will be built on this location?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. Although certain outside work remains to be done these houses are about ready for immediate occupation.
2. No, but negotiations are under way.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Mr. E. R. Donaldson, regional supervisor.
5. Dominion public building, Campbellford, Ont.
6. Region is comprised of counties of Northumberland, Peterborough, Haliburton, Victoria and Durham.
7. One.
8. Daniel MacQuistan, building inspector. $175. per month.
9. About June 1, 1946.
10. None sold yet. Present programme calls for completion of four houses on this location.

SUBSIDIES ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. What subsidies being paid on agricultural products produced in Canada as at January 1, 1946, have been subsequently discontinued?
2. What is the present floor price, if any, on these products?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Subsidies paid on vegetables for canning will not be paid in 1946.
2. There are no floor prices on these products other than minimum prices fixed by some of the provinces.

WAR ASSETS—DEBERT HUTS

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. How many huts at Debert camp have been turned over to War Assets Corporation?
2. What was the amount and value of (a) lumber; (b) other materials, salvaged by War Assets Corporation from these huts?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. None.
2. Answered by No. 1.

WARTIME HOUSING—CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS, 1942-45

Mr. BRUCE:

1. How many housing units were built by Wartime Housing in the years 1942-43-44-45?
2. What has been the cost of maintenance on such houses in each of above years?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1:	Units
In calendar year 1942	7,629
In calendar year 1943	6,121
In calendar year 1944	1,805
In calendar year 1945	1,618

2. Prior to April 1944 costs were not kept separate as between maintenance of houses and staff-houses.

Fiscal year 1944-45, $525,066.00; April 1945 to Feb. 28, 1946, $910,983.00.

NOTE: Higher cost of maintenance in 1945-46 is due in great part to expenditures on external painting.

[Mr. McCann.]

BUTTER AND CHEESE IN STORAGE

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What was the quantity of butter in storage in Canada as at March 1, 1946?

2. What was the quantity of butter in storage in Canada as at March 1, 1945?

3. What was the quantity of cheese in storage in Canada as at March 1, 1946?

4. What was the quantity of cheese in storage in Canada as at March 1, 1945?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. There were in storage: Creamery butter, 9,663,781 pounds; dairy butter, 17,304 pounds; whey butter, 78,688 pounds; total, 9,759,773 pounds.

2. There were in storage: creamery butter, 20,223,184 pounds; dairy butter, 51,782 pounds; whey butter, 66,915 pounds; total, 20,341,881 pounds.

3. There were in storage 19,894,994 pounds.

4. There were in storage 23,697,271 pounds.

FERTILIZERS AND FERTILIZER CHEMICALS

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What quantities of ready mixed fertilizers have been exported from Canada, and to what countries, during the year 1945?

2. What quantities of fertilizer chemicals have been exported from Canada during 1945, naming them, and stating to what countries exported?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1 and 2. Canadian exports of ready mixed fertilizers and fertilizer chemicals by countries, during the calendar year 1945

Country	Fertilizers manufactured Cwt.	Ammonium sulphate Cwt.	Fertilizers phosphate Cwt.
United Kingdom	17,360	..	690,820
British East Africa	40	..	..
British South Africa	..	274,540	317,560
Southern Rhodesia	..	..	37,480
British India	4,480	172,160	126,000
Ceylon	77,200	27,200	4,480
British Guiana	40	..	..
Barbados	40	..	..
Jamaica	11,404	5,500	2,600
Trinidad	40	11,200	..
British West Indies, other	3,960	..	9,099
Newfoundland	88,083	25	..
Australia	40	469,800	..
Fiji	..	2,440	..
New Zealand	8,000	47,620	..
Palestine	21,000	..	..
Brazil	640	..	..
Colombia	..	..	21,000
Cuba	1,800	..	..
Greenland	270	..	58
France	1,095,857	..	..
French Africa	1,100	..	..
Honduras	90	..	..
Iceland	25,500	39,065	50,714
Netherlands	474,282	..	..
Panama	2,500	..	..
Peru	1,500	..	..
Portugal	19,834	..	..
San Domingo	13,198	10,000	3,000
Alaska	1	..	..
Hawaii	97,300	1,414,700	175,100
Porto Rico	279,192	..	..
Uruguay	40	..	..
Venezuela	2,450	..	..
United States	5,978,194	1,149,538	1,788,048
Totals	8,225,435	3,623,788	3,225,959

VETERANS LAND ACT—WELLINGTON NORTH

Mr. MENARY:

How many farms have the Veterans' Land Act purchased in the townships of Erin, East Garafraxa, West Garafraxa, East Luther, West Luther, Arthur, Peel, Maryborough and Minto, in the riding of Wellington North?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Erin, 8; East Garafraxa, none; West Garafraxa, 1; East Luther, none; West Luther, 2; Arthur, 5; Peel, 6; Maryborough, 4; Minto, 6. As per head office records March 28, 1946.

JAPANESE NATIONALS—DEPORTATIONS

Mr. KNIGHT:

1. How many people of Japanese origin have been deported from Canada to date since the end of the war with Japan?
2. Have any Canadian citizens of Japanese origin been deported in the same period?
3. If so, how many?
4. What number of either category are at present being detained and held for deportation?

Mr. MITCHELL:

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

WAR ASSETS—TRANSCONA PLANT, DEFENCE INDUSTRIES LIMITED

Mr. WINKLER:

1. Has the Department of Munitions and Supply submitted a report to War Assets Corporation of the materials at the Transcona plant of Defence Industries Limited?
2. If so, how much (in gallons, barrels or pounds) chemicals in liquid form (giving nature) is, or will be listed for sale, and at what price?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes.

2. 1,870 tons sulphuric acid (92%), $14 to $18 per ton; 400 tons oleum, approximately $12 per ton; 400,000 lbs. acetone, approximately 10 cents per lb.; 136,400 lbs. potassium sulphate, $35 per ton.

BEET PRODUCERS—FARM LABOUR

Mr. HENDERSON:

What steps, if any, is the government taking to supply the western Ontario sugar beet producers with an adequate and efficient supply of farm labour?

Mr. MITCHELL: The following steps have been taken by the federal Department of Labour in cooperation with the Ontario Department of Agriculture, under the joint Dominion-Provincial farm labour programme:

1. Special interviews of unplaced applicants in local employment offices throughout southwestern Ontario to determine the number of experienced and inexperienced farm workers interested in sugar beet employment this year.

2. Local meetings, including those attended by managers of local employment offices, provincial agricultural officials and chairmen of county agricultural committees, to discuss local measures to meet labour requirements in sugar beet and other areas of Southwestern Ontario.

3. A canvass of Japanese families, and single Japanese, in western Canada, interested in employment on farms in the Ontario sugar beet area.

4. The possibilities of retaining a number of prisoners of war for seasonal work on Canadian farms are under review with other interested authorities.

5. Plans are under discussion with sugar beet growers and the sugar refineries for establishing a minimum wage rate for sugar beet work, and for providing suitable accommodation for housing and meals, as incentives to available civilian workers to accept employment in the sugar beet fields.

BROADCAST "SOLDIER'S WIFE"

Mr. FRASER:

What is the cost to the Wartime Prices and Trade Board to produce and broadcast "Soldier's Wife"?

Mr. MAYHEW: $4,431.78 per week.

HOUSING—PRIORITIES FOR ESSENTIAL BUILDING

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. What priorities have been provided for the purchase of essential building materials in the case of low cost housing schemes sponsored by the government?
2. Are the same priorities applicable to individual veterans who undertake construction of their own homes?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Priorities officer's order No. P.O. 11, effective March 12th, 1946, requires suppliers of building materials to make prior shipment of building materials listed in schedule A of the order into government approved low cost housing projects for ex-servicemen of world war No. 2.

2. The same priorities have not as yet been made applicable to total quantities of materials required by individual veterans who undertake construction of their homes. However, the same priorities are applicable to minimum quantities of building materials required to effect completion of homes being built by individual veterans and which are now at least 75 per cent completed.

VETERANS LAND ACT—COUNTIES OF LINCOLN AND WELLAND

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. To date, how many veterans of World War II have been placed on farms in (a) the county of Lincoln; (b) the county of Welland?

2. What are the names and locations in each instance?

3. How many applications have been received to date in (a) the county of Lincoln; (b) the county of Welland?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1 and 2. Veterans established on farms in Welland and Lincoln as per Head Office Records 28th March, 1946.

County—Veteran's name—Land description

Welland—

W. M. Blackie, Pt. lot 13, con. 1, twp. Bertie.

J. G. Sibbald, Pt. lot 1, con. 9, twp. Bertie.

E. D. Geyer, Pt. lot 5, con. 7, twp. Crowland.

D. E. Byer, Pt. lot 16, con 8, twp. Pelham.

O. W. Chambers, Pt. lot 11, con. 9, twp. Pelham.

S. R. Rogers, Pt. lot 242, twp. Thorold 1st door N. off Thorold Rd.

W. H. Urquhart, Pt. lots 31 and 32, con. 7, twp. Wainfleet.

W. B. Brown, Pt. lot 40, con. 7, twp. Wainfleet.

Lincoln—

A. E. Pyett, Pt. lots 17 and 18, con. 5, twp. Caistor.

G. C. Tufford, Pt. lot 11, con. Broken Front twp. Clinton.

J. B. Bucht, Pt. lot 12, con. 7, twp. Clinton.

S. J. Webber, Pt. lot 13, con. 8, twp. Clinton.

E. G. Gortson, Lot 20, con. 9, and lot 20 in the Gore of con. 9, twp. Clinton.

W. H. LaRose, Pt. lots 16 and 17, con. 1, twp. Gainsboro.

E. J. Taylor, Pt. lot 11, con. 2, twp. Gainsboro.

E. Longbottom, Pts. lots 12 and 13, con. 2, twp. Gainsboro.

G. R. Moyer, Pt. lot 21, con. 1, twp. Louth.

J. W. I. Henry, Pt. Lots 7 and 8, con. 2, twp. Louth.

H. H. Usher, Pts. lots 42, 43, 44 and 50 and pt. of govt. allowance for road lying east of lot 50, twp. Niagara.

F. S. Goring, E½ lots 150 and 151, twp. Niagara.

C. T. Bolton, Pt. lot 3, B.F. con., twp. Saltfleet.

3. Information not available. Counties of Lincoln and Welland are within the area coming under the Dundas regional office. Number of applications for qualification received by that office up to 28th February, 1946—full time farming, small holdings and commercial fishing, 1,580. Number of applications for assistance to become established in full time farming, 98; small holdings, 245; commercial fishing 1; as of same date.

HOUSING—VETERANS—ST. CATHARINES

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. How many (a) number; (b) types of houses for the exclusive use of veterans have been contracted for at St. Catharines, Ontario?

2. What was the contract price in each instance?

3. To whom has the contract been let?

4. On what date was the first contract awarded?

5. How many homes have been completed to date and ready for occupancy?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. (a) Ten; (b) bungalows, 9; 1½ storey, 1.

2. Average price: bungalows, $4319; 1½ storey, $4797.

3. Timms Construction Company.

4. June 12, 1945.

5. None to date.

DAY OF PRAYER FOR PEACE IN INDUSTRY

Mr. CHURCH:

What action has been taken by the government to set aside, by proclamation, some Sunday for a day of prayer for the promotion of peace in industry, in view of the need of reconversion in industry from war to peace economy?

Mr. McCANN: The suggestion has been noted but at present this does not appear to be a matter requiring action by the government.

WAR ASSETS—MACHINE TOOLS, ETC.

Mr. FRASER:

1. What machine tools, equipment, motion picture projectors, typewriters, hand-tools and other material suitable for vocational training and educational instruction have been sold, or turned over by the War Assets Corporation to educational bodies in Canada?

2. What is the value of such goods sold, or given, to these bodies according to each province?

Mr. HOWE: The remarks I made on the first question apply to this one. I would ask that it be dropped.

Mr. FRASER: I do not think this question should be dropped. We should get information about War Assets Corporation. It is employing over five thousand persons and we ought to be able to find out something about it. This has been a hush-hush matter—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. FRASER: —right from the beginning. No one can find out about it and we should have some information.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can ask for the information before the committee.

Mr. FRASER: Will you please let me know, Mr. Speaker, when a private member can go before a committee and ask these questions?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask the hon. gentleman to resume his seat. He knows that he should not question the Speaker from the floor of the house. Dropped.

BUTTER EXPORTS

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf):

1. How many pounds of butter were exported by Canada in each of the years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945?

2. How many pounds were exported to each European country?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1:

Year	Pounds
1939	12,398,600
1940	1,337,600
1941	1,481,800
1942	1,600,900
1943	9,408,600
1944	4,726,700
1945	5,598,300

2:

Year	United Kingdom Lb.	Norway Lb.
1939	11,109,200	....
1940	900	....
1941	10,000	....
1942	....	....
1943	7,089,200	....
1944	200	....
1945	....	6,200

RESEARCH ENTERPRISES LIMITED—LEASIDE PLANT

Mr. FLEMING:

1. In the case of each of the buildings at the wartime Research Enterprises Limited plant at Leaside, Ontario,

(a) What was the cost of (1) constructing or otherwise acquiring; (2) equipping the same?

(b) What disposal has since been made thereof?

(c) What were the terms of disposal, including (1) price of buildings; (2) price of equipment; (3) undertakings as to employment of former employees of Research Enterprises Limited, and the number thereof; (4) recognition of collective bargaining agreement between the Research Enterprises Limited and Local 1039 of United Steel Workers of America; (5) date of delivery of possession; (6) name of purchaser or party otherwise acquiring?

2. (a) What other offers were received for such plant and equipment in each case?

[Mr. Fraser.]

(b) What other efforts were made to interest similar or comparable industries to purchase or acquire the said buildings in each case?

(c) What efforts were made in each case to obtain better terms as to employment of former employees of Research Enterprises Limited, maintenance of wage rates and recognition of the existing collective bargaining agreement?

3. (a) Who have been or are members of the board of directors of Research Enterprises Limited, and for what terms have they served or been appointed?

(b) Who are the present officers, and who were formerly the officers of Research Enterprises Limited?

4. In the case of all corporations which have acquired any of the said buildings and equipment, who are,

(a) The directors?

(b) Officers?

(c) Solicitors who acted for them in the purchase or acquisition?

5. In the case of how many of the said buildings has possession been taken by the purchaser or party otherwise acquiring the same, and on what dates?

6. (a) What buildings and equipment still remain in the ownership of Research Enterprises Limited?

(b) What use or disposal thereof is intended?

(c) If disposal is intended, to whom, and on what terms?

7. (a) How much space will be used and occupied by Canadian Arsenals Limited?

(b) How many employees of Research Enterprises Limited will be continued in the employment of Canadian Arsenals Limited?

(c) Will the collective bargaining agreement between Research Enterprises Limited and Local 1039 of the United Steel Workers of America be recognized and enforced by Canadian Arsenals Limited?

(d) What type of work and operation will be carried on by Canadian Arsenals Limited?

(e) What products will they manufacture?

(f) On what date will Canadian Arsenals Limited take over, or on what date have they taken over, possession of plant or equipment from Research Enterprises Limited?

8. Have government orders for radar or optical instruments been placed with private industry?

9. (a) Where will Turbo Research company be located?

(b) On what operations will it be engaged?

10. (a) Has the government of the United Kingdom placed any orders for radar equipment since V-J day with Research Enterprises Limited?

(b) Has the government of the United Kingdom intimated a willingness to place such orders, if suitable financing can be arranged?

Mr. HOWE: My previous remarks apply to this question, which, among other things, asks what the government's intentions are with reference to Research Enterprises Limited, thus referring to current transactions as well as to those that have been completed. I would ask that this question be dropped and the information obtained before the committee.

Mr. FLEMING: May I point out that half of these questions do not relate to the disposal of assets, and for that reason I could not obtain the information before the committee since the questions would be outside the scope of reference to the committee. This is the only place I can obtain the information I seek.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

Mr. GRAYDON: On a question of privilege, on what ground does Your Honour say that the question is dropped without the consent of the member who asks it? After all, it is a matter for the house to decide, surely. In three or four instances this afternoon Your Honour has declared a question dropped, and so far as I know the suggestion has come from the government benches and not from the member who asked the question. Either the member must drop it of his own free will or the house itself must decide whether it should be dropped or not.

Mr. POULIOT: It is not dropped by the member; it is dropped by the Chair.

Mr. GRAYDON: It has to be dropped by the member.

Mr. POULIOT: It is dropped by the Chair.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is not enough.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that it has always been the practice, when the government refuses to answer a question, to declare the question dropped. Moreover, this matter has been discussed by the house on previous occasions; and it has been pointed out that the members who have asked questions which have been dropped will have an opportunity to submit those questions to the committee with a view to having them answered. I think the minister is entitled to ask that the question be dropped.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I rise again, Your Honour, with great deference, to suggest that if there is disagreement in the house over the question whether or not this particular interrogation should be dropped, then it should be submitted to the house for approval or disapproval. I submit that Your Honour cannot simply say that it is dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. gentleman that there is no division on questions, but only on motions. May I assure the house that it is very disagreeable sometimes for the Speaker to refuse what a member may regard as a privilege, but the Speaker has no choice; he must do as the practice of the house dictates or as the standing orders require.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is also very disagreeable to the interrogator.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will consult Beauchesne and May he will find it clearly indicated that it is the privilege of ministers to refuse to answer questions, either on the ground of public interest or for the reason that members may have their questions answered in the committees that are appointed by the house.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, what the citation is, so that we may look it up?

Mr. SPEAKER: Beauchesne, 307.

Mr. FLEMING: May I respectfully point out, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has not yet refused to answer the question. All he did was to make a statement in which he argued that the question should not be answered, and asked that it be dropped. He has not yet refused to answer it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The fact that the minister asks that the question be dropped is, I think, an indication that he does not wish to answer it.

Mr. GRAYDON: The position is clear if that is the case.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

*WAR ASSETS—CANADA-UNITED STATES

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. Was any arrangement and/or agreement made between the government of Canada and the government of the United States providing that surplus war material shall not be exported from Canada to the United States and from the United States to Canada?

2. If so, what was the nature of the arrangement or agreement?

3. If such an arrangement and/or agreement has been entered into, have any instructions been given to Canadian customs officers to refuse entry of United States surplus war materials?

4. If not, why not?

Mr. HOWE: I propose to answer this question orally. There is an arrangement between disposal agencies in the United States and in Canada. It is not an arrangement between governments but simply a working arrangement between disposal agencies. I may say that there is the same arrangement between

the disposal agencies of Canada and the United Kingdom, namely that the disposal agency in one country will not offer goods in the other country. There is no prohibition against bringing goods across the border, if they are bought in the United States from the United States disposal agency, provided there is no law of the land which prevents them from being brought into Canada.

I think that answers questions 1 and 2. It also answers questions 3 and 4, since in the circumstances there is no occasion to notify customs officers.

Mr. FRASER: Can the minister now go back and answer the question I asked?

CHEESE EXPORTS

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf):

1. How many pounds of cheese were exported by Canada in each of the years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945?

2. How many pounds were exported to each European country?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1.

Year	Pounds
1939	90,944,800
1940	106,631,100
1941	92,331,000
1942	141,503,900
1943	129,741,000
1944	131,429,200
1945	135,409,300

2.

Country	1939 Lbs.	1940 Lbs.	1941 Lbs.	1942 Lbs.
United Kingdom	81,153,800	103,192,400	89,089,100	131,374,000
Eire	4,500	—	—	—
Malta	184,700	—	—	—
Belgium	152,400	60,500	—	—
France	75,500	—	—	—
Germany	135,000	—	—	—
Italy	1,000	—	—	—
Norway	18,000	2,200	—	—
Iceland	—	—	1,100	29,500

Country	1943 Lbs.	1944 Lbs.	1945 Lbs.
United Kingdom	126,604,700	128,872,900	132,855,400
Malta	16,000	8,000	—
Italy	—	—	95,300
Norway	—	—	500
Iceland	75,600	7,700	—

*EDWARDS PROPERTY ON OTTAWA RIVER

Mr. FLEMING:

1. For what purpose is the crown acquiring the property of Mr. Gordon C. Edwards of Ottawa, located at a point overlooking the Ottawa river and Governor's bay?

2. When is it intended to be put to the purpose for which the crown is acquiring it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With regard to part 1 of this question, the property is being acquired in pusuance of the government's policy of securing title to valuable properties on the banks of the Ottawa river in order to preserve them for special purposes and particularly to prevent their acquisition for undesirable uses. The hon. member may be interested to know that just prior to the last war the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, then Prime Minister, arranged for the acquisition of properties along the west side of Wellington Street for some distance beyond Bank, and between Wellington street and the river. He regarded those properties as valuable for future use for governmental purposes. They have since become the site of Confederation building, the Justice building and other departmental buildings in that vicinity.

The second part of the question is:

When is it intended to be put to the purpose for which the crown is acquiring it?

The answer is, at an appropriate time, depending on circumstances. Perhaps my hon. friend does not know, and I might inform him that in the meantime the property continues to be occupied by Mr. Edwards.

My purpose in answering this question orally, Mr. Speaker, is to direct attention to the wisdom of the policy of acquiring certain properties in the interests of the crown. In this connection I should like to draw attention to the emphasis that the fire in Hull on Friday night last has given to the desirability of careful and proper use of land in and about the national capital. That fire endangered the

whole city of Hull. It partly destroyed the interprovincial bridge. There are oil tanks on adjacent property. If the fire had spread to them they might have exploded, and the wind could easily have carried the flames to the houses of parliament and other government buildings on this side of the Ottawa river.

The significance of Friday night's conflagration should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. Some years ago a fire on the opposite side of the river destroyed much of the city of Hull and seriously menaced this city of Ottawa. If plans for a capital worthy of Canada are to go forward successfully, there must be both a restraint on the use of property by firms and individuals, and a directed effort by the government to hold desirable properties for their best use in accordance with a general plan for the capital and district.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is what the United States government does along the Potomac.

VETERANS LAND ACT—DURHAM COUNTY

Mr. STEPHENSON:

1. How many farms have been purchased in Durham county under the Veterans Land Act?
2. Where are these farms located and from whom were they purchased?
3. What acreage is in each farm and what was the price paid for each?
4. Has an inspector reported on the quality of the land and the buildings on each farm?
5. Have the farms previously owned by Mr. Millson and Mr. Yellowlees, north of Bowmanville, been purchased by the Veterans Department?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. 2. 3. and 5. Farms purchased in Durham county as per Head Office Records, March 30th, 1946.

Vendor	Land Description	Acreage	Price
Hoey, Herman	Lots 4 and 5, Con. 5, Cartwright twp.	160	$4,200.00
Mountjoy, Mildred	E.½ Lot 23, Con. 5, Cartwright twp.	100	4,800.00
H. F. and R. C. A. Waddell Assets Ltd.	W.½ Lot 21, Con. 13, Cavan twp.	100	3,620.00
Moore, E. Lloyd	E. Pt. of N.½ Lot 3, Con. 1, Clarke twp.	80	3,500.00
Stewart, Harold	N.½ Lot 6, Con. 3, Clarke twp.	100	3,400.00
Lewko, Wm.	South Pt. Lot 9, Con. 6, Clarke twp.	40	3,300.00
Robinson, Milton	Pt. Lot 8, Con. 8, Clarke twp.	100	4,000.00
Trull, Fred W.	S.½ Lot 28, Con. 8, Clarke twp.	120	4,600.00
Yellowlees, N. C.	Pt. Lot 28, Con. 6, Darlington twp.	70	4,800.00
Millson, Arthur	N.W. Parts Lots 29 and 30, Con. 6, Darlington twp.	120	8,500.00
Hoskin, Glen J.	Pt. E.½ Lot 11, Con. 8, Darlington twp.	45	3,000.00

4. Yes.

NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. FAIR:

1. What was the gross national debt of Canada at the end of each of the fiscal years: 1942-43, 1943-44, 1944-45, 1945-46?
2. What is the amount of (a) accrued interest; (b) other related commissions and charges, at the end of each of the above years?
3. What percentage of the total national revenue of each of the above years was required to pay the interest, commissions and charges above?
4. What provision has been made to satisfy the above indebtedness?
5. If present monetary policy is continued, can our national debt ever be repaid? If so, how long will it take?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1.

Fiscal Year Ended	Total Liabilities
March 31, 1943	$ 9,228,252,012 03
1944	12,359,123,230 16
1945	15,712,181,527 26
1946	Not yet available.

2. While the question asks "what is the amount of (a) accrued interest; (b) other related commissions and charges, at the end of each of the above years", the question is answered on the basis of the annual expenditures during the years in question.

Question 3 indicates that the questioner desired the annual expenditures rather than the amount due and unpaid at the fiscal year-end.

Fiscal Year Ended	Interest on Public Debt	Other Debt Charges
Mar. 31, 1943	$ 188,556,249	$ 13,992,646
1944	242,681,180	19,457,839
1945	318,994,821	20,851,591
1946	Not yet available.	

3.

Fiscal Year Ended	Percentage Debt Charges to Total Revenue
March 31, 1943	9·00
1944	9·48
1945	12·65
1946	Not yet available.

4. The Dominion of Canada has always paid the full face amount of the principal of and interest on every direct obligation issued by it, all promptly when due in the lawful currency of the country where payable at the time of payment thereof.

In the budget speech delivered in the House of Commons on February 25, 1937, the Minister of Finance, in referring to an issue of perpetual bonds, stated "it was intended as the initial step in a program which is designed to provide for the consolidation and simplification of our public debt structure. Another purpose which we had in mind was to facilitate the setting up as soon as the condition of our national finances make it practicable, of a general sinking fund to provide for the gradual amortization of our long term debt on scientific lines."

During the war period and for some years before the dominion government has been operating at a deficit and it has not been possible to provide for the paying off of indebtedness out of revenue. However, the government plans in this respect will be made known at the appropriate time.

5. Yes.

YALTA CONFERENCE

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

1. Has the government been informed of the secret agreements reached at the Yalta conference?

2. If so, on what date?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Certain information regarding agreements reached between the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. at the Yalta conference has been received by the Canadian government.

2. The information was received some time after the conference had concluded its sittings.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

What amount was paid to the unemployed by the unemployment insurance commission during each of the following months: September, October, November, December, 1945; January, February, 1946?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1945	Amount
September	$ 881,729 39
October	1,708,343 06
November	2,508,609 71
December	3,449,783 41
1946	
January	4,492,081 25
February	5,900,722 63

[Mr. Mayhew.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

HUDSON BAY ROUTE

Mr. MOORE:

What steps have been taken by the government to make use of Fort Churchill and Hudson Bay route in the shipping season of 1946?

Mr. McCANN: Return tabled.

SOLWAY AND SONS—STORAGE BATTERIES

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North):

1. Were storage batteries sold by any department of the government to Solway and Sons, Toronto?

2. At what prices were they sold to this firm?

3. What was the cost of these batteries to the government?

4. How many storage batteries were sold to Solway and Sons?

5. Were batteries sold to the above company damaged in any way?

6. If so, what was the nature of the damage?

7. How many of these batteries had been used before the sale?

8. Have any batteries been declared surplus by any department of government?

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—VETERANS

Mr. McKAY:

1. How many veterans were in receipt of unemployment insurance during (a) December, 1945; (b) January, 1946; (c) February, 1946?

2. How many veterans were in receipt of out-of-work benefits during (a) December, 1945; (b) January, 1946; (c) February, 1946?

Mr. McCANN: Return tabled.

CANADIAN TROOPS IN INDIA

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

1. Are there members of the Canadian Army serving in India at present?

2. If so, how many?

3. What is their assignment?

CANADIAN TROOPS OUTSIDE OF CANADA

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

1. What was the total strength of Canadian troops belonging to the various army services, which were outside of Canada on March 14, 1946?

2. Where are such troops stationed?

3. How many in each place?

VETERANS LAND ACT—FRASER VALLEY

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. How many applications have been received under the Veterans Land Act for (a) the purchase of farms; (b) small holdings, in the municipalities of Matsqui, Mission, Maple Ridge, Pitt Meadows, and unorganized territory in the Fraser Valley?

2. How many have been sold (a) farms; (b) small holdings?

JAPANESE FARMS—FRASER VALLEY

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. When will the balance of Japanese farms be available for purchase, under the Veterans Land Act?

2. What steps are being taken to keep them in production pending sale?

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT

Mr. BROOKS:

1. Is the Canada Temperance Act still in force in any part of Canada?

2. If so, in what municipalities and counties in the different provinces?

PRIORITY SYSTEM FOR SERVICEMEN AND REJECTED VOLUNTEERS

Mr. KNIGHT :

1. Is there a priority system used by the government in selecting personnel for government employment as between (a) men who volunteered for active service but who were rejected upon physical grounds; (b) men with overseas service; (c) men who served in Canada?

2. What is the order of any such priority with respect to the above groups?

Mr. McCANN: Return tabled.

WAR ASSETS—STORAGE BATTERIES

Mr. ZAPLITNY:

1. Were any storage batteries sold by the War Assets Corporation in 1945 and 1946?

2. If so, how many, to whom, at what dates and at what prices?

3. Were these batteries advertised for sale?

4. How many of these batteries were new?

5. Were any of these batteries damaged? If so, how many and to what extent?

BUTTER RESERVES

Mr. LACOMBE:

1. What were the total reserves of butter in Canada on March 1, 1946?

2. What was, on that date, the reserve of butter stored in each province of Canada?

3. What is the present reserve of butter in each province?

4. Has the government received representations to the effect that it is impossible to obtain butter in some parts of the country?

5. If so, what action has the government taken in order to cope with the situation?

WAR ASSETS—MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. How many (a) automobiles; (b) trucks, were in the possession of the Department of National Defence in Canada on V-J day?

2. How many (a) automobiles; (b) trucks, have been declared surplus and transferred to War Assets Corporation for disposal since V-J day?

3. How many (a) automobiles; (b) trucks, transferred from the Department of National Defence to War Assets Corporation for disposal since V-J day have been disposed of to date?

4. How many (a) automobiles; (b) trucks, still in possession of the Department of National Defence are in open storage at the present time?

PRISON REFORM

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What clauses of the prison reform commission report have been adopted by the government since the report was tabled?

2. Who was in charge of federal prisons, is it the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General, and what is the division of authority between them, if any, herein?

3. Who appoints those in charge of these institutions, and the staff, and what qualifications have they in this work before appointment?

4. What inspection is there of these institutions, and how may visits have been made by the minister in charge?

5. What practical experience have the chief officers of the department in this work before appointment?

6. Do grand juries visit these institutions and make a report? If so, to whom?

7. Under the Act, who compose the board of visitors, other than federal officials and members of the House of Commons?

8. Will any arrangements be made for members of the House of Commons, representing each province, during the year, to inspect these federal institutions in each of the provinces?

9. What improvements have been made since the last session of parliament on this whole question, and what new improvements have been introduced?

10. Have there been any riots in the various institutions?

11. Are these places inspected to see if they conform to modern rules of public hygiene?

12. How many soldiers who served in the late war overseas are being confined in each institution, and where?

IMMIGRATION

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Under what conditions can immigrants now enter Canada?

2. How many immigrants have entered Canada from 1938 to 1945 annually (a) from Great Britain and Northern and Southern Ireland; (b) the United States of America; (c) the continent of Europe?

3. Is any assisted passage now being given to those who come from Great Britain?

4. Has the government, since the war closed, or shortly before, held any conferences with Britain or the other dominions regarding migration within the empire in the form of assisted passages for members of the forces of Britain or the other dominions who seek to come to Canada?

5. What change has been made after the war in the government's immigration policy, subsequent to privy council order P.C. 3016, dated November 29, 1938; P.C. 2653, dated September 14, 1939, as amended by P.C. 3547, dated May 21, 1941?

MATERIALS AND LABOUR FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THEATRES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What rules and regulations have been laid down by the government regarding building materials and labour for the erection of theatres?
2. Are theatres given priority over the building of houses at the present time?
3. Have any complaints been received by the government or officials thereof, from the corporation of the city of Toronto or individuals there, relating to the providing of labour and building materials for the erection of theatres?
4. What priorities as to building exist now in Toronto?

CLARKE STEAMSHIPS—NORTH SHORE ST. LAWRENCE SERVICES

Mr. DORION:

During the last fiscal year, what amounts were granted by the various departments to the Clarke Steamship Limited, for each of the services performed by this company on the north shore of the St. Lawrence river?

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—WESTERN PROVINCES

Mr. QUELCH:

1. How much money was paid to the farmers in each of the three western provinces under the P.F.A.A. for the three years 1943, 1944, 1945 respectively?
2. How much money was collected under the one per cent levy in each province during that period?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

K. R. & O.—PHYSICAL DISABILITIES—1939

Mr. POULIOT:

For a copy of each amendment to the King's Regulations and Orders for the Canadian militia, 1939, concerning the physical disabilities of the men, showing the date of each one.

Mr. ABBOTT: Return tabled.

EVIDENCE AT TRIAL OF KURT MEYER

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

For a copy of the transcript of the evidence taken by the court on the trial of S.S. General Kurt Meyer.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not rise to oppose this motion, but I want to point out to the house that ordinarily court martial proceedings are not producible before parliament. There have been a number of cases in which that question has come up and the request has always been refused. I appreciate that this is an exceptional case, in that the person tried was not a Canadian subject, and therefore I am prepared to allow the motion to pass, but on the understanding that this is not a precedent but a special case.

There is one further point. We have only one copy of this evidence here in Canada. It is very lengthy, covering four large volumes. The task of copying it would be rather long and expensive, so perhaps my hon. friend and I could arrange for him to take communication of it at some convenient place, so that we may not have to produce in the house the only copy we have. If he insists on the evidence being copied, of course that can be done, but I think we can arrive at some satisfactory arrangement for him to take communication of it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: So far as the copying is concerned, there is no necessity for that. In regard to the other point raised by the minister, while it is true that according to decisions rendered in the past, court martial evidence is not producible in the house, I should like to point out that this was not a court martial. This was a body set up as an international court by order in council under the provisions of the War Measures Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Carried subject to the remarks of the minister.

COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE ON KURT MEYER

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

For a copy of all letters, papers, memos of telephone conversations and other documents which passed between Lieutenant General Chris Vokes and any officer or officers of the trial, tribunal, and/or any senior staff officers of the Canadian Army, and/or legal officers of the Department of Justice and the Department of External Affairs, touching on the commutation of the sentence passed on S.S. General Kurt Meyer.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am sorry to have to oppose this motion, on the well-known grounds that communications between junior officers and senior officers or between departmental officials are privileged, and that it is not in the public interest to produce them in parliament. I have raised the same point on other occasions, as my hon. friend well knows. I shall be pleased to make a statement on this matter at the appropriate time, and to answer any questions. I may say here that there were no communications with any minister of the crown or any government officials in Ottawa relating to this matter. Their advice was neither sought nor given, but I must take the stand that the various documents referred to—letters, papers, memos of telephone conversations and the like if there are any, between General Vokes and the other officers of the tribunal, or senior staff officers at headquarters in London—are privileged communications and not producible in parliament, such production being not in the public interest.

Mr. SPEAKER: **Dropped.**

CANADIAN CORPS OF FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. LENNARD:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Minister of National War Services and the Minister of National Defence (Army), from January, 1942, to September, 1945, respecting the Canadian corps of firefighters.

Mr. McCANN: I will have to oppose this order on the ground that this is correspondence between ministers and is therefore privileged. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would be good enough to withdraw it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

VETERANS LAND ACT—OLIVER FARM

Mr. LENNARD:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and other documents in the possession of the Department of Veterans Affairs, in connection with the enquiry made by Mr. D. M. Brodie, of Windsor, Ontario, regarding the price paid by Veterans Land Administration for the Oliver farm.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I understand from discussion with the hon. member that he has received the information he seeks.

Mr. LENNARD: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

ST. SIMEON, QUE., POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DORION:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports and other documents, from 1936 to March 15, 1946, in the possession of the Post Office Department and the Department of Public Works, relative to the erection of a post office at St. Simeon, Charlevoix county.

DEPARTMENT OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY ACT—ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. DESMOND:

For a copy of all orders in council approved since September 6, 1945, under the authority of the Department of Munitions and Supply Act.

Mr. McILRAITH: I have discussed this motion with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Desmond) and he has arranged to examine the index of the orders in council asked for. Until he has an opportunity of doing so I suggest that the motion be permitted to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

HOUSING ACT, 1944—ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all orders in council and regulations passed under the National Housing Act, 1944.

VETERANS' INSURANCE ACT—REGULATIONS

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all regulations made by the governor in council under the authority of the Veterans' Insurance Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Return tabled.

FARM IMPROVEMENT LOANS ACT—REGULATIONS

Mr. HENDERSON:

For a copy of all regulations made by the governor in council pursuant to the Farm Improvement Loans Act.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE ACT—ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. HENDERSON:

For a copy of all orders in council approved since July 1, 1945, under the authority of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

FISHERIES PRICES SUPPORT ACT—REGULATIONS

Mr. BROOKS:

For a copy of all regulations made by the governor in council pursuant to the Fisheries Prices Support Act.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK—BY-LAWS

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all by-laws of the Industrial Development Bank.

*PRIME MINISTER'S SPECIAL PREROGATIVES

Mr. DESMOND:

For a copy of all orders in council prescribing the special prerogatives of the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The motion is for a copy of all orders in council prescribing the special prerogatives of the Prime Minister. I may say there is nothing unusual about this particular order. It is one that was first adopted by Sir Charles Tupper when he came into office. It has been part of the normal procedure as each new administration came into office to enact similar orders. I have here the various orders that have been passed. The first by Sir Charles Tupper was passed on May 1, 1896. Then there was one by Sir Wilfrid Laurier on July 13, 1896, one by Sir Robert Borden, on October 10, 1911, and another by Sir Robert Borden when he was head of the Union government. Then there is one by the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, approved on July 19, 1920, and one by Mr. Bennett, approved on August 7, 1930. Then there is one by myself, approved on October 25, 1935.

I seem to have overlooked passing a similar order between 1921 and 1926. Mr. Meighen also overlooked his opportunity from June to September of 1926. Again I recommended

no order from 1926 to 1930. I am told that the clerk of the privy council has assumed that where a prime minister has been in office on a previous occasion, and is returned and continues in office, the old order still has force.

The only variation in the orders passed by myself and by my predecessors since the time of Sir Charles Tupper has been that in the original recommendation of Sir Charles the railway committee was included in the list of appointments designated as the prerogative of the Prime Minister in section 4 of the first two orders in council. This committee was deleted for obvious reasons from the list of appointments, under P.C. 2437 of October 10, 1911, and from subsequent orders in council.

Then in the case of the last two orders in council, namely P.C. 1930 of 1930 and P.C. 3374 of 1935, the original wording of section 3 has been slightly altered to read "recommendations affecting the discipline of the department of another minister" instead of "the discipline of another department".

That is the extent of the changes made. I have been told to be sure to inform the house that this list does not include all the prerogatives of the Prime Minister.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is the list being tabled?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am tabling all the orders.

Motion agreed to.

WAR ASSETS—ESTEVAN AIRPORT BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia):

For a copy of all correspondence, since July 1, 1944, in the possession of War Assets Corporation or any department of the government with reference to the disposition of Estevan airport buildings and equipment.

R.C.A.F. BUILDINGS AT NORTH BATTLEFORD

Mr. CAMPBELL:

For a copy of all correspondence and telegrams exchanged between any department of the government and the city council of North Battleford or any other person or persons, from July 1, 1945, to date, regarding the sale of R.C.A.F. buildings at North Battleford.

CURRIE MEMORIAL AND SOLDIERS' CONVALESCENT HOSPITAL, MONTREAL

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

For a copy of all correspondence between Mr. David, of Montreal, Quebec, an architect, and any of his employees with the Department of National Defence, and/or the Department of Public Works, and/or the Department of Veterans Affairs, regarding plans for the prospective erection (including the cancellation of such plans, if any) of the Currie Memorial hospital and/or the Soldiers' Convalescent hospital in the city of Montreal.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

PEACE RIVER DISTRICT

RAILWAY OUTLET TO PACIFIC COAST

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo) moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should give immediate consideration to the building of a railway outlet from the Peace River country to the Pacific coast.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I need hardly say that the resolution which I now rise to discuss is not worded as forcefully and as specifically as I should like it to be. But for certain restrictions imposed upon me by the rules of the house I should have the resolution read: "That this parliament endorse the building of the Peace River outlet, forthwith." However, members know full well that private members are not permitted to offer motions which might involve the expenditure of public moneys. I do not see why such motions should not be made by private members. We represent the people who are taxed; we should have some say in how much they are taxed, and how their taxes are to be expended. However, I shall not stop now to discuss amendments to the rules of the house. I merely say in passing that we are compelled by the limitations of the rules to restrict our expressions in matters of this kind. So that the resolution can only ask that the government give consideration to the building of the line, as desired.

I wish to express the hope that hon. members will not talk the resolution out. It is a practice sometimes indulged in. I should like in that connection to say that a long-deferred hope has saddened the hearts of the people in the area which will be directly affected by the proposed railway. I am asking that the house pass the resolution, and thus give them at least some basis for encouragement. But if we cannot see our way clear to pass the resolution, I think it would be better to face it squarely and fairly and vote it down, thereby putting out the *ignis fatuus*, that dazzling, sparkling, phosphorescent light of political promises which, in the past, has been leading the people toward futility. It would be better for us to put out forever these tantalizing, false beacon-lights which mark the road to nowhere.

The proposal which I would ask the government to consider, and which I would ask hon. members to authorize the government to consider, is to build a railroad line to connect the Pacific Great Eastern with the Northern Alberta railroad, which would incorporate both lines into the Canadian National railway system, and would connect the two branch lines mentioned.

The Northern Alberta Railway, runs from Edmonton to Dawson Creek, at which point it ends in a blind alley. This section of the road is now managed jointly by the two great railway companies in Canada, the Canadian National railway and the Canadian Pacific railway.

My information is that the joint management has not proven very satisfactory. The rolling stock seems to have got into bad repair, while the roadbed itself has been rather badly neglected. It would appear that each of the companies is endeavouring to skim off as much cream as possible, without feeding the cow any hay or chop.

The Pacific Great Eastern section of this line is managed by the government of British Columbia. As hon. members may know, it begins at the town of Squamish, thence running north or north easterly to the town of Quesnel, there meeting with its blind alley. As hon. members will recognize, this road begins at a considerable distance from the main port on the Pacific coast, and ends long before it taps the resources of the north-eastern and central territories, toward which its eastern end hopefully points. My suggestion is that the government consider taking over the Pacific Great Eastern and building a line through from Squamish to Vancouver to join with the Canadian National railway, and that at Quesnel they extend it north to Prince George and then east to connect with the Northern Alberta railway. That would involve the building of about 350 miles of new road.

I believe there has been some talk of inviting private corporations to take over the Pacific Great Eastern and build the road through to the Peace river. I think I am safe in saying that this idea is generally opposed by the people. As late as the early part of last March I had the privilege of meeting the board of trade of the town of Lillooet, and that body passed a resolution to the effect that they would rather have the Pacific Great Eastern remain in the hands of the provincial government and be operated as it is now being operated than have it turned over to a private corporation.

There is a fear among the people of private corporations building railroads because they usually ask for large concessions of the public domain, in the form of either land grants or timber or minerals or power or some other natural resources. The feeling seems to be that the resources which can stimulate a private corporation to build a road, which resources belong to the people themselves, might very well be used by the people to build their own railroad so that they may own it and also control the resources which it will tap. For that reason we believe that the Canadian National Railways should build this line. We feel that the logical and efficient thing to do is to take over both these branch lines and incorporate them in the Canadian National system and then build the line necessary to join the two.

I intend to spend the next few minutes in dealing with the extent of the territory to be served by the proposed line and to indicate something of the natural wealth which might be tapped or exploited thereby. Last year during the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne I spent some time in dealing with the resources of the Cariboo and Peace River districts. The building of such a railroad as I am suggesting would be of great benefit, not only to British Columbia but to the nation as a whole. Such an undertaking has far more than local importance; it is indeed of national importance.

In particular, however, this line would serve a vast and rich territory which is now very poorly served with transportation or which has no rail transportation at all. The territories which would be directly affected by the building of a Peace River outlet would be, first, the whole territory known as the riding of the Cariboo. This area is roughly about the size of the United Kingdom. It has, as I shall show subsequently, a great variety of valuable resources.

The next territory which would be directly served is the constituency of Peace River which is represented, as hon. members know, by the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Low). He is unavoidably absent to-day from the house, but I believe he intended to support this resolution. That territory also is nearly as large as the United Kingdom.

Then there is a third territory which should not be overlooked when the building of a Peace River outlet is being considered. I refer to the Northwest Territories from the boundaries of British Columbia to the boundaries of Alaska. Such a railroad as I am suggesting would be a gateway to that great territory to the north. I believe hon. members are fairly well aware of the abundant natural resources within these territories.

On many occasions this resolution, or one similar to it, has been discussed in this parliament. Seldom has it been discussed without the mover having a good deal to say about the extent of the natural wealth of the country concerned. I imagine than hon. members who have not been there have a good idea of how extensive the natural wealth is.

I should like to summarize some of the things I presented to the house at the last

session of parliament. First, let me say something about agriculture. The Peace River and the Peace River block, which is that section of the Peace River within the boundaries of British Columbia, as well as other parts of the Cariboo contain a vast extent of the finest agricultural land in the world. I may say that the agricultural production is extensive enough to warrant the building of this railroad and to guarantee sufficient revenue to make it pay. I believe that the late Sir Henry Thornton is on record as promising to build this line when the Peace River district was able to export 10,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. That 10,000,000 bushels is now away above 20,000,000, and it is not mere idle talk to say that the present production could easily be doubled in the near future were farmers encouraged to the extent of being provided with proper transportation facilities.

Then I want to say a word about ranching in the Cariboo riding. Out in the Chilcotin we have some of the greatest ranching on the North American continent. I believe these ranches have almost reached the limit of their producing capacity unless they can secure supplies of fairly cheap cattle feed from the prairies. If they can receive such shipments on a reasonable basis they could raise more and better cattle than they are now producing.

As a matter of fact the people of British Columbia require for their own use a great deal of agricultural products which could be supplied from the Peace River and the Peace River block. From 1940 to 1943 British Columbia imported $100,000,000 worth of farm products. The Peace River could have supplied probably all of what British Columbia required. It is quite possible that a large portion of that $100,000,000 worth came from the Peace River country, but hon. members may be surprised to learn that before British Columbia can use the products of its own province they have to be exported into another province and then redirected to Vancouver. Some farmers in the Peace River block have to haul their products from one hundred to two hundred miles before they reach a railhead, and then they have to ship them four hundred miles to Edmonton, so that such produce travels from eight to twelve hundred miles and still will be no nearer to Vancouver than they were at the point of shipment. The result is that it costs about seventeen cents to ship a bushel of wheat from the Peace River district to Vancouver, whereas if this line were built the wheat could be laid down in Vancouver at eight cents a bushel.

Farmers have to haul their feed grain from far distant points to the railway at Dawson Creek or to some other point along the line and then send it to Vancouver, where it is transshipped and reloaded an the Pacific Great Eastern and hauled another three hundred to four hundred miles to Williams Lake and then reshipped another hundred and seventy-five miles in to the Chilcotin in order to bring feed to the ranchers in that area, whereas if it were shipped by means of the railway I suggest directly from the Peace River block to the Cariboo, it would be a very short haul indeed and a downhill run all the way, and there would be no difficulty in the ranchers there purchasing what they require to augment their feed supplies.

This Cariboo country is also rich in furs and rich in timber, not only timber which is manufactured into lumber but timbers which may be used for producing newsprint, wall-board and building paper. There are also numerous stands of timber which could very well be used in the plastic industries. We have been given to understand that there are great possibilities in the future for the plastic industry, and there is an abundance of the resources required in such an industry in northern British Columbia.

Next I want to spend a moment or two on the mineral resources. I shall not spend much time on gold because I imagine most people know that there are fine gold mines in the Cariboo riding in full production. Nor shall I spend much time on some of the other minerals which seem to be more attractive from the point of view of moneymaking. I would rather mention the great coal deposit at Hudson Hope. There is nothing on this continent to compare in extent and quality, with the possible exception of the coal deposit in west Virginia, with that great coal deposit at Hudson Hope. The brochure which was prepared by the government of British Columbia points out that this coal is superior to Pennsylvania coal. Much of this coal could be shipped direct to our ports on the Pacific coast if we had the means of transportation, and it could be used not only in our locomotives but in our shipping and in our furnaces. At the present time British Columbia has to import a good deal of the coal used for these purposes. The development of our coal resources in this area would very probably lead to the establishment of secondary industries of great value. I was reading a speech made by Mr. J. Corsbie, M.L.A. in the provincial legislature of British Columbia about two weeks ago, in which he gives what I believe to be a conservative estimate of the possibilities of a ton of coal. He says that a ton of coal will yield 800 feet of gas, ten gallons of gasoline,

twenty pounds of ammonia sulphate, thirty gallons of crude oil tar, three gallons of creosote oil, one gallon of lubricating oil, ten pounds of grease, and 1,500 pounds of coke; and even that does not exhaust all the possible by-products of a ton of coal. The British Columbia government informs us that there are three billion tons of coal packed in there in that area near Hudson Hope. The only way you can get it out is by a wheel-barrow.

I also wish to mention in passing the great wealth of hydro-electric power that we have in the ridings of Peace River and Cariboo. The Peace river canyon alone has tremendous possibilities. The government has estimated that sufficient power could be developed in the canyon alone to meet all the light, heat and power needs of a city of one million people, and that is probably more people than we have in the entire province of British Columbia. Then there is also the Fraser river and other rivers which could produce an immense volume of power.

I should also mention that Cariboo riding is a mecca for tourists. There is no more beautiful scenery in the world, and fishing and hunting are superb in the Cariboo.

In the southern end of the riding horticulture is beginning to be developed extensively. They can grow fruit and vegetables in great abundance, but until recently they did not do so because they would grow it only to rot in the fields. Last year, however, a canning industry was established at Lillooet, and it has greatly stimulated the growth of fruit and vegetables.

While I am emphasizing the great national wealth of the territories which would be benefited by a Peace River outlet, I do not desire to base my argument for the building of the road entirely on this ground. I think any forward-looking government and parliament would give careful consideration to these great resources and would be planning the best way to develop them in the interests of the nation as a whole. But even if that were not done I wish to make this point, that the Peace River outlet should be built because of the developments that have already taken place in that area. There is already a sufficient development to warrant the building of the Peace River outlet. It is necessary to enable the farmers in that territory to market their produce direct in the coast ports as well as in the interior. It is necessary for them to have this line in order to facilitate the marketing of fruit from the southern part of British Columbia, in the Peace river and on the prairies. It is necessary equally to have this means of transportation in order that they may be able to supply feed grain to the ranchers, dairymen and chicken farmers of southern and interior British Columbia. This line which I am suggesting should be built would make the Pacific Great Eastern, the Northern Alberta and the Canadian National from Jasper to Prince Rupert pay dividends. It would also bring about cheaper transportation for farmers' grain that has to be exported, particularly to the orient, and it would justify the building of the grain elevator at Prince Rupert. My information is that, while that elevator was built at a very considerable cost of public money, it has never been used to any extent, certainly far from being used to its fullest capacity; and it is simply monstrous that the grain which is grown in the Peace River district cannot be directly unloaded in the elevator at Prince Rupert so as to stimulate not only the railway itself but serve the community which grows wheat so extensively in the Peace River country and provide the shipping so badly needed at the city of Prince Rupert.

I desire to urge this undertaking on the government as part of its post-war rehabilitation pragramme. As far as I understand the government's programme as it has been announced by the spokesmen for the administration, the government anticipates that there will be need of extensive public investments in the immediate future; for while the government is apparently committed to entrusting the future of our economy to the gentle and tender care of private enterprise, it does not seem to have a very great deal of confidence in private enterprise; it anticipates that private enterprise will fall down; and if the government does not do something about the matter there will be another depression, perhaps as bad as that which preceded the war. So that the government has told us that when private enterprise has done its best to give full employment and maintain full production the government will undertake to make very considerable public investments with a view to increasing purchasing power and thus stimulate private enterprise to scramble for greater profits and thereby employ the population. That, I believe, is a fair statement of the government's position.

The expenditures which might be made in connection with the Peace River outlet would do much of what the government intends to do in the event of unemployment becoming rampant. I do not know when it is rampant; whether it is rampant when we have 250,000 unemployed, or 300,000 or 450,000 unemployed. So far as I am concerned it has all the rampancy that it ought to have now. But such an investment would, as I say, not only stimulate private industry but at the same time leave

a considerable asset on the credit side of the exchequer and provide a much needed public service to the people concerned. I believe that such public investment will very soon become necessary; and, frankly, I believe that the only possible hope of the people of the Peace River and the Cariboo securing this line is through the implementing of the government's policy of post-war rehabilitation. For that reason I would like very much to have, in the course of this debate, the assurance, either of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) himself, or of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier), who will probably speak for the government on this resolution. or through some spokesman, that the Peace River outlet will have a priority on the programme of the government in its post-war reconstruction work.

By way of an example I should like to invite the attention of the government and of the house to what is taking place in Great Britain along similar lines at the present time. In this connection I would mention the case of Middlesborough, which I found referred to in an interesting article in the last issue of the *Reader's Digest*. There will be found the story of how the government of Middlesborough hired architects, geographers, designers and sociologists to make a complete analysis of living conditions within the city borders. To assist them they found ready cooperation on the part of the chamber of commerce, industrialists, housewives, teachers, doctors, trades unions, shop-keepers, and indeed all groups within the community; all were ready to cooperate, and together they fearlessly and realistically analysed the situation of the city. This self-inventory became the basis of a plan to rebuild the entire city of Middlesborough, and to rebuild it in a period of thirty years, taking three definite stages to complete the plan. The city government was and is responsible for carrying out the plan, but the British nation has an interest in Middlesborough, and because of that interest we found present at this analysis four ministers of the national government. They were there to support the local community with the financial resources of the state in carrying out the plans upon which the community itself had decided. There were there the minister of education, the minister of health, the minister of transport, and the minister of town and county planning. They were there to give leadership and advice and to supervise the carrying out of the plan in accordance with national standards. The government of Britain was behind the Middlesborough city plan in order to provide the required financial aid. Thus the authority, the advice and the funds of the nation entered into partnership with the initiative and the enterprise of all elements in the community.

In using this case as an example I do not mean to imply that our government is less competent to undertake great and costly projects than the government of Great Britain. This government's record during the war period in its production of war material and supplies is a noble one, and should be sufficient answer to anyone who might have any doubt that the government of this country was less competent than governments in other countries. I for one do not question the government's ability to do the job, but I am questioning its willingness to try. I find that the British government is on the job supporting the plans of each local community, so far as rehabilitation is concerned, by putting behind those plans the financial resources of the nation.

The city of Middlesborough is a comparatively small affair when one thinks of the vast territory and the wealth of which I have spoken, within the Cariboo and the great Peace River country and the Northwest Territories. That area of the Peace River and the Cariboo is about twice the size of the United Kingdom, and I feel safe in saying that the natural resources of the Cariboo and the Peace River is greater than that of the entire British Isles. Surely with such an attractive proposal the government of Canada will not be loath to support the plans that have been made for twenty years by the people of the Peace River and the Cariboo, by advancing the necessary capital to build their means of transportation.

I do not hesitate to say that this district of which I am speaking is rich enough in natural resources to employ gainfully every returned soldier in Canada, if the government were sufficiently interested to give leadership and to finance whatever projects might be required to develop those natural resources. What then is to be the answer of this parliament and of the government to the plea of the people of the Cariboo and of the Peace River, which plea I now bring before this house.

I have just said that in the case of Middlesborough the government representatives were there on the job to stimulate every spark of initiative in the community, to stimulate this free enterprise of which we hear so much. I would point out to the government that there are hundreds of communities in the territory of which I have been speaking who would gladly respond to any appeal which the government might make in this regard, and no one can possibly estimate what can result

when it is possible to inspire a whole community to exercise its rights and powers of free enterprise, and its initiative.

The people of the Cariboo and of the Peace River decided more than twenty years ago, after a careful analysis of their economic position, what was the first step to be taken in developing their country and making it possible for them to earn a living on the farms of that land, and they came to the government and are still coming with their plea that this step be taken. To-day they are still the forgotten people.

That area was settled very largely on the strength of promises that were made to build this railway, and I think it is only fair to say that the party in power to-day was not the only party that made those promises. Every leader of the major parties of the country is on record, committed to the hilt to build this railroad. I pointed out last year that the Prime Minister himself, speaking in Edmonton in 1924, unequivocally pledged himself to build a road as soon as humanly possible. I do not know what the Prime Minister thinks is humanly possible, but that was a long time ago, and surely it is approximating human possibility by now.

Other leaders, such as the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, Lord Bennett, the present leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), and, I believe, the leaders of the other parties in this house, have pledged themselves to support the building of the Peace River outlet. I suggest, therefore, that this house and the government as well have a moral obligation to the people of the Peace River and the Cariboo. I do not know to what extent a moral obligation is going to count in this parliament, but I think it ought to count. I am suggesting that we make it count, because it is the obligation of each one of us.

Those people went in there more than a quarter of a century ago on the strength of promises that a railroad would be built to take out their produce and convey it to market. They are still there, isolated within a vast territory filled with immeasurable wealth, and they are knocking on the door to be let out. This government and parliament alone hold the key that can open that door, and that key is transportation which will enable those people to find a market for their produce to the extent that their developments increase settlements, and to develop the natural resources to which I have already referred.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): I am very glad to support this resolution both on my own behalf and on behalf of the Progressive Conservative party. There can be no doubt in the mind of any hon. member who knows the situation that the Peace River district is severely handicapped by lack of a railway outlet to the Pacific coast. Further, as the member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) has said, that condition has existed over a period of almost thirty years.

There is no other area in Canada of like size that has been so unfortunate. The situation really is and has been a great tragedy. The people there moved in after the last war, and many of them have held on continuously until this time in the expectation that there would be a rail outlet to the Pacific coast. Many of the original settlers have died; others have been forced to give up their farms, quite a few have moved down to the Pacific coast. Right through the picture they have shown great courage and strength of character. Now that the war is over the time has come for this parliament to go to the aid of the people of the Peace River district. They should have a rail outlet to the Pacific coast at Prince Rupert, and also at Vancouver and New Westminster.

Another tragedy has been the failure to develop the country along the Canadian National line from Jasper to Prince Rupert, in the centre of the province of British Columbia. Much of that land is fertile, yet the people there have had to struggle along with inadequate railway service. Just a few weeks ago I believe their service was again reduced. They have had handicap after handicap, and they too deserve some help from this parliament.

I know the government of British Columbia is only too anxious to cooperate in getting an outlet to the Pacific coast. The provincial government has a railroad which runs from Squamish on Howe Sound up to Quesnel, and is prepared to complete it into Prince George where it could connect with a line from the Peace River district. The whole province of British Columbia is behind the plan of opening up the Peace River district to the Pacific coast.

In the summer of 1944 the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) toured that country from Prince Rupert to Prince George, down to Quesnel, and then flew into the Peace River country. As he left the province he made a statement which among other things dealt with this Peace River outlet. He said:

> The development of British Columbia's rich north country must be one of our first projects in the post-war era. I have already stated that

as a means towards that end, the Progressive Conservative party is committed to securing the connection by rail of the Peace River country with the ports of Prince Rupert, Vancouver and New Westminster. This project is essential, not only to the areas affected and the Pacific ports, but to the future development and utilization of the great resources of this section of Canada.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes think we are very much out of date in our attitude toward the building of railways. As a people we were badly bitten twenty odd years ago when we got too much railway mileage for our population. It is quite true that we got into trouble then and that a great deal of money was lost. Through the war years we found that much of that mileage was very useful, and that the money was not all wasted. But a belief has grown up in Canada that we must be very careful about building any more railways; that it is almost a sin to mention another line of railway which should be built in this far-flung country. That, I think, is dead wrong. In that view we are out of date, far behind the times. The country cannot stand still. Canada is developing all the time; new settlements are growing up, new resources are being found, and they must be served by railways. This Peace River district should have top priority in getting a new railway line. Let us as Canadians change our thinking a bit and be prepared to build railways where they are needed.

In conclusion I should like to leave one other thought with the house. We must think of northern Canada. This country cannot attain its destiny unless the northern part of Canada is developed. At the present time nearly all settlement in Canada is within one or two hundred miles of the boundary between the United States and Canada; we have not settled in depth at all. To do that we must go north. Look at what Russia has been able to do in Siberia; yet Canada has dragged behind. We must turn our attention to northern Canada; and I do not think there is any finer place to begin than by constructing this rail outlet from the Peace River district to the Pacific coast.

Mr. McIVOR: If I may ask the hon. member a question, are there any highways there on which big trucks can transport goods?

Mr. GREEN: At the present time the British Columbia government is completing a highway into the Peace River district from the Prince Rupert line of the Canadian National.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): In rising to speak to the motion now before the house, Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that it is not my intention to delay the house very long. I realize, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine), that very often over a long period of years the resolutions of private members have been talked out, and I for one would like to see this matter come to a vote to-day. Hence my remarks will be brief.

I am rising to support the motion. I think it was in 1931 that, as a new member of the house, I first listened to similar arguments being presented by the then member; and if my memory serves me aright he was told by the then Minister of Railways that the time was not ripe for the construction of this railway. That argument is used very often when a government wants to turn down something or someone is against it; they use the stock phrase that this is not the time to put such a proposal into effect. I want to say to hon. members of the house that in many provinces agricultural land is limited, and that is so in British Columbia. It is true that our province covers a large area, but actually the amount of good agricultural land is not as great as the area of the province would seem to indicate. I think it can be said without fear of successful contradiction that if at the inception the railways in British Columbia had gone right through that district, rather than down through the Fraser, we would have had a greater population in that province than we have to-day.

Just in passing may I offer one word of criticism in regard to the offer of the provincial government to returned men of a million acres of land in that country. I have said before, and I repeat, that if the provincial government would take off the strings and make that land available to all returned men, no matter from what province they come, there would not be any great difficulty in obtaining settlers in that district. This is first-class land; as the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair) says, there is certainly good land up there. But I think the hon. member for Cariboo overlooked one thing in his argument; and he will realize that as an old member of the house I listened to these arguments advanced year after year before the war. My information is that a great deal of the wheat grown in that part of British Columbia matures a little too late to go out through the lakes, so the only outlet is through the Pacific coast ports. If therefore for no other reason than that, an outlet should be developed to permit the wheat to get out as speedily as possible.

When one considers the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been spent in the east, one sometimes wonders why those of

us who come from British Columbia, and sometimes those coming from the prairie provinces as well, have to put up such a terrible fight for what we obtain. We see proposals advanced now to develop the St. Lawrence river, on which hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent; and to do what? To open up an inlet right up to the city of Toronto. Those of us who come from British Columbia should serve notice on the government right now—or on any government—that we in the west had better have a little more consideration before they start spending many more millions of dollars in the central provinces.

I have no desire to delay the passage of this resolution; as I say, it is my hope that it may come to a vote. Let me assure the hon. member for Cariboo and other hon. members that the resolution has my hearty support.

Mr. W. F. KUHL (Jasper-Edson): Mr. Speaker, as was indicated by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine), my colleague, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), who is the leader of this group, is keenly interested in the resolution. Had he not been unavoidably absent I am sure that on behalf of this group he would have been pleased to support the motion. However, inasmuch as the constituency of Jasper-Edson, which it is my privilege to represent, is the neighbouring constituency of Peace River, my leader has asked me to say a few words on his behalf in support of the resolution.

It has already been intimated by those who have spoken that for the last twenty-five years at least the Peace River outlet has been promised by the leaders of political parties. It would seem now that the time has long since come when that promise should be kept.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to add to the statistics already presented by the hon. member for Cariboo. What he has put on the record is adequate, and anything I might add would be superfluous. There are however a few general thoughts which have not been expressed, and to which I should like to give utterance.

It seems that in the discussion of matters of this kind we cannot get away from the fundamentals of economics. I noticed that on several occasions, before reaching the conclusion of his address, the hon. member for Cariboo related this resolution to those economic principles in which he contends he believes. I think it appropriate therefore to say a few words in that connection.

I am not sure that I agree altogether with all the reasons offered by the hon. member as to why the people of the Peace River area should be permitted this outlet. I consider that the purpose of the outlet, which might take the form of a railway or a highway, is primarily that of serving the people of the community. The Peace River outlet, as indicated, certainly would reduce the cost of shipping goods in and out of the area in question. That being so, surely there can be no reason why the project should not be carried out.

The hon. member for Cariboo stated that if this project, and others in close proximity to it, were undertaken, probably all the unemployed veterans in Canada could be put to work. I share with the hon. member, and with all others of like mind, the desire to see ex-servicemen receive the highest possible income at the earliest possible time. I cannot agree however that the construction of this or any other railroad or highway should be carried on for the express purpose of putting people to work.

Mr. IRVINE: I agree with that.

Mr. KUHL: If we are interested only in seeing that people are employed, then in the event of the carrying out of this project, rather than using the most modern machinery and equipment for the building of railroads and highways we should see to it that the work is done by the use of picks, shovels and wheelbarrows. If this were done there would be plenty of work for large numbers of people for a long time to come. So I cannot agree that out purpose in any way should be that of putting people to work on the project; the project should be the purpose, whether it requires a hundred or a thousand men.

I cannot anticipate what reply the minister is going to make to the arguments presented. I trust and hope however that we shall not be confronted with the statement that there are not sufficient funds to carry out this and other public works. I believe we have heard sufficient arguments, both in and out of the house, to establish for all time the fact that if we can finance a war there is no reason why we cannot finance any project for peace. The only argument I would consider as reasonable from the minister would be that at this time, or for a few years in the future, we may have a greater need for materials and manpower than we have for the building of this route. Otherwise I cannot think of any logical reason why the project should not be undertaken immediately. Surely the minister would not be logical and consistent if he were to plead a lack of funds, or that we must have the funds for other purposes.

Turning to what has been said by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid),

I can see no reason why there should be any competition between eastern and western Canada with respect to services of one kind or another. Whatever is physically possible in any part of Canada can be made financially possible. There is no reason why the east as well as the west cannot have all the facilities they desire. I trust therefore that the minister will not argue that to accede to the request which has been made would not be financially possible.

In conclusion I would repeat my opening statement, that we of this group heartily support the resolution.

Mr. J. M. DECHENE (Athabaska): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to raise my voice in support of the resolution offered by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine).

Strange as it may sound to Your Honour, this is the first occasion I have addressed the house since Your Honour has occupied the position of Speaker. I remember well only a few months ago when you, sir, and I sat in an obscure part of the chamber, trying to listen to the debates which at times reached us only as a faint echo. Since that time you have ascended the throne of the mighty I have not had an opportunity as yet to address you in your dignified position as Speaker of this house. Personally, I have remained within a seat or two of the seat I now occupy, and I believe that is as far as I can hope to get in this house.

I rise because the motion so ably proposed by the hon. member for Cariboo forms part of a programme and plan which I have often advocated in this house. I shall not delay the house to-day in going over that plan. I know how difficult it is for hon. members from the maritimes and the central provinces to understand fully what we are asking for. This is a vast country extending as it does from the forty-ninth parallel to the Arctic ocean.

I was pleased that the hon. member referred to the northwest in asking support for his motion. Athabaska is the gateway to this great north country. The building of an outlet to the Pacific ocean would prove a tremendous boon to the Peace River country and also to the northern parts of the western provinces. Not only would it prove a boon for the farmers in shipping their cattle, grain and dairy products, it would also be a great boon to our fishing industry and would help to bring about the further development of the oil and tar sands resources in the northern part of Athabaska and in the Northwest Territories.

Reference has been made to the Peace river. How pleasing it is to hear the word "peace" used in this house. How pleasing it is that hon. members are able to talk about peace instead of having almost all their time taken up with rumours of dissatisfaction, of riots, of rebellions, and all the signs of war that are appearing throughout this yet so sickly world. Those of us who know the great value of the Peace River district sometimes regret that it would be so easy to bring the instruments of war into that country. No Canadian has really enjoyed the feelings of peace, contentment and good will until he has stood on the shores of our great northern rivers, the Athabaska or the Peace, and communed with nature and thanked Providence for having so generously given of his greatness to this great north land.

The other day I read an extremely interesting article in the *Saturday Evening Post* by a United States engineer with the army of occupation. He told how Germany was cut off from sources of oil and gasoline, how she could get only a smattering of supplies from Roumania. But he described how, despite the bombardment by the allies, she continued to manufacture high-octane gasoline, superior to anything that we had, from coal. On reading that article I was reminded of the great coal resources of the west.

The hon. member referred to the tremendous area of coal in the Fort St. John area, but he could not speak too strongly of the possibilities of development there. That is only one small part of the vast coal resources of western Canada. Our resources of gas and oil are not increasing greatly and the day may not be too far distant when they will be greatly diminished. As I said once when I was trying to get the government to take action in the development of the tar sands in northern Alberta, the possession of oil is necessary if any nation is to be strong in war or in peace.

Oil was responsible for the breaking down of many of the negotiations after the last war. It was also responsible for the failure of many of the peace conferences after the last war. I need not repeat that to-day it is responsible for the disagreement in the UNO meeting now being held in the United States. Because of these vast resources known to be still available we do not need to worry. We know what has been done in Germany and we know that we have billions and billions of tons of coal available in western Canada. If we can properly develop our natural resources by carrying out the necessary research work Canada will stand in front of every nation in the world for having provided the necessary work for her people.

Every time you settle one thousand new settlers in western Canada on land such as

is yet available in British Columbia and in northern Saskatchewan and Alberta you ensure employment for ten thousand men and women in the factories of eastern and central Canada. There is no doubt about that. Just the other day I heard someone on the streets of Ottawa say that the west wants everything. All we want is to do our share in looking after the welfare of the workers of this country. We want to do our share in the reconstruction work that will be necessary. We want to contribute to the employment of men and women in the factories of eastern and central Canada.

These gaps in the line must be filled in, and I intend to refer to this matter in a later debate in this house. I hold in my hand a brief which I am proud to say was prepared by my son who was recently discharged from the army but who is now practising law in Alberta. This brief is presented on behalf of the people from St. Walburg in Saskatchewan to my own town of Bonnyville. If this route is completed new highway transportation will be provided for the northern parts of the western provinces. I do not want to keep the house too long, but I should like to show hon. members something of the possibilities.

In 1923 when I was a member of the Alberta provincial house I called upon the man who is now president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. At that time he was a vice-president stationed in Winnipeg. I was fortunate to get an immediate audience and he gave me an immediate and clear and straight answer to a question I asked. I asked, "Are you interested in the construction of branch lines and railroads in northeastern Alberta and northwestern Saskatchewan?" He said, "No, we are not. We had plans and surveys made in the past but we have abandoned them. We consider that that country is now part of the Canadian National railway territory and that it is up to them to develop it." May I claim credit for having told the gentleman then that he was making a mistake, that I, for one, was convinced of the tremendous possibilities of that north country where crops can be produced every year and which does not depend on one type of production alone, but where we have a diversity of resources and of production. Inside of five years the Canadian Pacific Railway Company came to this house and asked for a charter renewal or for a new charter to build lines in the northern part of the western provinces.

A few years later, in 1929 or 1930, I read in *Hansard* recently that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had joined with the Canadian National Railways in the purchase of the Northern Alberta railway, then known as the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway and the Alberta Great Waterways. They purchased these roads and they are to-day part of the Northern Alberta railway. So that we now have these two great railways joint owners of hundreds of miles of line in that territory. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has obtained running rights from near Meadow Lake on the Canadian National Railways on which construction began in 1929 at Loon Lake in Saskatchewan, a line which I am asking them to complete now that the war is over. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has running rights for fifty-five miles over the Canadian National railway, from a point at or near Loon Lake in the constituency of Athabaska to Cold Lake. The Canadian Pacific survey extends in an easterly direction and somewhat to the north running right through the riding of Athabaska and joining there with the Northern Alberta railway at Lac La Biche, and with the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway somewhere in the vicinity of Lesser Slave lake, forming a great new highway of communication in the northern part of the province, indicating not only the advisability but the necessity of building this western outlet which we are advocating to-day in this house.

I have been pleased with the tone of this debate, and I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) upon the able manner in which he has presented his argument in favour of the building of this outlet. I have spent the best years of my life, if I may speak humbly about myself, in the service of my country, and now that I am getting old I hope that God will lend to me enough years of life to enable me to see the completion of this great project and to hear the engines whistling their way clear all the way from Winnipeg and Saskatoon, or Hudson bay, because we have the choice of routes, right through to Prince Albert, through my country and through the Peace River country, that wonderful, beautiful country, and then on into the province of British Columbia to the sea.

Mr. A. L. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to say how much I appreciated the speech of the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Dechene). I was interested in his dealing with Peace, that wonderful river and that wonderful aim. But it seems that the word "Peace" is best described by Charlie McCarthy who four Sundays ago said that peace was now raging all over the world. I think that is the kind of peace we now have.

I was also glad that my hon. friend had discovered a lot of oil up in that country. If he has, he is the only one who knows anything about it, and I think he must have kept silent about it because the large oil companies, which are so often accused of saying that there is tremendous exploration going on there, do not yet seem to have discovered oil, although I hope that they will ultimately discover very large deposits there. The government of British Columbia, of course, must wake up. They are going to develop these resources on their own but they do not care to spend any money in doing so, and so their oil, I think, will remain where nature put it, in that great storehouse below, if it is down there at all.

I rise for one purpose and it is this, to say that we in Alberta of the political persuasion of which I am, are most heartily in favour of this resolution. We are not newly converted to it by any means. I attended a convention in Alberta in January of this year; we there affirmed a resolution that we had passed at the convention the year before, and it was right along this line.

May I also say something with respect to what was said by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). I know, Mr. Speaker, that one cannot refer to what has been said in a previous debate, but I have received from some organization in the maritime provinces literature dealing with what they call the maritime railway question. All that this resolution asks is that this government give consideration to the building of this railway. Why should we not in this parliament adopt a new outlook; in short, do our duty in the maritimes, do it in the northern part of Alberta, in Saskatchewan and in British Columbia, and so help to make this the Dominion of Canada rather than the sectionalized business that it seems to be at the present time

Mr. C. C. I. MERRITT (Vancouver-Burrard): Mr. Speaker, I rise also to support this resolution. I think it might be pointed out that although all the members who have spoken in favour of it come from the west, we all speak as Canadians and not as westerners, and the reason we speak as we do is because we know naturally better than the people in the eastern part of Canada what are our problems.

I have just three points and they are very short. First, it seems to me perfectly obvious, from what we have heard already in the telling arguments that have been advanced, that the non-completion of this railway outlet is a matter of expense alone. That is the only reason in the world why it has not been done. I was particularly interested in the only part

[Mr. Smith (Calgary West).]

of the remarks of the mover of the resolution (Mr. Irvine), with which I disagreed. He took some time to explain the great preference of the people of British Columbia for a government-owned railway over one owned by private enterprise. So far as I am concerned I do not care who builds the railway just so long as it is built. I think it is very likely that the people of that area feel as I do about it. But that question hardly arises. I do not believe there is any private enterprise that is particularly anxious to build that road now. They would not want to spend a large sum of money in the construction of a road which would not be a profitable operation at the present time.

If the government should consider that the expense of this construction is an insuperable obstacle, I wish to point out that this is not an isolated demand on the part of British Columbia and Alberta members for the building of an uneconomical railway purely for their sectional interests. I suggest to the responsible ministers that this is, rather, one part and perhaps one small part of a very great programme of public development, and particularly of development of communications, which we can embark on now that we have secured peace. We can make these developments into profitable operations either for private enterprise or for the government—if only we are prepared to face the obvious facts and link such developments, this one and many others over Canada, with a programme of large-scale immigration into this country. If we have the additional people who will settle in such an area, all questions of whether or not the expense is at present too great, or whether the traffic or the people in the Peace River could support a railway, disappear, just as they disappeared in the early days of railway building and colonization.

I should like to refer, too, to what the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) said about the provincial government of British Columbia having set aside a million acres for soldier settlement and having put a string on it that the settlers must be British Columbia returned men. I agree with the hon. member that that string should be removed, but I would still be fearful that veterans would not take up those million acres in any great numbers unless they were sure that a very large additional number of people were going into the area. I have not yet been there; I am going. I am told it is very fine indeed, that the yield of the crops is very great. But according to a professor at the university of British Columbia there are many people in that general area who have not a cash income of more than $400 a year.

When one takes into consideration the enormous demand for foodstuffs, and the tremendous wealth and great productivity of the country, that condition can only arise because of the lack of proper transportation facilities. I am very sure that, whereas returned veterans are now going on to the land in and around Vancouver and other cities, were they assured of a proper outlet for their commodities this great area of which we are speaking would be quickly filled up.

My final point, Mr. Speaker, is this. All great cities start as distributing centres for the produce of the countryside. Then they increase, and so long as they have veins and arteries reaching out into the hinterland they thrive and prosper. But so soon as the development of the great natural resources of the hinterland of our country ceases, those cities will fail to increase, and if they fail to increase they will probably diminish in size and cease to prosper. Nothing can stand still; it must go ahead or it must go back. Here is one of the missing arteries into the great port and city of Vancouver.

I suggest that Toronto started as a centre of agricultural marketing and as the years went by it developed, burst into a great industrial city and contemporaneously into the greatest mining centre in North America. That city is growing now, and depends for its prosperity upon the rich mining areas of the north which are being opened up, and upon western Canada itself. Likewise we have Winnipeg, which again is a great city, but which has not achieved the same position of diversification as has Toronto. Winnipeg, I think, may be described without offence to anyone as a grain city. That is its lifeblood; that is why it exists. In Vancouver we have a similar situation. Vancouver is a great port, but at the present moment it is chiefly dependent for its existence and expansion on the logging industry. It is a great lumber city, but if it is to reach the stage of diversification which has been attained by the older and larger cities of Canada, it, too, must have the same opportunity for outlets as have those other cities. In the past years of war there has been a great influx of people into Vancouver. At least 60,000 of the 90,000 who came to British Columbia during the war years came to that city. We must now not only be a logging city and a port but develop a secondary industry and must become an industrial centre and a mining centre as well. We cannot do that unless our hinterland is developed. That one should have to go 1,500 miles around by Edmonton to get into the Peace River country is most ridiculous, and one which will not improve the balance of population in British Columbia. If that balance is not improved the progress of Canada itself will be held back.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. For the reasons I have given I consider that this project can and should be undertaken, in the interest not only of the west but of the whole of Canada.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): If I may say a word in support of this resolution, I do not think this debate should be confined wholly to hon. members who come from British Columbia and from Alberta, because it is a matter of national concern. After all, when one considers that the province of Alberta and this part of British Columbia which has been particularly described this afternoon contain, I believe, the very richest part of Canada, with probably the most sparse population, a country which has a hinterland of this description with a sparse population cannot be expected indefinitely to be able to hold such a country selfishly for its own ends. I believe the time has come when we should have a comprehensive national programme to develop the whole of the Canadian north country.

The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine), who introduced this resolution this afternoon, is not supporting this proposal for the first time. I remember how the former member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy), who was a member of the old U.F.A. group of which my hon. friend was also a member, used periodically to introduce a resolution here regarding a Peace River outlet.

I am very glad to rise, not only on behalf of myself but on behalf of those associated with me in this party, to support this resolution. In doing so, I submit this to the house. Transportation, after all, ought not to be considered wholly as a matter of profit and loss. We do not consider highways in that light, and if we want to develop the country we must have transportation that is fast and that will carry the heavy loads which are necessary to maintain production in an area such as the Peace River and the Cariboo. My mind goes back to a period before the war, and I hope that we also learned a lesson during the war, when there were people in the house and across the country who were constantly urging that certain railway lines be pulled up, that certain branches be discontinued, and that even the railways connecting east and west might be served over one line of steel.

All of us during the war realized how valuable those rails were to the country. Sometimes I think the Canadian Pacfiic Railway Company would probably be glad indeed if

the double track which was removed between White River and another point on that railway, the name of which I have forgotten, had been left instead of being pulled up at the behest of those who were opposed to continuing two transcontinental lines. I am glad to hear my hon. friends to the right, the Progressive Conservative party, supporting expanding railway transportation in this country. That should make it pretty well unanimous in this house. In view of the need for the railway, the desirability of opening up the vast territory, the very rich country of northern Alberta and of the Cariboo area of British Columbia, and of the entire Peace River block, I hope that the resolution will receive the support of the house. More than that, I hope that the government will pay attention to the resolution and carry out the wishes of parliament and ensure the building of this badly needed outlet to the sea without unnecessary delay.

If, as has been already said, they consider it a matter of profit and loss immediately, it may be some years before the project is undertaken; but, after all, when we consider the history of western Canada and the building of the Canadian Pacific railway, we remember that there were people who predicted that it would not pay for the axle grease when it went through uninhabited country. We realize what the building of that road meant to the prairie country. I believe the logical railway, because of the location of its main and Prince Rupert lines, and in view of the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Cariboo, is the Canadian National. But let us bear in mind, when we discuss the building of new roads by the Canadian National Railways, that if we are to impose upon the Canadian National Railways the building of a road which may not be immediately profitable, then this House of Commons should remember that fact in future days when the balance sheets of that railway system are placed before parliament. We should not impose upon the Canadian National Railways an obligation and then criticize it because it cannot make the venture pay. This parliament was too prone to do that in pre-war days. Before I sit down may I say once more that I hope the resolution will receive the hearty support of the house.

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, normally at this late time one would be justified in asking the permission of the house to call it six o'clock, but in view of the expressed desire to have the debate conclude and the vote taken I propose to carry on for the few minutes that remain before we rise, and I would ask the indulgence of the house to continue at eight o'clock if I have not concluded.

The reason I rise to support the resolution is my belief that I can add, in the few brief minutes at my disposal, one or two arguments to those adduced by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine). With due respect, I hope that the minister will give consideration to those arguments and let the house have a reasoned statement as to whether or not he proposes to carry out the spirit of the resolution and, if not, why not.

It is not necessary for me to add anything to what the hon. member for Cariboo said with reference to the resources of that great country which would be served by the railway that he is advocating. Their main resources are grain, millions of bushels potentially, and coal, millions of tons, as he has pointed out. I need hardly add that grain, certainly wheat especially, is one of the main requirements of the world at this time and it is very probable that coal will rank closely behind grain.

These resources are not developed to their full extent because there are no adequate outlets for that area. Without adequate outlets resources cannot find their way to the market, and without adequate transportation facilities people will not go in. There is no free access in or out of the area. Before one can expect any country to develop it is certainly necessary to provide it with a proper transportation system and a proper outlet. After all, that is the whole history of Canada. Canada itself did not develop until someone took his courage in his hands and constructed a railway over what was virtual waste.

Following the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, Canada along the southern border underwent a great and remarkable expansion. Following the construction of the Canadian National, or what is now the Canadian National, we witnessed an almost equally remarkable expansion in the north central part of the dominion. It is only reasonable, therefore, to assume that the same expansion would follow were we now to build this railway into the further northern part of the two provinces of Alberta and British Columbia.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

VACANCY

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FOR THE ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF PARKDALE

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

150 Balmoral Avenue,
Toronto, Ontario,
March 30, 1946.

To the Speaker of the House of Commons,
Ottawa, Canada.
Honourable Sir:

I, Herbert Alexander Bruce, member of the House of Commons for Parkdale, declare my intention to resign my seat as such member, and hereby resign my said seat.

Dated at Toronto this 30th day of March, 1946.

Herbert A. Bruce.

Witness:
Olive E. Donnelly
Betty L. Stewart

I shall issue my warrant to-morrow for a new writ for an election in the electoral district of Parkdale.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Parkdale, whose letter you have just read, wrote me also and asked if I would be good enough to read his letter to his associates in the House of Commons. With your permission and with the indulgence of the house I trust I may be permitted to do so now. It is as follows:

John Bracken, Esq., M.P.,
Leader of the Opposition,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Bracken,

It will not be a surprise to you that by concurrent mail I am tendering my resignation to the Speaker, for you knew of my determination not to be a candidate in the last election until I yielded to your urgent request and that of my executive committee. Having accomplished what was requested of me under the special circumstances existing at that time, I think it is now clear for the very same reason that I should not continue longer to sit in the House of Commons.

May I recall that I only consented to be a candidate in 1940 when it was impressed upon me that this provided an opportunity to render actual war service because of the absence of so many of our younger men in the armed forces. The war was still continuing at the time of the general election last year and the same arguments were presented. Now, however, the situation has changed because the war has not only ended but we are nearing the completion of demobilization and the reason which impelled me to contest the last two elections and to occupy my seat in the House of Commons no longer remains. I am therefore happy to step aside and give place to some younger man, preferably a veteran, whose experience during the war will give him special qualifications for further service to his country in the difficult years of peace which lie ahead.

May I assure you that I have found parliamentary life and its diversified concerns with matters of outstanding importance to national and international well-being, both satisfying and on occasions exciting. I am grateful for the widened horizons it has offered to me and for the many new friendships it has brought on all sides of the house.

With warmest regards to you and every member of our party in the house and all good wishes for your future success.

I am,
Yours faithfully,
Herbert A. Bruce.

I do not know what the usual procedure is on an occasion like this, but perhaps the house would permit me to say a brief word of comment with respect to a matter which comes very close to me personally. I have known Doctor Bruce for three years, have worked with him intimately for over a year, and have always found him to be a loyal associate, a courageous public servant, a man who took his duties seriously and one who represented his constituency as faithfully as he knew how. As he resigns his place among us I wish to add that he will take away with him the best wishes, certainly of all his associates in this party and, I think I can say on an occasion like this, the best wishes of all members in all parties in the house. I am happy to have this opportunity of paying a word of tribute to a man who was not young when he came here, but who early in the war entered parliament out of a sense of public duty when large numbers of younger men were required for service in the armed forces.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) in wishing the Hon. Doctor Bruce, who, I regret to learn, has left this company of statesmen, a very happy and prosperous future. He had a distinguished career; he was a most distinguished physician and surgeon. He served with great dignity in representing His Majesty as lieutenant governor of the province of Ontario. He paid most assiduous attention to his duties in this house, and made valuable contributions to our discussions and debates. So from the opposite side of this aisle I would join with the leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition in wishing happy years to our friend Doctor Bruce.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, though on the same side of the aisle but further away we also would like to associate ourselves with the leader of the house in regretting the resignation of Doctor Bruce from the House of Commons. I knew

of Doctor Bruce by repute for many years before he came here. I was aware of his great interest in matters of public concern in his own province. I had an opportunity of becoming better acquainted with him here, and I am sure we of this group will associate ourselves with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and those on the government side in wishing him a long and happy life, in whatever he may undertake.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, from this corner of the house we wish to join with other hon. members who have already spoken in wishing Doctor Bruce a happy retirement from the house. I have been able to count him among my friends, and the hon. members in this corner have appreciated his contribution to the public life of Canada.

PEACE RIVER DISTRICT

RAILWAY OUTLET TO PACIFIC COAST

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Irvine:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should give immediate consideration to the building of a railway outlet from the Peace River country to the Pacific coast.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock I had just completed dealing in a general way with some of the resources of the area we are discussing, namely the Peace River area, and the desirability of developing these resources. I shall endeavour to conclude my remarks certainly within ten minutes and, if possible, within five, to leave the floor for discussion on the part of those other hon. members who wish to add their weight to what has been said.

Something has been said about driving spikes on the railway. I regret that my spike cannot be more in the nature of a golden spike. Possibly the minister will drive what we might call the golden spike in this railroad. Mine, however, will be a more workmanlike spike because, from now on, for the next few minutes, I intend to address myself to a few facts which I believe will give some practical support to the resolution. When I refer to my spike being more workmanlike, I must explain that it will be more workmanlike in appearance only. It may be that the minister's spike which would forge the last link would be the golden spike, and of great value.

The area in question has been described. We have heard about its resources, and we have also had some description of the present service afforded that area. Hon. members will recall that practically the only rail communication is from one side of the Peace river via the Northern Alberta railways to Edmonton. Then we have the main line of the Canadian National Railways, the shortest route to the sea, being a line direct from Edmonton to Prince Rupert, and another line from Edmonton to Vancouver.

As hon. members will recall, it means an extra haul of from 1,000 to 1,500 miles to get to the water, because it has to go first to the east, to Edmonton, and then come back the same distance west. That line of the Canadian National Railways to Prince Rupert goes through Prince George, which is in the constituency of Cariboo, the constituency from which the hon. member who has offered the resolution comes.

Some seventy-five miles south of Prince George is the town of Quesnel, which is the northern terminal of the Pacific Great Eastern railway. That railway runs from Quesnel southwesterly to Squamish on the coast north of Vancouver. So that we have a gap of approximately seventy miles between Prince George and Quesnel. That gap, it should be noted, was at one time graded. There has been a right of way put through there, but the rails were never laid.

If, then, we can get a railway from Quesnel to Prince George there would be a junction with the Canadian National Railways line to Prince Rupert. Thus we have the line from Edmonton to Squamish, which is practically from Edmonton direct to Vancouver, serving not only the Peace River, but also that other area of north central British Columbia, which at present has hardly any outlet, namely the Prince George-Quesnel district.

It is further significant to note that as the line runs down from Quesnel to Squamish, at one point on its length, in the vicinity of Pavilion and Clinton, there is a gap of only some forty miles between it and the main line of the Canadian National Railways to Vancouver. So that if we were to build a railway first from Prince George to the Peace River, that would be the first requisite. The hon. member for Cariboo has emphasized the importance of that, and I feel I need say no more on the subject. Then we have only a seventy-five mile gap from Quesnel to Prince George, and a forty mile gap from Pavilion or Clinton to Lytton, or the main line of the Canadian National Railways in the vicinity of Ashcroft or Savona. We have a complete hook-up giving direct access from the port of Vancouver to the very heart of the Peace River district.

Briefly, the advantages of such a set-up would be, first, that the Peace River would have its outlet to the great port of Vancouver.

An outlet would then exist for grain which, as the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) has remarked, cannot find its way out through the lakes, because of the late maturity of the grain in that district. Therefore it must find its way through a Pacific port. It has that direct outlet.

In addition, grain from the Peace River country would have ready access to the rest of the interior of British Columbia, particularly the Cariboo and Kamloops ranching district which, at the present time, has to import its feed grain for winter purposes. Some of that comes from the Peace River, and it must go east to Edmonton, and then all the way back, covering that extra thousand miles.

So that we would have a two-fold advantage in the outlet. First, there is the outlet to the port, and, second, the outlet to feed the ranch animals of the interior of British Columbia. In addition to that, you would have a road crossing the main line of the Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific railway in the vicinity of Ashcroft and Savona —that is the east and west line—you would have the north-south line from the Okanagan, and from the interior part of Washington and Oregon, up through Kamloops and along the main line to Savona, joined by the new construction to the Pacific Great Eastern, and so right up to the Peace River.

So that you have there, with those two short branches only needed to be constructed, a whole new network of communication serving the lower part of central British Columbia and Alberta, and serving the northern part of Alberta and British Columbia in the Peace River.

So much for specific benefits which would accrue from the adoption by the house and government of the policy outlined in the resolution. I have suggested the Canadian National Railways, not because I believe this matter should be decided on a basis of public ownership as against private ownership, but simply because that railway happens to be there already. It has a line running through Prince George. Then on the north side of the river running down to Vancouver, the first line you would strike would be the Canadian National. Therefore it seems logical to use it.

I suggest that this be done now, because I understand that surveys have been made. It is said that the surveys show that the line would not be profitable in the immediate future. Nevertheless, as I have said, history has shown that the construction of railways in this country has always preceded development.

There is in existence, I believe, a report of a recent survey conducted as to the future of the Pacific Great Eastern Railway system. The dominion government was represented on that survey. I have not seen the report. It may be that there are arguments in it which could be used to refute the present suggestion. Nevertheless I take the risk of advocating this policy now, although I have not read the report. I do that because if we have faith in the country we must be willing to take a certain amount of risk to build railways which inevitably must lead to a development of a vast and hitherto undeveloped part of the country. No doubt hon. members can think of many dangers and obstacles which would be encountered if this construction were undertaken. But I think I am safe in arriving at this conclusion: that there have been dangers and obstacles in the way of every development which has been carried on in this country and perhaps no more so than in connection with the Canadian Pacific railway. We admit that there are obstacles and dangers, but we say that our resource, our industry and our courage should be no less than those of the fathers of confederation who united this country by means of a great railway system.

Mr. MAX CAMPBELL (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, the first point I wish to make is that of need. Does this country or this district need this railway? I think that has been amply proved by those speakers who have already spoken in favour of this resolution. I wish to draw the attention of the house to the fact that as far back as 1910 settlers went into this area. In 1918 the government of the day put out a lot of propaganda to coax people to go into the district, and a lot of people did go in. Promises were made to these people by different governments in the past and by different members of government. I think it is high time something was done to fufil the promises that were made to these people.

There are certain principles involved. The history of our railways is not something that many of us are very proud of. As I said, promises have been made by members of different governments and by different governments. Railways have been started and left half finished. Sometimes they were started at one end and sometimes they were started at two ends. As one hon. member said last session, sometimes they are started in the middle and do not get anywhere at either end. Last year we had a debate urging the completion of the gap remaining in our railway system. The promises which were made to these people should be carried out.

As to its being a good business proposition, it has been amply shown that there is an empire in this territory. A few years ago I met a number of people who had prospected through it and they told me that they had found a mine that was practically solid copper. The only way they could get any of that copper to the railroad was by making sleighs which were pulled down the mountainside by hand, after which the ore was loaded on pack horses and packed twenty miles to the railroad. That sort of development is too slow; it is too much out of date.

Someone mentioned during the course of the debate that opportunity should be provided for young people with initiative, that people with the pioneering spirit should be given every advantage that would be derived from living in this particular area. I am satisfied that if the railroad were put through a great many young people with pioneering spirit, a great many returned men who are looking for an opportunity to establish themselves, would find opportunity there.

It is quite possible that there may be an economic recession in the near future. We have found in the past that when there is government expenditure on the opening up of a new empire or a new territory an opportunity is given to those who have stored up capital to put that capital into circulation and thus stave off a possible recession.

I see the minister has been in his seat all during this debate and I see also that he has a file on his desk. I am hoping that before eleven o'clock he will give us some inkling of what the government is thinking about in this connection, and so I shall not take up any more time.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of communications from Peace River, Grimshaw, Berwyn and other towns on the north side of the Peace river. On a former occasion when a similar matter was before the house I received communications from Grande Prairie, Dawson Creek and other towns on the south side of the river. Therefore I feel compelled to say a few words, but I shall be brief.

I have traversed both sides of the river, east and west and north and south. This is one part of Canada that has been—I was going to say shamefully, but that is not the right word—not very satisfactorily treated by the railroads. I am not blaming the railroads. I have in mind one of the pioneers of the area, a man who went in by wagon from Edmonton to the town of Peace River. I imagine he has been there for about forty or more years, perhaps as many as fifty years, and all that time he has been advocating the building and later the extension of the railways running into that part of the country. I refer to Page Rideout who has perhaps done more to obtain a Pacific outlet than anyone else that I know of. At much personal expense he has travelled all over the area and has delivered addresses in practically all the towns in British Columbia and Alberta that have been mentioned in the course of this debate. I think of other prominent business men who have been associated with him, such as Mr. Henry Jerry, Mr. J. D. Levesque, Mr. Pierre Gauvreau, Mr. J. B. Early and others. All of them were pioneers. They, along with the boards of trade of their respective towns, have been ardent advocates of the extension of these railways.

When I commenced my remarks I said that I did not think this area had been treated very satisfactorily by the railways. For instance, the railway running north from the fine city of Edmonton, after travelling perhaps four hundred miles, reaches McLennan, where there is a junction or fork. One line of railroad then runs north to Peace River. That is a real town, and in my opinion some day it will be a city. It is a splendid town, with fine prospects. The railway crosses the river there over a big steel bridge and runs along the north side of the river, finally ending at what is called Hines Creek, and there it ends, as one might say, up in the air. It is a splendid territory as far as Fort St. John and beyond that for one hundred miles in every direction. The whole area, as one hon. member has said has been denied adequate transportation ever since the pioneers went in there. I was talking to one pioneer in the town of Grimshaw, and he told me that he had gone in to Notikewin, north of Grimshaw thirty-seven years ago and that at that time the map he looked at when he was choosing his lot showed a railway running up to that part of the country. It is too bad what those pioneers have had to endure in transporting their grain and other products to market. The railway should have gone west as far as Fort St. John or beyond on the north side of the river years and years ago.

Turning to the south side of the river you see something, Your Honour, that is almost incredible so far as railways are concerned. The railway runs west from McLennan junction to Spirit River, and there it originally ended up in the air, so to speak. If you go there now on the train, the train takes you as far as Spirit River, and then it backs east a mile or more to Rycroft, where it turns directly south and runs well on to a hundred miles to the fine

town of Grande Prairie, which some day will be a city. At Grande Prairie it turns and runs to the northwest, ending at Dawson Creek. I never saw such a jumble of railways in my life. They do not seem to go anywhere but run all over the lot. From Spirit River to Pouce Coupe a route was constructed many years ago but the rails were never laid.

The whole area should be given an outlet to the sea. I am not going to enter into a discussion as to where the outlet should be. Some have mentioned Prince Rupert and others, Vancouver. They are both splendid outlets.

An hon. MEMBER: What about Squamish?

Mr. MacNICOL: I said an outlet to the sea. We have enough of these inland outlets already. I think my hon. friend, the member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) described the situation very well. I was not referring in any derogatory way to the town my hon. friend who interrupted mentioned, but I like to see a railway run to a destination where it will connect up with some other line, and I hope that at another session some of the British Columbia members will bring in a resolution to project these railways in British Columbia on northward. I often wonder why a road has not been run right through the Rocky mountains' trough. I do not know why it could not go right through there. It could go at least as far as I went because a railway can go as far as I can walk. I do not see why a railway could not go through there. maybe up to White Horse. I may be exaggerating a little as to distance because I did not walk that far, but certainly as far as I went up there a railway can go. The whole area wants railway connections and, as one hon. member has said, the railways should precede the opening up of a country. It is full of magnificent resources, minerals of every description in vast quantities. The mover of the resolution (Mr. Irvine) spoke of the great coal deposit at Hudson Hope. I have a piece of coal from Hudson Hope either in my desk or in my room. It is a wonderful deposit of coal, and that deposit has this great advantage, that you could take coal out of that mine and transport it down the Peace river itself. But that is a waterways question, not a railway question.

I wish to pay tribute to those pioneers who have endured everything in the Peace River country, in Alberta and in Britaish Columbia. They have endured things that no pioneers should be asked to endure. And what have they now? The railways end just where they did forty years ago. But settlement has gone away beyond the railways. The last time I went for forty miles north of Fort St. John. I saw a very good settlement. As it is to-day, these people have to come down the Alaska highway and then down to Dawson Creek before they can get their produce to a railway.

I support this resolution strongly. I would have supported it from my own observations, but I have also had numerous letters from people up there who know I am familiar with what they are up against.

Even after you leave Peace River, the railroad should be extended east. I know that if my hon. friend the leader of the Social Credit party, (Mr. Low), who unfortunately is out of town to-day, were here he would be advocating the extension of the railway east from the town of Peace River to Athabaska Landing. For how long have we not heard of the hopes of Athabaska Landing. There is another case where the railroad ends in the air. It ends at the town of Athabaska. That line should be extended east from Peace river to Athabaska Landing, then on to Lac la Biche, past Meadow Lake and on to Prince Albert. The hon. member for Athabaska has repeatedly asked for an extension of the railway from Frenchman Butte to connect up a forty-mile gap. My hon. friend the member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), if he wants to go from Prince Albert to Edmonton, has to do as I did, take that whole long route down to Saskatoon, where he transfers and takes the main line to Edmonton. The line should go straight through, as the hon. member for Athabaska has urged on many occasions.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Where is Prince Albert?

Mr. MacINNIS: Ask the Prime Minister.

Mr. MacNICOL: I had been expecting my hon. friend the member for Fraser Valley to rise in his place long ago and support this resolution. I shall not answer his question because I think too much of him and he may rise and support this resolution yet. All the railroads in that part of the country, in British Columbia and Alberta, end, as one might say, in the woods, except the one that runs to Prince Rupert.

I hope that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) will accept this resolution. There is no reason why he cannot accept it because all it asks for is consideration of this project. But I want him to do more than consider it. I want him as Minister of Transport to build some of these lines so that the people of this great area, where there are now many thousands of people — there are 10,000 farmers north of the Peace river and there are thousands of fine farms south of the river;

I do not know of any area that is better than the area from Grande Prairie up to Dawson Creek—will have an outlet.

I support this resolution as an easterner, as no other easterner has yet spoken in favour of it. I know from long years in business that we can make the area prosperous by having those railways completed, which will mean more money for the farmers all round about, and the opening up of the area. This in turn will mean a lot more orders down east. I am one of those who believe that we all live together; if the west prospers the east prospers; and if this area opens up, and the farmers there get at least fair play—which they have not had—they will be able to buy more. How can they buy when they cannot get what they are entitled to? There is no better buyer than the farmer; he will send in his orders when he has the means. In that way the east will participate in the profits which will accrue from carrying out my hon. friend's suggestion. I have heard it on many previous occasions. I am not sure if he brought in this motion before, but I give him credit for his action. Mr. Kennedy brought up the matter when he represented Peace River; and Mr. Fraser, when he represented Cariboo.

This house should unanimously carry this resolution and strengthen the minister's hands to present a strong case to the railway board. For forty years the long-suffering pioneers have endured these conditions; they have carted their grain and produce over all sorts of roads; indeed it is only lately that they have had half-decent roads. In saying that, I am not finding any fault with those responsible for the roads; they did not get the support to which they were entitled, so they could not construct the roads which should have been available for the pioneers. Now let us support these people by giving them an outlet to the Pacific ocean.

Mr. JAMES SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): In rising to speak to this resolution I should first like to say that in the last few moments my faith in one of my idols has been rudely shaken. Since coming to the house we here have been proud of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol). He is one who periodically has gone out into the west, after each session, and has returned to tell the story of what the west needs. We have heard him tell us here in the house of the long journeys he has taken, to the Great Slave lake, the Great Bear lake, to Aklavik and across the Peace river, and we have all marvelled at his geographical knowledge and been amazed at the way in which he has been able to recall the locations of all these places. But when the hon. member tells me that the railway terminates at Squamish and that it is in the interior of British Columbia and not on the coast, my faith in him is rudely shaken. Perhaps his knowledge of the north country, too, is not as good as in the past we thought it was.

I should also like to speak of the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton). As the house knows, I take a keen interest in the progress of the young member, and I wish to congratulate him. This morning's press carried the announcement that he had been elected national president of the Young Progressive Conservative Association. I was surprised to learn that there were enough young people sufficiently benighted to form a Young Progressive Conservative Association.

Mr. HOMUTH: You will be surprised again.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Apparently reaction dies hard in Ontario, but since it must be that such an association shall exist, I know of no one better fitted to lead it than my young friend the hon. member for Kamloops.

To-night is one of those refreshing occasions to members from British Columbia when British Columbia questions are discussed in this house, and we see in every part of the chamber British Columbia members rise to speak with no trace of political partisanship.

Mr. FULTON: What were you doing a moment ago?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): You are not a British Columbia problem yet: you are rapidly becoming one. We see the C.C.F. hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) rise and put forward a resolution advocating a railway to the Pacific coast, and this is supported by Liberal and Conservative members from British Columbia, all wishing to represent that province in a non-partisan way, but in a provincial way. The reason is very easy to find. We are only three thousand miles from the capital, but in spirit we are ten thousand miles away. There are only sixteen of us here to bring to the attention of the house the problems of British Columbia, and only by being united do we find that we get any attention at all. No matter what government has been in power here, the programme seems to be, as the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) says, millions for the St. Lawrence, tariff protection for Ontario, great grain subsidies for the prairies, and airy promises for British Columbia. For this reason we have tried to speak of British Columbia problems as British Columbia members, and not as Conservatives or Liberals. However,

the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) did introduce a slight political note when he mentioned that an outlet from the Peace River to the Pacific was a policy of the Conservative party. He went farther; he mentioned that one who at that time was his leader, now the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), last year toured British Columbia and visited Ominica and the Peace River.

Mr. GREEN: 1944.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): At that time, when he was not in the house but going around the country making political speeches; and he said, at the conclusion of this great hegira to British Columbia, that if elected he would promise an outlet to the Pacific coast, so that the people of the Peace River could move their coal and lead and other products to open water. It might be expected that a people so sorely pressed would leap at this promise and show their appreciation of it by returning Conservative members in the ridings affected.

An hon. MEMBER: I thought you did not talk politics on this resolution.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): But we find that in these ridings—the Cariboo, Skeena and Vancouver North—not only were not the Tories elected but they lost their deposits. Why? Not because the people of the Peace River were stupid, but because they were smart, and they had heard these promises before. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, where they had heard them. It was at the time, I believe, that the Liberal-Conservative party, as it was then called, had a convention at Winnipeg, and on June 9, 1930, gave their pledges to the nation. Pledge No. 5 was, amongst other railway construction, the construction of a Pacific outlet for the Peace River; and they were elected. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition had little hope of being elected, so that he need not have been quite so careful. The hon. member for Davenport, who is now putting pressure on the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) to carry this work through, sat here, having given that pledge, in 1930, with R. B. Bennett as Prime Minister.

Mr. MacNICOL: And I have supported it every session since then.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): And what was done?

Mr. MacNICOL: I am not a minister. If I were the minister I would put the railway through.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): So that is why I say that the people of Peace River, the Cariboo and Vancouver North, have shown very good sense in not paying much attention to the leader of the Conservative party.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Get a new needle; that record is worn out.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): And the interesting thing is that the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) played the same record to-night.

Mr. HOMUTH: Are you for it or against it?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): I am for it, and I am going to say why I am for it. I know the Ominica and the Ingonika country, and I understand the need of railroad facilities to get heavy materials out of there. Passengers can fly out. The hon. member for Davenport can fly out and can get his grip when he leaves it behind.

Mr. MacNICOL: I did not catch what the hon. member said. I like to use the railroad when I can.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): But heavy material still requires railway transportation; the wheat of the Peace River, the lead and silver of Ominica and the groundhog country can only move by railway. The hon. member for Kamloops gave a full description of the actual possible railway outlets, and there is no need for us to repeat that, but simply to support what the people of the Peace River and all of us from British Columbia believe should be undertaken by voting immediately for this resolution.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): I am in the happy position of not being of a controversial nature, and I am not a Rhodes scholar. I really do not know much about the Peace River. So far as I know, there are only two men in Canada who have a complete knowledge of everything, and mightily have they proclaimed that knowledge, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and Mr. B. K. Sandwell, of Toronto *Saturday Night*. If there is anything you are not sure of, ask them; they know everything. At last we in the west are actually getting somewhere. Ontario and Toronto—Toronto particularly—are beginning to see the light.

Mr. FULTON: They repealed prohibition the other day.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: There are two answers to that and George Drew will find the next time that a Liberal government will be back in power. I am more unfortunate than my roommate. Not only can I con-

gratulate the hon. member for Kamloops on his appointment to the exalted position he holds as leader of a party of two, but I may say that he has already invited me to dinner with refreshments.

I said I would not take up much time and I do not intend to. This is the first time in my life that I am appearing in an unofficial capacity to accept a resolution on behalf of the government. Why my hon. friends the Conservatives should be wasting so much time in trying to talk out the resolution I really do not know. The hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith), in his own style, said more in three minutes this afternoon than all the other speakers have said in four hours. I will say what I have to say in a minute and a half. Next to myself, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and the member for Calgary West are probably the two best speakers in this house. I say to my hon. friends, therefore: For goodness sake, keep quiet and let us allow the Minister of Transport to speak and endorse what we have been asking.

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): I will not take up much time. I am going to emulate the other speakers in that regard. I had intended to begin by saying that there seems to be a Chinook blowing through the building, everyone was getting on so well. However, since the last two speakers have spoken, Mr. Speaker, you will realize why I have the disposition I have. In British Columbia politics are real.

I should like to bring out one point that has not been brought out to-day and that is trade with the orient. That will develop in the future to far greater proportions than the trade which has been going on for so long from the Atlantic seaboard. It is just beginning to be developed. China is developing into a united nation and is becoming industrialized, and we in British Columbia want to be in the position where we shall have heavy industry so that we can capitalize on that. If heavy industry develops in British Columbia it will develop in the heart of the country, through Prince George, on through the ground-hog region and over toward the east. That is where the minerals are. That is where the coal is. In that section of the country there will some day be cities to correspond with Pittsburgh, Akron and so on.

Vancouver will make a nice tourist attraction, I admit, but we shall have industry there. All we have to do is to have a lead and transportation will solve the problem. Capital will flow there if the transportation is there, because the trade will soon develop.

[Mr. Cruickshank.]

At Prince Rupert we have a port that handled more material during the war than Vancouver did. It has the facilities which the Americans put there during the war and those facilities are second to none. As I said the other evening, it had such facilities put in as the elevator, which has not been used, and so on, and we are in a number one position to handle any trade that develops at Prince Rupert. This railway will be our lifeblood if it can be put in. The government will come to depend upon it and we are looking to the government for that lead. We do not want to be disappointed as we have been in the past.

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): In a few words I wish to support the resolution, speaking as a member from British Columbia. I cannot add anything to what has already been said in describing the necessity for the project. This necessity was well stated this afternoon by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) and others, but I must say that I do not quite agree with the approach of the hon. and gallant member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt). The argument he put forward in connection with the necessity for this railroad extension seemed to me to imply that it was for the advancement and building up of Vancouver.

Personally I think that is a wrong approach to the situation. I always rise to the bait, so to speak, when I hear people glorifying cities and size, and now I am making a countryman's protest. I think the railway should be built. just as other services should be provided, for the building up of smaller districts and not for the purpose of making cities larger. The object should be to decentralize our economy.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard also suggested that Vancouver was one of the leading mining cities in Canada. So far as I know, all mining that has been done in Vancouver has been done on paper. These facilities, railways and roads. are necessary to decentralize our economy and build up the small communities that are the strength and the bright spots in our present democracy.

Take British Columbia. You do not go to Vancouver to see democracy at its best, but to Nelson, Penticton, Kelowna, Kamloops and Chilliwack. We must emphasize the development of these backwoods districts, this hinterland, and not build railways with the idea of simply making larger the cities that are already oversize.

There are on the order paper five resolutions dealing with essential developments in Canada to-day. Personally, I think this is absolutely unnecesssary. This method of approach is

entirely obsolete. Why are we following such a method? We have to do so at present because no other approach is possible for members of the opposition. We are doing so because the government has failed to bring down a plan for reconstruction covering Canada as a whole. Instead of private members rising to support a railway here, a road there, a bridge here and a wateway there, the government, in my opinion, should have produced an over-all plan. a five-year plan if you like, for reconstruction throughout Canada, having in view the necessities of all sections, and then we would discuss it as a Canadian project and not as so many provincial or community understakings. Then we would have railways and roads proposed for British Columbia, irrigation projects for the prairie provinces, waterways for possibly Ontario and Quebec, and coastal facilities for the maritimes.

I trust that this policy of bits and bobs will soon be done away with and that we shall stream-line our procedure for the future, bringing in a plan covering a period of years to take care of the economic necessities of the country as a whole.

Mr. J. L. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, in order that the members from British Columbia may be unanimous in their endorsation of the resolution moved by the hon member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine), I should like to voice my support for his proposal, and also to congratulate him on the able manner in which he presented the facts of the case. I sincerely trust the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) is not going to be too well informed, so that he may be able to change our minds on the subject.

There is, it appears to me, one very important matter which has not been brought out to-day, a matter which the minister, who is from the east, may not appreciate. It is that I was going to say most but I will say many of the intelligent people of Canada are moving to the Pacific coast, and we in British Columbia are not able to support these people in our large urban areas, so that we must develop our outlying country, our hinterland. If we in British Columbia are to take care of the population which is going to crowd into that province, we shall have to open up our backwoods, where our great natural wealth lies. So that I would ask the minister to give this matter serious consideration and to do everything he possibly can to forward this project.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is really a matter of some concern to a minister of the crown when everyone in the house is of the same mind in regard to a project of such importance. I make that statement deliberately, because as a rule the house is in disagreement on matters that are brought forward. As I note the temper of the house in regard to this resolution, I recall the statement made by a former member of this house some years ago, that when the house agrees upon an important project, generally the house is wrong.

Whether or not that be so, it is not my intention this evening to oppose the resolution. Before I go on to discuss it I think I should congratulate the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) on the manner in which he brought the resolution forward. I think he deserves the commendation of hon. members generally for the fair way in which he presented the matter. I think, too, I should add a word of commendation to those who have joined in the debate. It is always pleasing when a subject is discussed in such a non-partisan way, and I think what I have said applies to all who have taken part in this discussion.

In saying what I have to say on this subject this evening I should like the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution to understand that I am not opposing it. I feel sympathetic toward him and toward the plight in which the people in the Peace River block find themselves but at the moment I am simply discussing the resolution, pointing out some of the objections and some of the difficulties that lie in the way. That there are some objections and difficulties is beyond question, though with many things said by the hon. gentleman I find myself in complete agreement. With others I find that I must disagree, and with those I shall deal at greater length a little later on.

A great deal has been said this evening about the matter of cost. Whether or not hon. gentlemen like it, whether we have in mind a private railway or a public railway, the cost factor must enter into the picture. I make that general statement now, and will come back to it a little later on. The problem which has been discussed this evening, that of providing an outlet from the Peace River block to the Pacific seaboard, is not new; it has been discussed in this house for many years. It has been the subject of discussion among agriculturists, ranchers, mining engineers, railway engineers, government officials and the like for more than a quarter of a century. During all that time the complaint has been that people living in the Peace River

block have to back-track or back-haul some five hundred miles before they can reroute their products to the relatively near ports of Vancouver and Prince Rupert. That back-haul is necessary because a chain of mountains intervenes between the seaboard and the Peace River area. The existing railway facilities in the area consist of the Northern Alberta railways, owned and operated jointly by the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The distance from railhead at Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Edmonton, Alberta, is some 500 miles; and the farmers, ranchers and others complain with some degree of equity and justice that they have to reroute their products back in the direction of Edmonton before they can go on to the closer ports on the Pacific coast.

On going over the debates of the house, I find that almost every year from 1922 to 1933 a resolution similar to that before the house this evening was placed on the order paper and debated exhaustively. This evening the hon. member for Cariboo has brought forward the arguments which militate in favour of the construction of this railway. In doing so, however, he has raised a very important point, which must come to the attention of the house sooner or later. It is that the policy in reference to the construction of new lines, branch lines or the extension of lines must receive consideration by parliament at some time or another; and in that respect I have to remind the house of the statement made the other evening by the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe). The minister dealt extensively with economic conditions in Canada at the moment. One of the things he said was that if at the beginning of the war he had been told that steel production in Canada would have doubled during the war years, he would not have believed it. Then he said that not only had it doubled but that in the last six months steel production has been in short supply and that there is a back-log of requirements which makes the position very difficult. In view of the statement of the minister that steel is in short supply, of necessity one must have that in mind in dealing with the "immediate consideration" referred to in the resolution.

Then the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply went on to refer to the housing situation, and to say how vital a problem housing is in Canada at the present time. Everyone in this house knows that steel will be in great demand in connection with the construction of commercial buildings and housing generally. Then there is the all-important point of cost. Hon. members in their discussion this afternoon seemed to put that to one side, and say that the time had come when railways of this kind could be built regardless of cost. I say to the house this, that I have before me at the present time some twenty applications from bodies all across Canada demanding the construction of railway lines. The people who have put forward these requests think them reasonable, and all think they should be built without delay. Some of those lines would be unprofitable, by any stretch of the imagination; others would not even begin to pay operating costs, and still others would not pay operating costs until they had been in existence or in operation for many years. Some, too, might well be profitable.

Therefore I say to the hon. member that the question of cost, notwithstanding what has been said in the house, is not the all-important factor, but it is certainly a factor which must be taken into consideration. Whether a railway costs $1 million or $100 million is a matter in which certainly the Minister of Finance would be interested because, particularly during the debate on the speech from the throne at this session, there has been an all-out demand for the retrenchment of expenditures. On Friday of last week the Minister of Finance was able to bring down estimates in which he showed a substantial reduction in expenditures.

I must remind the house that we cannot have the expenditures, and at the same time have the reduction in taxation. There is in the house a demand for a reduction in taxation. I believe there are on the order paper resolutions to that effect. I believe there is, too, on the order paper a resolution to the effect that exemption from taxation should be increased in the case of single men, and in the case of married men as well.

The point I wish to make is this. In a matter of this kind cost is a factor which unquestionably must be taken into consideration. Then, again, when the general question is considered, namely that in which I have just been engaged —the short supply of steel, the extreme necessity for housing, the question of curtailing expenditures and reducing taxes—it may well be that the building of railways will have to await a betterment in the position of those three items.

I note that one hon. member said this should be considered as a great post-war project. Perhaps that is somewhat in contradiction of the resolution, which demands immediate consideration. Having made those general observations, I should like now to address myself to the subject matter of the resolution in particular.

Again I say to him this, I am not opposing his resolution; I am discussing it, and pointing to some of the difficulties which lie in the way. The difficulties as I see them are three in number. They are physiographic, economic and financial.

Four routes have been discussed as possible solutions to the Peace River area. They are, first the Aggie-Obed outlet, which was mentioned in one of the reports of the commission. Next is the Monkman pass route; the third is Pine pass route, and the fourth is the Peace River route. Any one of these routes would provide an outlet from the territory under discussion; and any one of them would, I take it, meet with the approval of hon. members, although I note that some preference has been indicated in favour of one or other of the four routes.

Since 1925 a number of surveys have been made by the government in connection with these various routes. In these surveys the government has sought to obtain from engineers, who are experts in the matter, who know their business, and who have given the matter some study, various opinions respecting the four routes.

I am informed that five such surveys were made, over the course of the years, and I should like to deal with those surveys as briefly as possible. The first of them was made in 1925, jointly by the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The report was tabled in the house in 1927. That report went fully into the cost, the economics, the facilities, the transportation, and the branch lines which would be required if any one of these branch routes was proceeded with by the government.

The economic studies of the engineers in this report indicated that the best possible route at that time was the Aggie-Obed route, because it was the shortest, and because also is connected the line of the Northern Alberta railroad with the Canadian National Railways at Obed.

Another question, too, was considered in the report, namely as to whether Vancouver or Prince Rupert should be the objective of the western outlet. It was considered that the former port would attract most of the business for many years to come, certainly for such a period as would make it unnecessary to consider any other alternative. The engineers estimated that the minimum cost of the Aggie-Obed route would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of $13 million. They estimated further that the maximum cost would be over $80 million.

The report went on to say, too, that when the traffic out of the Peace River district had reached the amount of over $1,080,000 tons, there should be considered the possibility or the practicability of building the outlet.

I should like to put on record the conclusions of the report. I now quote from the report on various proposed railway routes for a western outlet to the Pacific from the Peace River district, by a joint board of engineers of the Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific Railway Company, dated 1926 and 1927:

> We may therefore briefly sum up the results of our studies in the following conclusions:
>
> (1) The route via Obed is the best western outlet to the Pacific, that is from the national standpoint or from the standpoint of the Canadian National Railways. It may not be the best from the standpoint of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it implies using part of the Canadian National Railways lines.
>
> (2) The immediate minimum outlay will be $13,336,000.
>
> (3) To fully develop the section we have considered will require a minimum outlay of over $80, million, and this does not include any betterments on existing roadways.
>
> (4) There is no hope even with the existing freight rate of about 39 cents per 100 pounds, for the line to pay even operating expenses on the immediate traffic, or on a traffic many times the present traffic.
>
> (5) There seems little hope of the line ever being self-supporting at rates even 50 per cent higher than the present ton-mile freight rate on grain to Fort William for similar distance.
>
> (6) It would be more economical to handle the business, regardless of the rate received, over the existing lines until the traffic was many times the present.

So much for the joint report of 1925. The next report was that of 1929-30. This was made at the instance of the British Columbia government in cooperation with the railway. The report is not in the Department of Transport; I have not seen it and therefore I am unable to discuss it.

The third report, made in 1931, was made by the engineers of the Canadian Pacific railway at a cost of $250,000 to that railway. It did not agree with the report of 1925 which had recommended the Aggie-Obed route; it rather favoured the Peace river route. The report then went on to say that in the opinion of the engineers, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company favoured a northern route, the Peace River pass.

When that report was brought to the attention of the then Minister of Railways and Canals he tried to get the two railways to agree on a route. He brought them into his office, but all he was able to get the railways to agree upon at that time was that neither of the railways should build the outlet but that the government of Canada should foot

the bill. I do not know what the position of the railways would be to-day with reference to that point, but I have no reason to believe that it would be any different in 1946 from what it was in 1931.

The fourth report, made in 1932, was made jointly by the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and is known as the Crysdale report. It again went into the various routes, and again this joint report recommended the Aggie-Obed route as being the best outlet to the Pacific coast. That report differs very little from any of those I have discussed up to the moment. I should like to summarize the report by reading the concluding remarks which I think are very much to the point. I am quoting from the Peace River outlet report by the committee of railway engineers appointed to consider the matter in 1931:

At the time the 1925 report was made, local interests were mainly concerned in obtaining a western outlet to cheapen their freight cost to the Pacific, and supply further railway mileage in the district. Since that time, a reduction of freight rates has been accorded them, now substantially equalling rates which would obtain if a western outlet were in use.

I pause here a moment because I think the hon. member for Cariboo by his statement would lead the house to believe—at least I gathered his meaning to be such—that the people living in the Peace River area were in a difficult position because they had to pay higher rates on account of the five hundred miles over which they had to back-haul their products before they could again be rerouted to the Pacific coast. I understood him to say that for that reason the freight rate was higher than it would normally be, but I am informed that such is not the case. Certainly that is not the conclusion I have just referred to. In order to make sure that I was not misinformed I got from the officers of the Canadian National Railways a statement on that point.

I am informed that in 1926 the railways voluntarily applied for preferential rates on wheat and wheat products moving from the Peace River area to the Pacific coast. Those rates were put into effect and have been maintained ever since. They were so favourable that the establishment of the Crowsnest pass rates in 1928 had no effect on the preferential rates. For example, a movement from Grande Prairie to Vancouver under the rates existing prior to 1926 would carry a rate of forty-one cents a hundred pounds. The preferential rate was twenty-eight cents a hundred pounds. If the Obed cut-off were provided, shippers in the Peace river area would get a benefit of only about two cents a hundred pound. I now come back to the conclusion of the report of 1932, which is:

Thus, if not all, have the main requirements of the local interest been met. As the development of the district is from time to time pushed beyond reasonable road haulage distance from the existing lines of railways, local interest will demand further railway mileage. In our opinion this can be, as and when necessary, readily met by further branch-line construction.

In view of the above, our conclusions are:

1. No western outlet is justified for the present, as the existing railway furnishes the most economical route. It will take many times the present traffic to justify another railway outlet.

2. The Obed route for a western outlet is the most favourable from a railway economic standpoint, considering the present phase of the railway situation.

3. We recommend that the matter of a final route be decided when the question is a practical one, believing that by the time the volume of traffic has reached a point where the western outlet is justified, general and possible local conditions may have materially changed. When the decision is imperative, the whole situation should be reviewed, in order to appraise all the contributing factors, including the potential traffic which may accrue from the lands beyond the definite areas included in this report.

I point to this fact because I want to come back to it in a moment. It is concluded here that when the question of building a route becomes practicable, it should receive the attention of the railway. On the files of the department are two letters concerning this report which I think might interest the house. One of these letters was written by Sir Henry Thornton, then president of Canadian National Railways. The other was written by Sir Edward Beatty, who at that time was president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Notwithstanding the report of the joint engineers recommending the Aggie-Obed route, Sir Henry Thornton wrote to the then Minister of Railways and Canals indicating that he favoured the Obed outlet above everything else but that he did not regard that outlet as a western route. He regarded it rather as a southern outlet, the grades being better than through the Monkman pass and construction being much less costly.

Sir Edward Beatty, on the other hand, endorsed the general conclusion of the joint report with but one exception, that exception relating to the Obed route. He favoured the Peace river route because he believed that the Peace River outlet must be justified on its own permanent value. He stated that while the Obed route was the cheaper of the two from the point of view of construction costs, it could not be considered a proper solution of

the question because in his estimation the Peace river route, tapping as it did northern resources, was the better of the two.

Mr. GREEN: In what year were those two letters written?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have them in my office. Speaking from memory they were written shortly after the Crysdale report.

That brings me to the point I mentioned a moment ago: Is the question of building an outlet from the Peace River block to the Pacific coast a practical one to-day? Is that not the question which, above all else, would interest the house? Is the project a practical one from the point of view of cost, from the point of view of population, from the point of view of traffic and from several other points of view? I am sure the house would not want the government to undertake a project of this kind if it were convinced that it was not a practical one from those points of view. That is the question which must be considered in the light of the reports, and I should like to deal with it for two or three minutes before I go on to the final report, which was brought down this year and which, I have to say, does not differ a great deal from the reports of 1925, 1931 and 1932.

The question of whether or not the line is practical is one which should engage the attention of the house before a project of this kind is advanced any further.

The house will remember that the joint report of 1925 estimated that when the traffic on the road amounted to 1,080,000 tons it would be economical to build the Aggie-Obed outlet. The figures which I have before me at the moment, and which I should like to give to the house, indicate that with the exception of the war years the traffic over the route for the past ten years has been nowhere near 1,000,000 tons.

I have before me a statement prepared by the Department of Transport on the Northern Alberta Railways. It has to do with the total tonnage carried over these railways from 1932 to 1945 inclusive. In 1932 the total freight tonnage carried over the Northern Alberta Railways amounted to 525,000 tons; 1935, 451,000 tons; 1939, 533,000 tons; 1941, 721,000 tons; 1943, 1,307,000 tons; 1944, 1,345,000 tons; 1945, 959,000 tons. That is the total traffic carried over the Northern Alberta Railways. How much of that traffic comes from the Peace River area I am not able to say, but we all know that a great deal of the traffic over the Northern Alberta Railways goes to Waterways and on to the Mackenzie river district. It is estimated, although I have no manner of proving this statement, by the officers of the Department of Transport that there would have emanated from the Peace River block some 250,000 tons of freight going over the Northern Alberta Railways. If that is the case, we are far from the 1,080,000 tons mentioned in the report of 1925.

While on that subject, may I take one minute of the time of the house to give the operating surplus or deficit of the Northern Alberta Railways for the period from 1932 to 1945. In each year the operating deficit was $1,000,000 or more, with the exception of 1942 and 1943, when the surplus was $1·3 million and $2·5 million. I mention that because it is a factor which must be taken into consideration. The house knows that the operating deficit on the Hudson Bay railway each year amounts to almost half a million dollars and sometimes more than that. Over and above that, there is the cost of the capital construction, which amounts to from $30,000,000 to $35,000,000. If the interest thereon were added to the operating deficit on the Hudson Bay railway it would make a total deficit, operating and construction, of about $1,500,000 a year.

The point I make is that if on the Northern Alberta Railways there has been a yearly deficit of almost $1,000,000, what then would be the deficit on the Peace River outlet if it were built?

I now come to the fifth report. It is known as the province of British Columbia report of the committee on resources and railways, 1945. Early in 1945 the government of British Columbia advised this government that it intended to set up a joint committee with the Canadian National Railways to study railway locations and railway lines in northern British Columbia, and it asked this government to appoint members to that committee. The government consented to send two delegates, one representing the Department of Transport and one the Canadian National Railways and it gave these two delegates certain instructions. That committee met on several occasions and finally made its report, which I have before me at the moment. The conclusions of this report are not a great deal different from those of the previous reports, but there are a number of interesting things in this report to which I think the house would like to have me refer not only because they rave a close bearing on the whole subject-matter of the hon. member's resolution but also because they look at the matter from perhaps a little different aspect. They consider the problem from the point of view of the Pacific Great

Eastern. I do not know what the views of the two great provinces interested in this project are in this respect, but I would take it that Alberta would be far more interested in developing the Northern Alberta Railways onward from Hines Creek and Dawson Creek, and across to Hudson Hope and Finlay Forks, than in extending the P.G.E. from either Squamish to Vancouver or from Quesnel to Prince George.

Mr. MacNICOL: If the railway is extended from Dawson Creek, where would it pass the Peace? At Hudson Hope? There is a splendid position at Hudson Hope.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes; I intend to deal with that more fully in a moment.

I go on to the report of 1945, and I see in it a number of things which I think cannot do other than commend themselves to the attention of the house. One of the conclusions we find in it is that it is essential to the proper development of a pioneer country that rail and highway facilities be coordinated. That is extremely important. Railway engineers, I think, are coming to the conclusion that it is far cheaper to coordinate rail and highway facilities than to build railways or even to extend branch lines.

Then this report approves the Peace River outlet. It agrees that the Peace River route is strategically and fundamentally the route by which the northern resources of this great country can be tapped; and here, when it refers to the great natural resources in northern British Columbia and northern Alberta, I cannot but find myself in agreement with my hon. friend; I agree with everything he said in that statement. I myself was amazed to see what immense wealth there is in that great country. It is a potential reservoir of natural resources. There is practically everything there. There are forests and fisheries; there is agriculture; there is mineral wealth of all kinds; there is gold, silver, lead, zinc, uranium.

Mr. MacNICOL: Coal.

Mr. CHEVRIER: There is coal in large quantities. My hon. friend has referred to the coal deposits—and so has the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol)—the centre of which is at Hudson Hope; and someone, I believe, has compared it with the deposits of the whole of the North American continent. I believe that statements of that kind are verified in this report. There can be no doubt about the immense natural wealth of that country. The climate, too, is extremely favourable. It is said in this report that the natives and people living there are able to have gardens and grow vegetables and even berries at certain seasons of the year, which would indicate that the territory can be easily inhabited. But the report states, too, that the extension from Prince George north to Hudson Hope will not improve the balance sheet of the Pacific Great Eastern as a whole until the density of traffic has reached 1,000,000 tons; and here we have in 1945 a report which agrees almost in its entirety with that of 1925, twenty years previously; namely, it lays stress on the fact that until the density of traffic has reached 1,000,000 tons it will not improve the balance sheet of the P.G.E. to build the railway.

With reference to the statement made by the hon. member for Davenport that railway construction should always precede development, there are many engineers and railway economists who disagree with that statement and who say that the railway must be built after development has taken place. I am not contradicting the hon. gentleman, but I point to the statement in the report.

Mr. MacNICOL: The Canadian Pacific railway went ahead of immigration.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes; railways have gone ahead under certain circumstances, but what I am saying to the hon. member is that the statement cannot be accepted generally because some railway engineers believe there are two sides to the question. Here is what the report says. The report evades that question, but it raises this point:

> The committee does not consider it within their terms of reference to state whether the extension should follow development or precede it ,but whatever is decided, the need of population in the area is the problem which should receive first consideration.

That is the point which I should like to bring to the attention of the house. All through this report the question of population is the one which is emphasized, the density of traffic; and the report goes on to say that you can have all the railway facilities in the world, but unless you have the traffic you cannot have a profitable and successful railway enterprise. That truly is the point which should, I think, be brought to the attention of the house. Again, it is said:

> To obtain the full development of the resources of the country to be served by the railway directly and by its tributary highway facilities, it is necessary that the country be settled by a sufficient number of the right type of people to furnish traffic to the railway . . .
>
> Adequately to extend the present Pacific Great Eastern to make it pay and to justify expansion of the present railway it is necessary that people move into the country and develop its natural resources.

And again:

It must be borne in mind that facilities do not make traffic, inhabitants make traffic. There must be people to furnish goods and to provide the need for transportation. Given the people willing to pioneer, this country will support a great number in comfort.

The report concludes by saying:

The initial capital construction expenditure (of the P.G.E.) would be in the neighbourhood of $20,000,000 and there would be additonal money needed for equipment. With the present foreseeable traffic immediately available there would result an annual payment of about $1,000,000 on account of this extension. This deficit, in a decreasing amount, would persist until the traffic volume reached approximately 1,000,000 tons a year.

I should like to conclude my remarks on the 1945 British Columbia report by reading the five conclusions:

1. Keep the present Pacific Great Eastern railway where it is for the benefit of the country it serves. Coordinate bus, truck and railway services now.

2. With the present amount of traffic in sight extension will not improve the financial balance sheet of the Pacific Great Eastern railway. A million tons a year of available railway freight would alter this conclusion.

3. Increase the rate of settlement of the country and the rate of development of the natural resources.

4. When justified build to Hudson Hope, a future junction of lines beyond north and south of Peace river. The southern connection with Vancouver should be altered as business warrants.

5. Complete and revise the railway location surveys before construction.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask the minister whether a copy of this report could be distributed to each member of the house?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I should think I have not the authority to distribute the report to the house. My understanding is that it was tabled in the legislature, and I would think there would be no difficulty in obtaining it from there. If my hon. friend wants to see it I have no objection, but I do not think this house should table a report made to another legislature. I have not given the matter any thought, but that is how it strikes me at the moment.

I think the most important feature of this report is the recommendation to coordinate rail and highway facilities. The house may find, as time goes on, that the railway engineers will feel that rather than build lines at tremendous costs it would be much better to coordinate the existing facilities in rail and highway in order to meet requirements.

If the house will bear with me for a few moments longer I will say a word or two on the question of coordination. The out-of-line or back-haul which is occasioned, would be a great deal less extensive by coordination as I have indicated than by the building of a new line, and that could be done by branch lines extending westerly, aided by highway transportation, which would be capable of the development of all the natural resources of the Peace River area up to and including Hudson Hope, much more cheaply than by any other means.

With regard to the question which the hon. member for Davenport put to me, the extension of the line from Dawson Creek to Hudson Hope, thereby tapping the great coal fields of that area, that would require the construction of approximately 150 miles of line, costing probably $14 million. The construction of a through route from Hines Creek through Fort St. John on to Hudson Hope is impracticable, but a line extending seventy-five miles from Hines Creek is feasible and might cost $4,500,000. It is doubtful whether such considerable sums of money should be spent at the present time, particularly when a cheaper means of meeting all reasonable transportation requirements is available by coordination of rail and highway facilities.

Mr. MacNICOL: If and when the railway is constructed from Dawson Creek northwest to opposite Hudson Hope on the north side of the river, the great deposits of coal being on the north side, there will be a bridge across there and there is an excellent position for a bridge. The river is very narrow where the bridge site is, and many years ago plans were got out for it, so that the railway could go northwest from Dawson Creek, across the river at Hudson Hope direct to the coal mines. I do not like to interrupt the minister because he is doing splendidly and I must congratulate him, but I would ask him to answer the question.

Mr. CHEVRIER: This coordination provides for building both north and south of the Peace river by extension of a line from Hines creek on and the extension of the line from Dawson Creek on and crossing the bridge over the Peace river to reach Fort St. John.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is it suggested that the railway would run north from Dawson Creek, that is directly north, using the new United States bridge across the river? I understood the minister to say that the road would run northwest from Dawson Creek toward Hudson Hope and join the other railway if it were projected from Hines Creek toward Hudson Hope.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I hope the hon. gentleman does not get the impression that I am

suggesting that that be done. I am discussing the coordination of the two and how it could be brought about, and I wish to discuss it in a moment with particular reference to the resolution because I think that is a matter which deserves consideration in that regard.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Do I understand the minister to say that the government's view is that rail and truck traffic should be coordinated?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No, I did not say that. I said that certain railway economists held that view. That is not the government's view. It may or may not be.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): The minister said it was the most important thing in the report.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes, in this report, but this report is not the government's report. This is the report of the province of British Columbia in conjunction with the railways.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I ask what the government's view is, if that is not being impertinent?

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is what the resolution seeks. I will answer that before I sit down.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Before the minister sits down he might speak of the coordination of rail and air traffic.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but I did not get the question.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): The minister might also deal with the coordination of rail and air traffic. There seems to be rather a difference.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am dealing with one resolution that has to do with the building of a rail outlet and not an air outlet from the Peace River block, and I must address my remarks exclusively to that question. The coordination I have referred to, as applied to the resolution of the hon. member for Cariboo, would work perhaps something like this. A highway service based at Dawson Creek as railhead, not exceeding 100 miles in length of run, would serve agricultural development in the Fort St. John area lying to the west of the Beaton river. This would make use of the Alaska highway and bridge over the Peace river to reach Fort St. John. A similar service operating from railhead at Hines creek, approximately 100 miles, would develop the rest of the territory north of the Peace, and advantage might also be taken of the provincial highway toward Grimshaw to develop the country in that direction. If highway operations are to be conducted with an eye to economy, it would be necessary to operate with heavy trucks and trailers, and this would of necessity confine the service to main highways having adequate gravel surfac. Depots might be established along the main highways at intervals of approximately twenty miles. The railway would not attempt to render transportation service except to and from such depots.

Service via the highway could, however, be expected to develop to build a country forty miles in width and twenty miles on either side of the highway. Such service would need to be developed cooperatively with the province, which would undertake to maintain the highway in fit condition for operation and to protect the railway from unfair competition, although as regards the latter, extension of railhead would in itself largely preclude such competition.

On the other hand, the railway company would be prepared to pay standard licence fees for its motor vehicles and gasoline taxes. Highway services such as I have envisaged them would, of course, be operated at a loss, notwithstanding what has been said, and the economic advantage to which I have referred springs from the fact that the loss incurred in the highway service is less than the loss which would be incurred in railway services due in the latter case to fixed expenses.

It follows from this that the answer to the Peace River problem might well be in the coordination of highway and railway facilities. I have dealt with the coordination of highway and railway facilities because of what is contained in this report of 1945. As I said a moment ago, it is the feeling of some railway economists who have gone into this question of the extension of the P.G.E. that such should be the policy for the future. It would remain to study the question to find out whether that policy is or is not a good one.

That brings me to the conclusion of my remarks. To sum up what I have said, the matter immediately before us is a resolution which reads:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should give immediate consideration to the building of a railway outlet from the Peace River country to the Pacific coast.

I started by saying that I was not opposing the resolution, I was simply discussing it. I have pointed to some of the difficulties in the way. I have said they are three in number, physiographic, economic and financial, and I have referred also to the immediate difficulty having regard to the short supply of steel. As the resolution is worded, I can see no

objecting to accepting it, and I now inform the house that I will ask the government to give immediate consideration to this project.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I have been very much gratified with the tone of the debate, which has been referred to already by the minister, and it has been a pleasure to note the general unanimity of opinion with respect to the whole question. I also appreciate very much the fact that the minister has been kind enough to accept the resolution, which as he said means that the government will give consideration to the problem. That having been done, I desire to extend the thanks of the people I represent for the consideration the minister has given their plea, which has been presented through me.

As the minister proceeded with his remarks I made a few notes. I do not know that I shall try to go over them all, because it would take too much time; and I am afraid the order in which I have them here would not correspond with their sequence in the minister's remarks. He discussed the subject dispassionately and fairly, and there is no great objection I would wish to take to what he said, certainly none at all to the attitude he adopted. But there are one or two matters upon which I should like to comment.

In the first place the minister said something as to the practicability of the construction of the road. I hope the minister has not prejudged the issue before it is considered by the government. I do not suggest that the minister said it was impractical, but there seemed some little doubt in his mind about it. In the first place, of course, I submit that it his business to be careful about everything he says on an issue as big as this, and that he and his colleagues must give consideration to every phase of the problem which is contained in the proposal. But I would suggest to the minister that if there is doubt as to the practicability of building the line, in my mind there is no doubt at all as to the impracticability of not building it, and I think that is of major importance at the moment.

The main questions the minister raised were: costs, the population and the traffic. The population and the traffic are practically the one question. As to costs, I do not think anyone really suggested that costs were something that could be entirely left out of consideration. Most of us realize that costs are very important matters in anything we attempt, and I do not think anyone would suggest that we should plunge into a great undertaking without carefully counting the cost. But in regard to financing the undertaking, I hope the government will not find any difficulty there if from other points of view, and especially the economic point of view, they should find its advisable to proceed with the project. It may appear to be a very big task to build this railway, but it is not such a task compared with what this government faced in 1939, the task of preparing this country for war and for the production of the materials that were necessary for the defence of this nation. That was a task which might well have staggered them. Supposing the cost of this project should go to $100,000,000; in view of the admitted wealth of the area and the possibility of developing that wealth and using it in the national economy, surely that is not a staggering sum when we consider what may be expected from its expenditure.

Then as to the population, I would not be surprised if the population were to get less and less from now on, instead of more and more, if the line is not built. I hazard this opinion, that it is foolish for any country to permit people to go into the backwoods without a means of transportation; and I think—

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Do not talk yourself out of this. We are all with you.

Mr. IRVINE: No, I am not going to do so. I am not blaming the government for having done that; as a matter of fact it has not been the general policy of this country to allow people to migrate to certain sections without building railroads to them. But certainly it is unreasonable to expect a great railway traffic when there is no railway over which the traffic can move. I think that is a reasonable thing to say; and I believe the minister will agree that if that line were built and the transportation facilities were adequate, not only would the population speedily increase, but the production of each farm unit would also increase greatly, and thus increase the traffic. May I point out to the minister that the report he gave concerning the Northern Alberta Railways very largely dealt with the years of the great depression, when practically every railroad line in Canada showed a deficit. The two years of the war period showed a marked increase in traffic, while the others, naturally, were down.

I know the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) is a very wise man, and he has given me a hint which perhaps I had better take. As I have said, I greatly appreciate the minister's attitude, but before I sit down I wish to say a word in explanation to the hon. member for Jasper-Edson (Mr. Kuhl). I just want to point out that when the hon.

gentleman reads my speech and his own in *Hansard* I think he will see that he misunderstood my point. I did not suggest that the construction of this railroad should be undertaken in order to provide employment. My suggestion was that construction of the railroad would enable us to tap the great resources of a vast territory; that new industries might well be expected to arise as a consequence, and that thereby we would be able to develop industries to meet the needs of the people, at the same time, if you like, providing employment as an incidental to the production of those goods. I wish to make it clear to my hon. friend that I have never been so foolish as to suggest a policy by which people would be provided with work merely for the pleasure of looking at them working. No one I know of has ever advocated an economic policy of that sort. Let us assume that all modern equipment is used, that we have been able even to harness atomic power, and that we have reduced the necessity of human labour to the ultimate. Still it is possible that we shall have to work for an hour or so each day. That would be full employment, under a definite set of circumstances; and that is all we mean by full employment.

Therefore I hope that with this explanation my hon. friend and I will not appear to be as far apart as one might have thought while listening to his remarks.

Motion agreed to.

SOCIAL SECURITY

ALLOWANCES TO PERSONS SUFFERING INJURY, ACCIDENT OR CONGENITAL INFIRMITY.

Mr. LIONEL BERTRAND (Terrebonne) moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into consideration the advisability of including in their social security programme a system of allowances to every person, without any income or means of support, who, by reason of an injury, accident or congenital infirmity, is at a disadvantage in seeking or obtaining employment, or incapable of providing for his subsistence, and whose age prevents him from benefiting by the social security legislation now in force.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution barely needs comment. Therefore my remarks will be very short because, furthermore, I should like to know the opinion of the house on this question.

The problem of social security is becoming more important than ever in a world upset by war. In this respect, Canada has accomplished an effort which deserves mentioning. Family allowances are now permitting large families with low income to face the heavy charges imposed upon them by a higher cost of living. Indigent mothers, blind and old age people are drawing from various government grants which alleviate their sufferings and allow them an improvement in their uprooted life. Allowances and pensions afford veterans an opportunity to rebuild their civil life on a better basis, and secure them a living if, physically speaking, they have left part of themselves in this conflict. The labourer temporarily out of work may rely on unemployment insurance benefits, a social law which, however, in order to keep up with new conditions and new circumstances, should undergo several amendments.

Family allowances are stopped at the age of sixteen; old age pensions start at seventy. May I say that the age for these latter pensions should be lowered as soon as possible to sixty-five years. The 54-year difference between the ages of sixteen and seventy represents more than the average human life. In my opinion, a certain section of the people, especially included within these age limits, was left unprovided for; that is, the invalid and cripple. This group includes the victims of infantile paralysis, the victims of all kinds of accidents who do not fall under the benefits of any provincial accident insurance act, persons suffering from congenital deformity and other sick people who cannot be cured.

If they, or their famly, are wealthy, these invalids can obtain all the necessary treatments in peaceful surroundings which will thus alleviate the burden of their misfortune. If they have no money or if they are paupers, they fall under public charity. No municipal by-law will provide any help for them; no provincial law can give them any grant, and I could not discover any federal statute which could give them assistance of any kind. No one will hire any invalid person; they are not accepted on the labour market. In this age of mechanization, the machine, which does not stop, supersedes the human being who, in order to follow it, must have strong arms, strong legs and powerful eyesight. Invalid and crippled persons are set aside for reasons of security and production. In the meantime, the cripple or invalid, out of work or occasionally employed in some casual job, cannot earn his living; if he has a wife and children, his fate is simply tragic. Then he must resort to public charity, to welfare associations, and even beg from door to door; besides his misfortune he must beg and undergo the brutal obligation of living desperate days with no hope of improvement. From week to week, under the heavy yoke he has to bear, he

will become discouraged, if not filled with despair. Misfortune will poison some persons, but misery will kill him.

Crippled and invalid persons deserve their share under the sun. They have a right to happiness to the same extent as any one of us. The conditions of modern living, which are improved by scientific inventions, gives everyone a minimum of comfort. In order to win the war, we had to spend billions; can we refuse setting aside a few hundred thousand dollars to rid us of poverty? At present we are spending millions to help the destitute populations of the old world; by an elementary sense of charity, should we not also think of those living near us who are victims of hazard, who are the outcasts of happiness?

In Great Britain, it is intended to enact—if it has not already been enacted—legislation providing for the employment of crippled and invalid persons. All employers with twenty employees or more, must hire a number of invalids equal to two per cent of their total effective. This is the disabled persons employment act. I do not know the opinion of the government over this legislation, and even less its immediate or future intentions toward invalid or crippled persons. But I sincerely believe that, during the present session, this unfortunate section of our society should be provided for. Would it not be right for the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) to study this problem, to give a statement concerning these indigent persons, and then to recommend a suitable system of allowances, paid by the federal government, or subsidized both by the federal and provincial authorities? The social security programme cannot be complete if indigent invalids and crippled persons are left to their unfortunate fate.

Everyone endorses a programme of social security for children, for the family, for indigent mothers, for the aged and blind persons and for veterans and disabled soldiers. Everyone will also endorse a movement to extend to cripples and invalids the total sympathy of the nation if special legislation to that effect is presented. Their existence on a lounge chair is restricted to the horizon of their window. They live in darkness, without life or company, in a state of perpetual restlessness toward the future, constant dejection, sleepless nights and continuous disappointment. A person who has never suffered cannot understand the darkness which is cast upon the life of a hapless person affected with infirmity, want and very often poverty. Let us brighten their existence by giving them some means of living. Let us assure them that if they are ignored locally the whole nation is not indifferent to their fate and will not reject them from our national life. Spreading joy means spreading peace. To abolish social misery means strengthening the security of the nation.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand) who has just introduced this resolution. I think it is worthy of the support of the house and the government. I believe the proposal that he has made to-night will before many years have passed—I was going to say I hoped before many months had passed—be given full effect.

I often think of people who are in the condition he has described, that of disability. I think of what persons with disabilities which perhaps have extended over a long period of years have to endure. That is something that those of us who enjoy good health can scarcely realize. It is all very well in the home where there is a regular income to have one who is permanently handicapped, but I often think that in homes where the income is low or where there is virtually no income the misery cannot be estimated, not only of the individual who is permanently incapacitated but of those who have to care for and see the suffering of the one afflicted.

When the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) was speaking this afternoon I thought how much we could do if we would to alleviate these chronic and, as my hon. friend has stated, congenital diseases which afflict so many persons. I know something of it myself. I wish to say that as far as the party to which I belong is concerned, for thirteen years we have urged that the aged should be cared for and that the blind should be given adequate pensions to enable them to live decently and enjoy life to the extent that they can under the circumstances from which they suffer. We have urged the same consideration for persons who suffer from arthritis and from many other diseases that are incurable, like disseminated sclerosis. I only wish that this house could see its way clear to give every sufferer who cannot earn his or her daily bread and is wholly or partly dependent on others the necessary assistance so that they may be enabled to receive the care that they should receive.

I do not want to delay the house, nor do I want to interfere with others who would like to speak to this motion before eleven o'clock. I wish again to congratulate the hon. member who introduced this resolution. I am perfectly sure that it is deserving of support. I hope we

shall all assist in bringing about a condition of society in which those who cannot earn their daily bread or those who are shut in and suffering may be recognized as the responsibility of the whole community. When we have achieved that I believe we shall have established the foundation of a society which may not only profess but actually become in the true sense Christian.

Mr. EUGENE MARQUIS (Kamouraska) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I had not expected that this resolution would be discussed at once. I would have considered it preferable to have an opportunity of making some preparation in order to submit more adequately to this house the few arguments I have to offer. First, I wish to congratulate the mover of this resolution, the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand). He gives expression to an urgent appeal from those among the population who suffer perhaps more than any others.

We now have social laws which help children, prevent them from suffering, and ensure them food and a proper education. We have social laws whereby a helping hand is extended to old people who, after having spent the better part of their life in caring for their families and developing their country, are entitled to some compensation from the nation they have so long served. But there is one class of people who are still in a worse plight than others; I refer to those in their thirties, forties or fifties who, through some disability, are unable to earn a living. In our rural districts, I have often met some of those poor people who have aged beyond their years, and are unable to earn enough to support their wives and children, but are too proud to request any help from public organizations or municipalities or to accept any assistance from neighbours who would be in a position to help them. Those are the people who are most in need of the government's assistance.

To my mind, in keeping with the principle which made it possible for the government to pass the Old Age Pension Act, those who reach that stage prematurely, who, at fifty are as incapacitated as others are at seventy, should be entitled to state assistance.

I am happy to concur in the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Terrebonne. Twenty-five or fifty years ago, beggars could be seen everywhere in the street. Many of us as youngsters delighted in listening to some vagabond's life-story or to the tales he could tell. Nowadays, society has forged ahead and individual hardship is less frequent. Federated charities are active in our cities. This federation was inaugurated to carry on the work of essential charities and to help various associations which could not, unaided, achieve their aim.

Charity can be organized. It is not socialism but social legislation enacted in order to rectify certain anomalies and cure certain ills of our society. It is neither state paternalism for state control of individual or social groups but a remedy designed to alleviate some of our ills.

I represent a constituency whose population lives rather well and even very well, in some centres. But it has not been altogether spared. I have seen with my own eyes the head of a family dragging himself to work every day; this man should not have worked but his pride urged him to go and eke out a living for his wife and child, who, although she is sixteen, is herself incapable of working. Mr. Speaker, those who have witnessed, in their own constituency or elsewhere, such cases as I have just mentioned, know that they are common to every parish, every county, every province.

In the county of Terrebonne, the citizens have urged their member to have the Old Age Pensions Act amended by parliament, for the benefit of cripples and invalids; the same request has been made in my constituency and, no doubt in others throughout the country, the same appeal has been voiced.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this measure would impose too heavy a burden on the budget of the Minister of National Health At the present time, old age pensions amount to a sizeable figure. The crippled are very much less numerous that the old people; in fact, they constitute but an insignificant proportion of our population. Those unfortunate people are not themselves in a position to present their request, but we are by fairness and charity bound to take their interests at heart in this house.

It might be argued that the setting up of an organization for the administration of an act dealing with the invalids and the crippled would present tremendous difficulties. I would venture a suggestion in this regard. Some may think that, were we to include invalids under the old age pension act, a certain number of so-called invalids might, by playing on sentiments, obtain a certificate entitling them to benefits to which they would have no right. There is a very easy means of preventing any such fraud. Let the Department of National Health set up a medical board, with members appointed by the government, to examine every applicant claiming to be an invalid or a cripple.

Those who are really incapacitated, who are now abandoned without any government assistance, who could hardly obtain relief from municipalities or corporations, might thus be helped and assisted. Under our provincial laws, a man is not bound to help his brother. He should perhaps consider it a natural obligation, because Christianity teaches to help and to love one another. But we know that this is often forgotten, as well in mutual as in Christian love. Well, when a man has in his house one or two of his crippled brothers. he must, under Christian law, receive them and assist them, but he is not bound to do so under civil law and these disabled or incapacitated individuals are completely abandoned. Then the municipalities should offer them relief, but in many cases it is difficult to secure.

Finally. may I point out that our government has lent a helping hand to the underprivileged, protected our children and provided them with proper means of development, helping them to grow and become stronger while giving full play to their particular talents; it has also assisted the elderly, bringing a bit of happiness and comfort to them in their old age in recognition of the devoted service they rendered their country by raising a sound and strong family. I should now like to express the hope and wish that this same government will, in the near future, take the necessary steps to relieve our invalids who are unable to earn their livelihood.

(Text):

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, as I sat here to-night and heard the eloquent and beautiful expressions with which the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand) presented his case, I was unable to refrain from thinking of the vast difference which has come over the house during the last ten years. It is ten years since the members of the Social Credit group were trying to get the members of this house to listen to the idea that there should be distributed among the people purchasing power. I suppose every hon. member remembers that at that time it was a common sneer that we were advocating twenty-five dollars a month. We have all heard the hon. member for Terrebonne to-night advocate more than twenty-five dollars a month for all those who, from one cause or another, have been rendered unable to gain access to the means of life. Of course the members of the Social Credit group will endorse heartily and enthusiastically all that the hon. member for Terrebonne has said.

May I draw the attention of the house to one or two further considerations which naturally arise? The Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) has only just now been telling us about the need for being careful about money. The hon. member for Terrebonne is not worrying about money, and I submit Mr. Speaker, that this house must find the means of obtaining the money for the achievement of the objectives which this house finds desirable. We are living in an age of superabundance. There is no doubt whatever that we can produce all the food and clothing and shelter in this country which are necessary to provide every one of the unfortunates whom the hon. member has in mind with all he can possibly use—not a mere pittance, but an abundant life. It is equally obvious that we can produce enough to accomplish the other objectives which this house has in mind —the building of railways which will be outlets of the Peace River area, the development of other projects which will be necessary in order to make this nation strong and happy. We must find a means of turning these goods, this real wealth, into financial wealth. I would suggest that all hon. members quite earnestly set about trying to find out what that method is. With that I will close my remarks at the present time.

Mr. PIERRE GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a few words in support of the motion of the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand), to tell him that his motion was due to be discussed some day, the sooner the better, and that as a medical man it is to me a pleasure and a satisfaction to give to those who are incapacitated by congenital infirmity work such as they would want to do.

I do not find, as the hon. member who has spoken before me suggests, that the chamber has changed at all. What we were discussing was not social credit, we were favouring assistance to those who could not earn their living and, as the motion of the hon. member for Terrebonne states, are without any income or means of support. If I understand well the social credit theory, its supporters want to give a bonus to everyone, incapacitated or not. That is the distinction between the social credit theory and the theory of the hon. member for Terrebonne, and that is why I am supporting the motion. As a medical man I have been very close, closer than those of any other profession, to the infirm. In my province we have hospitals and hospices to help crippled people, but even though we have these establishments I believe, with a law passed by the government adding to the social security programme, we could help the hospitals in taking care of the infirm and the crippled.

That is all I have to say at this time, but I wish again to congratulate the hon. member for Terrebonne and all those who have spoken in favour of this motion.

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): I just rise to congratulate the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand) upon sponsoring this resolution and to express my hearty support of it. Some years ago, in the province of British Columbia, through regulations enacted under the jurisdiction of the social welfare department, all people coming within the scope of this resolution were cared for, on a somewhat limited basis; and then two years ago, pending legislation by the federal government, those regulations were put into statutory form under the social assistance act. So that now, in British Columbia, by law, all people coming within the scope of this resolution are cared for in a limited manner; that is, they receive, on the whole, slightly less than those who receive old age pensions, and in British Columbia, as I think all hon. members know, $30 a month is paid to old age pensioners. While that assistance is limited and insufficient, I can speak from personal experience of what it has meant to hundreds of people in the interior of British Columbia. Even that limited assistance has changed life for them in many respects. I wish to express my support of this resolution, and I trust that all hon. members will support it and that when it is passed it will result in the federal government assuming its responsibility in this respect, and including proposals of this kind in a national security scheme which will make it possible for these people to live a happy and decent life.

Mr. P. E. COTE (Verdun): I wish to join with the hon. members who have congratulated the mover of this resolution. It certainly shows on his part an intention to alleviate the difficulties of those who have to compete on the labour market when handicapped by injury, accident or congenital infirmity. I am all for the help which can and should be given to that class of our Canadian population. I am just wondering what legislation in the form of concrete proposals this house could initiate without preliminary consultation with the authorities that have the prime responsibility of looking after these matters; I mean the provincial authorities. I do not know if the matter has already been the subject of any discussion at the interprovincial conference which will be resumed later on in the month, but I think this angle should have been discussed by the mover.

[Mr. P. Gauthier.]

In the second place, I respectfully submit that before resorting to allowances and financial help to the disabled of such a category as is entitled to be covered by this resolution, all other means of rehabilitation should be resorted to. I would have preferred seeing this matter discussed under that angle. I would be a much more enthusiastic supporter of a motion which would find ways and means of rehabilitating disabled and injured persons as, for instance, the Department of Veterans Affairs does so well with the veterans of this and the other great war. Citizens of this country have a right to expect something more than charity from the government of this country. Most of them have had an active period in their life; they have contributed to the development of our economic and social life, and they are entitled to a concrete and useful help in order to reduce their disabled condition. For those disabled persons covered by this resolution who are still of an age where they can be trained in some way and rehabilitated for the labour market, I would rather suggest some ways and means of helping them to attain that end, and I would be inclined to support such a resolution as this only when I have been convinced that there was absolutely no other way of rectifying this unusual situation than by granting allowances or financial aid.

I hope that this matter will come up again for discussion in the house and that every angle of the situation will be discussed before any decision is taken. Nevertheless I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Terrebonne on having afforded the house an opportunity of discussing such an important question as help for a class of citizens who certainly cannot be left in distress and who need the assistance of the responsible authorities in the country.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand) on the manner in which he has introduced this resolution. I remember when the estimates of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) were before the house during the last session the member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) discussed the matter rather fully, and I believe the minister said he would give sympathetic consideration to the proposals and suggestions made at that time.

As has been well pointed out by one of the speakers, it is not so serious a matter where there is a steady income, but where there is a cripple or someone who comes under any of the various headings that have been so well

set forth by the hon. member, and where there are financial difficulties coupled with such incapacity, the situation is quite different.

Dealing with some of the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat, I would point out that there is at least one organization, and there may be more, already doing a splendid job, though it is more or less on a charitable basis. They solicit financial contributions from the public, and the last contribution I was called upon to make before coming to attend this session was solicited by such a committee. They operate two or three hospitals in the country to take care of and endeavour to train younger people, but it is most difficult for these people who find themselves in straitened circumstances financially to have to depend on such charity. If the department has not some concrete suggestion to take care of such people, as suggested by another speaker, it might well, after a thorough investigation, give some assistance to worthy institutions which are now trying on their own to assist the unfortunate who find themselves in such difficult circumstances.

If the minister will recollect the case brought forward by the hon. member for Lake Centre and other members as well when his estimates were before the house at the last session, he will recall that he said he would give the matter sympathetic consideration. I simply wished to say a few words in support of the resolution.

Mrs. GLADYS STRUM (Qu'Appelle): I rise to support the motion and I am happy to see that it includes various categories. I hope it also includes those people who are suffering from arthritis and rheumatism. There are many crippling and disabling diseases that are painful. While I realize that many persons could benefit from training, I would point out that there are many others who are so incapacitated physically that it is impossible for them to use both hands, or in some other way they are incapable of engaging in any useful trade.

I hope that when the government institutes such an allowance or pension it will not wait, as in the case of pensions for the blind, until the recipient is forty years of age. It is a great mistake to leave a person to charity or chance until he or she attains that age. A pension for any of the purposes contemplated by this resolution should start where the family allowance leaves off, and we should supplement the allowance with training or some other service which would enable the individual, as far as it is humanly possible, to attain some degree of accomplishment and human satisfaction. A great many people are handicapped and their lives unduly stunted because we have failed to make any financial provision or to give them training of any kind to develop them. I hope that the government will see fit to include such persons along with the categories set out in the dominion-provincial proposals, under which they propose to take care of certain specific diseases or disabilities. I hope also that any plans which the government has in mind will at once proceed to take care of those people who are part of our society and for whom society must take the responsibility.

On motion of Mrs. Strum the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, April 2, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

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

Government House, Ottawa.
Office of the Secretary to the Governor General
April 2, 1946.

The Honourable the Speaker of the
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Sir:

I have the honour to inform the house that the Honourable Patrick Kerwin, acting as deputy of His Excellency the Administrator, will proceed to the Senate chamber on Wednesday, April 3, at 5.50 p.m. for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. L. C. Pereira,
Assistant Secretary to the
Governor General

UNITED NATIONS

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION ON ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement with respect to Canadian representation on the united nations atomic energy commission.

It will be recalled that on January 25 of the present year the general assembly of the united nations, meeting in London, provided for the establishment of a commission to deal

with the urgent and important problems raised by the discovery of atomic energy and other related matters.

It was also provided in the resolution adopted by the assembly that the commission should be composed of one representative from each of those states represented on the security council, and Canada when this country was not a member of the security council. Each national representative on the commission was to have such assistance as might be desired.

The secretary general of the united nations has now asked the government of Canada to appoint a representative to this important commission and an order in council has accordingly been passed appointing General the Honourable Andrew G. L. McNaughton, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., as Canadian representative.

General McNaughton will be assisted by an advisory panel consisting of appropriate officials of the Departments of Reconstruction and Supply, External Affairs, and National Defence, and including the president of the national research council. The membership of the panel will be flexible according to the nature of the questions coming before it for consideration, and provision has been made for adding persons with special knowledge to this group of advisers as and when it may be deemed desirable.

POSTAL SERVICE

TWO DELIVERIES A DAY IN URBAN RESIDENTIAL AREAS—COMMERCIAL SHIPMENTS BY PARCEL POST

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, in connection with two deliveries service by letter carriers in residential districts throughout the dominion, may I say that instructions are being issued at once for the employment of additional men from Monday next, and to give them one week's training. The reestablishment of two deliveries service in residential districts will therefore become effective on April 15, two weeks from to-day.

I am glad to say that arrangements have been completed under which, effective immediately, the parcel post service from Canada to certain countries has now been extended to include commercial parcels.

Commercial parcels for such countries weighing up to twenty pounds where that weight limit applies, and prepaid accordingly, will be accepted for onward transmission.

Gift parcels weighing over eleven pounds may also be forwarded under the same conditions to countries other than the United Kingdom. The eleven pound weight limit still applies for gift parcels to the United Kingdom in accordance with the regulations of the British postal authorities which have not yet been modified.

Full instructions have already been issued to the postal service in order that this extension may be made available to Canadian business firms without delay. I wish to give a list of the countries where commercial parcels may be made:

Extension of gift parcel post service to include commercial shipments

Belgium, British North Borneo (7 lb. limit of weight); Brunei (7 lb. limit of weight); China (except Manchuria and provinces of Shansi, Suiyan and Chahar (11 lb. limit of weight); Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Guam (15 lb. limit of weight); Hong Kong, Luxembourg, Malay States (Federated and unfederated); Netherlands, Norway, Philippines (11 lb. limit of weight); Poland, Sarawak (7 lb. limit of weight); Straits Settlements, Sweden, Switzerland, Yugoslavia (11 lb. limit of weight).

PRICE CONTROL

DEVELOPMENTS IN PRICE CEILING POLICY

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement regarding recent developments in price ceiling policy.

During the past few days, as hon. members no doubt will have noticed, the wartime prices and trade board has authorized a number of important price adjustments. Ceiling prices for iron and steel and for various consumer articles made from iron and steel have been increased. Producers of lumber will be permitted to charge higher prices, although wholesalers' and retailers' ceilings remain unchanged. Butter and pork prices have been raised. Price increases have been permitted for various pulp and paper products other than newsprint. In the course of the next three or four months small increases will take place in the retail prices of clothing and furnishings consequent upon the government's decision to eliminate subsidies on imports of raw cotton and wool.

Taken in conjunction with the decision made at the beginning of February to suspend price ceilings on a list of some 300 items and with the relaxation of rigid price controls on many imported goods, these recent steps may be regarded by some as implying that price control is breaking down, or at least that the basic policy of the government has been changed.

I am therefore taking this opportunity of making it plain that such is not the case. These adjustments are part and parcel of a carefully planned programme which has been developing gradually since V-E day, and which, in its broad outlines, has been

explained to the house and to the public on several occasions during the past twelve months. These measures do not mean that the government's anti-inflation policy as administered by the prices board is beginning to falter. They do not mean that we contemplate an early lifting of our price control system, nor must they be taken to imply that any serious increase in the cost of living is impending. On the contrary, they indicate that the government is prepared to maintain control over the movement of prices during this difficult and highly dangerous transition period.

I need hardly say that the danger of inflation is still very great. Many commodities are still in short supply, e.g., food, textiles and building materials—all highly essential. Purchasing power and consumer demands exceed their war-time levels. In this situation it would be unthinkable to allow prices to find their own level. But that does not mean, of course, that the administration of price control should not change. The system which served Canada so well in war must now be adapted, and is being adapted, to meet the special circumstances of the transition period.

Our system of price control has always permitted price adjustments in cases of genuine necessity. The special significance of the adjustments recently announced arises from the fact that they cover a wider area of Canadian industry than has so far been affected. I believe, however, that this will be recognized as the sensible approach to the problem. It would be folly to pretend that the government could continue to administer the same more or less inflexible system of price ceilings that was appropriate to the uncertain days of 1942 and 1943. Here and there the line has to bend if it is not to break.

The declared aim of the government's price policy for the transition period is to give a reasonable degree of stability to living costs while creating conditions favorable to a high level of employment and production. In practice this means that where the wartime prices and trade board is satisfied that production is capable of expanding on the basis of basic period selling prices, then basic period prices will continue as the legal maxima. On the other hand, where it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the prices board that present ceiling prices are prejudicially affecting production and employment, adjustments are made. But except for commodities in quite ample supply, or relatively unimportant, price ceilings are not suspended.

As the house will realize, it is easy to state general principles such as these but more difficult to put them into practice. The prices board is literally in a continuous fight to prevent price increases from being extended any further than is absolutely necessary. The increases in prices, to which I referred earlier, provide examples of the policy in practice. In the case of iron and steel, the support of the price structure formerly given by war production has disappeared. Consequently, wartime increases in costs must now be reflected in selling prices of the basic iron and steel products. The wartime accumulation of cost increases, particularly wage increases, is also the basic factor behind the increase in the producer's price of soft-wood lumber, and in pulp and paper prices.

Another factor behind certain recent price increases stems from the decision which the government reached some time ago to reduce or eliminate subsidy payments. While subsidies played a vital part in checking the forces of inflation during the war, they are not desirable as a permanent feature of the price structure, and should be removed as expeditiously as possible. Certain subsidies were paid to offset temporary wartime cost increases and are more or less self-liquidating. The subsidies formerly paid on imports of petroleum are a good example of what I mean. On the other hand, it looks as if the wartime increase in the cost of imported cotton and wool, for example, is more or less permanent. In view of this, the board has largely withdrawn from the payment of subsidies on wool imports in recent months, and has reduced the amount of subsidy paid on cotton imports. At the same time, the prices board has authorized certain price increases that will be necessary to compensate for the higher price of wool and cotton as the various products move from the mills and converters, through to the garment manufacturers and down to the final consumer. The price increases authorized have been carefully worked out in relation to seasonal production, and in relation to inventories and other such factors, and the board is confident that the increase of consumer prices will be kept to the bare minimum necessary to offset subsidies. In other words, basic period or 1941 price ceilings in this particular industry, as in other industries where adjustments are necessary, will cease to be the rule, but the system of legal maximum price ceilings remains intact.

The recent increases in the prices of butter and pork products require very little explanation. In the case of butter, an additional incentive is needed if even a restricted consumer ration is to be met. In the case of bacon, the United Kingdom, realizing that hog numbers were declining seriously, agreed

to raise contract prices immediately, and the domestic price was simply adjusted to the new level.

I am confident that the policy we have been following is capable of meeting the realities of this period of adjustment. It will undoubtedly mean a modest increase in the cost of living. But it will enable us to preserve the economic advantages we have gained from nearly five years of self-discipline on the economic front, and will protect consumers and producers alike from the economic and social dislocation which would surely develop if present inflationary pressures were given free rein.

In conclusion I wish to reiterate that the government has no intention of putting into effect what some political and other groups are advocating, namely, the removal, wholly or substantially, of price control.

We believe that price control and the maintenance of ceilings have the support of the Canadian people and we do not intend at this stage of the fight to flout their opinion or destroy the results of nearly five years of determined effort to prevent inflation.

I would like to appeal to this house and to the Canadian people for continued support of measures which we are satisfied are necessary if economic stability is to be maintained, if the real value of our currency and our bonds is to be protected, and if the bankruptcy and unemployment resulting from a price boom followed by a price collapse are to be avoided.

Mrs. STRUM: I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance on his statement, regarding the price of butter. Did I understand the minister to say that this arises out of a withdrawal of the subsidy to the producers of butter fat?

Mr. ILSLEY: No, I did not say that. The subsidies are not withdrawn.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

ORDER IN COUNCIL CREATING CANADIAN COMMERCIAL CORPORATION

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table order in council P.C. 1218 of March 29, 1946, which authorizes the creation of the Canadian Commercial Corporation. I would like to make a brief statement to explain some of the main functions of this corporation.

In view of the many transactions which require immediate attention, it has been necessary to bring the corporation into being by means of order in council. Legislation will be presented at this session to enable the corporation to operate on a continuing basis for a period.

For some time it has been clear that there are many transactions in international trade which cannot be handled entirely by private enterprise and the work of the corporation is intended to supplement the activities of business organization rather than to interfere with them.

The Canadian Commercial Corporation will, firstly, take over the various functions of making purchases in this country for foreign governments and the united nations relief and rehabilitation administration that have hitherto been performed by the Canadian Export Board. The value of such purchases made to date by the Canadian Export Board exceeds $417,000,000.

Secondly, the Canadian Commercial Corporation will assist private enterprise in obtaining essential supplies from ex-enemy territories. Supplies from such territories cannot be obtained at present through ordinary commercial channels.

Thirdly, this corporation provides the machinery which could be used in the future to purchase commodities such as sugar, tea, oils and fats which are under international allocation or foreign government control and may continue to be so for some time to come.

It is impossible at the moment to enumerate in full detail all the functions that will be discharged by the corporation. The three main purposes that I have outlined are only an indication of the work to be performed. New tasks may devolve upon the corporation, as its work proceeds, in the light of its developing experience and the needs of Canadian business.

The creation of the Canadian Commercial Corporation enables the government to provide facilities to Canadian business that will match those being offered to British and American traders through the operations of the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation and the United States Commercial Corporation.

The executive officer who will be charged with the primary responsibility for directing the activities of the corporation will be its director and general manager, Mr. W. D. Low, who assumes these new duties after having been chairman of the Canadian Export Board, and prior to that, executive assistant to the deputy minister of the Department of Munitions and Supply, where he had supervision over the purchasing branches. He is on loan from the purchasing department in Montreal of the Canadian National Railways.

The president of the new corporation is Mr. M. W. Mackenzie, deputy minister of the Department of Trade and Commerce, and its directors are: Mr. H. B. McKinnon, president, Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation; Mr. David Sim, deputy minister, Department of National Revenue (customs and excise); Mr. V. W. Scully, deputy minister, Department of Reconstruction and Supply; Mr. D. B. Finn, deputy minister, Department of Fisheries; Mr. L. P. St. Amour, assistant deputy governor, Bank of Canada, and Mr. W. D. Low.

The corporation will be capitalized at $10,000.000.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FOR PARKDALE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just a word about the resignation of the hon. member for Parkdale, Mr. Bruce, which was announced to the house last night, and the reference made by Your Honour to the fact that you are issuing a writ to-day for a new election.

What I am about to say is said solely with the intention of bringing to the attention of hon. members of the house what I believe to be the spirit if not the letter of the parliamentary law with respect to a member of parliament relinquishing his seat in the House of Commons. Do not let it be assumed for one moment that I take any exception to the hon. member for Parkdale having resigned his seat, or that I am criticizing his action in so doing. Such is not the case. I believe there is a certain responsibility upon myself as the leader of the house to draw the attention of the house to what is quite evidently, according to the authorities, the spirit of the parliamentary law with respect to resignations of members of the House of Commons.

The House of Commons Act does not set forth any reason for a member's resignation. Section 6 says, "Any member of the House of Commons may resign his seat" either by giving notice in his place in the house or by addressing a written declaration of his intention to resign attested by two witnesses. Nevertheless it may I think be truly said that a member is elected to serve during the life of a parliament. Unless there are grave reasons compelling him to return to private life, or he receives some appointment under the crown he is, I believe, in duty bound to keep the mandate he has received from his constituents. Sir Erskine May says in his thirteenth edition, at page 45:

> It is a settled principle of parliamentary law that a member after he is duly chosen, cannot relinquish his seat.

This restriction can be evaded in the United Kingdom by a member accepting an office under the crown, usually the Chiltern Hundreds, an office which is merely nominal though assuming the form of a place of profit. The evasion takes place only when there are grave or very special reasons for it. It would not be acceptable if a member wished to resign when he becomes weary of political life or feels that parliamentary work interferes with his personal affairs.

Redlich, Procedure of the House of Commons, volume 2, at page 99, says:

> It is well known that English parliamentary law recognizes no power on the part of a member to relinquish his seat.

Bourinot, fourth edition, at page 157, says:

> It was formerly a principle of parliamentary law that a member after he is duly chosen cannot relinquish his seat.

There can be no doubt that the hon. member for Parkdale had the right to resign without giving any reason for taking that step, but he has taken a course which may establish a dangerous precedent. The House of Commons Act, in prescribing the way in which a member may resign, cannot have intended to make resignation easy, and applicable on the slightest provocation. The cause of it, it would appear, should be prompted by public rather than personal interest.

Mr. POULIOT: Is he making room for Arthur Meighen?

Mr. CASSELMAN: You will find out in time.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Arising out of the statement of the Prime Minister with respect to the resignation of the hon. member for Parkdale, I did not understand the Prime Minister's intention or purpose or what he desired in making a statement of the kind. I gathered that it was in some sense a criticism of the hon. member for tendering his resignation. If it was, I would like to ask him this question: What criticism did he offer the hon. member for Glengarry for resigning when the Prime Minister was without a seat in this house?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was very careful to say that I was not taking exception to the resignation of the hon. member for Parkdale.

Some hon. MEMBERS Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hon. members may laugh; perhaps their hearing is not as good as that of hon. members in other parts of the house; but they will find, if they look at *Hansard,* that is exactly what I said. Perhaps the error I have made, if I have made any, is being a little too conservative in seeking to preserve what I believe to be good traditions in the matter of parliamentary law and procedure. I feel it part of my duty to bring to the attention of the house any matters which affect developments in parliamentary law and procedure, and I was proceeding on that line to-day.

An hon. MEMBER: Answer the question.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will answer it. I think I was very careful to say that there had to be some important reason why a member should resign—not only important, but a public reason. That would apply to the hon. member for Glengarry. I am very happy to say that my hon. friend immediately opposite is one of those who were courteous enough to say at the time that he thought it would be a pity if I were not allowed to be returned to the House of Commons.

LEON BLUM

MISSION TO WASHINGTON—VISIT TO OTTAWA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister? I have noted that Mr. Leon Blum, former premier of France and a distinguished French statesman is on a special mission to Washington. Is there any possibility of Mr. Blum coming to Ottawa, and has the government extended an invitation to him?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that the government has already expressed to Mr. Blum its pleasure at the prospect of his visiting Ottawa during the course of his stay in Washington. I learned only this morning that it is possible that Mr. Blum may be in Ottawa before the end of the present week. I think I may say on behalf of this country that we shall welcome a visit from Mr. Blum at this time.

[Mr. Bracken.]

CANADIAN ARMY

INQUIRY AS TO POSTING TO WINNIPEG OF LORD STRATHCONA HORSE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. LESLIE A. MUTCH (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Can he give the assurance that the Lord Strathcona Horse, a regiment which has had an historic association with the city of Winnipeg ever since the South African war, will continue and maintain its peacetime establishment—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. member to put his question on the order paper.

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence? Is there a possibility that a squadron of the Lord Strathcona Horse will be posted to the city of Winnipeg?

Hon DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): Answering the hon. members for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart) and Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch), I may say that anything is possible. I am aware of the historic significance which this great regiment has for the city of Winnipeg, and that will be taken into account when considering where the permanent headquarters of the regiment are to be located.

INQUIRY AS TO ALLEGED DESERTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. It has to do with a Canadian by the name of McCloy who served in the United States army about the beginning of the war and then left that army, allegedly by desertion—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: Let Mr. Speaker keep order. He does not need your help.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I should hear the question first.

An hon. MEMBER: Ask a question.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, I necessarily must say what the facts are before I can put the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: This man then joined the Canadian army, in 1939.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must request the hon. member to ask his question. Under the rules of the house his question should be brief and to the point.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: After being discharged in 1945 from the Canadian army he lived in Winnipeg, and was taken into custody—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should put his question.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of deference, I cannot place the question before the minister unless the background is available.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very sorry; I want to be generous, but the hon. member should not make a speech; he must put his question for the minister to reply to.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My question now is, this man has been arrested under—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to resume his seat and put his question on the order paper.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, the minister a moment ago—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked the hon. member to resume his seat and put the question on the order paper.

Mr. GRAYDON: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, surely we have gone the limit to-day with respect to restricting an hon. member who desires to ask a question. Let us be fair to all parts of the house. We had to listen to-day to what I think was a great extension of the rules of the house when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) ended up his statement with a political speech.

Mr. ABBOTT: You did not like it.

Mr. GRAYDON: I admit that it is a touchy spot with you too, and I do not blame you for objecting to the question, but surely the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) has the right to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe it is desirable, for the decorum and dignity of this house, that the ruling of the Speaker should not be discussed.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: May I ask a direct question?

Mr. GRAYDON: Order. There is a question of privilege before the house. Privilege comes first.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Just a minute. You cannot go on all day.

Mr. GRAYDON: Privilege comes first.

[*Later*:]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Before the orders of the day are called I wish to ask a question of great urgency to a native-born Canadian who is about to be deported to the United States under an order in council making an offence retroactive. Will the Minister of Justice look into the case which I brought to his attention, that of a man from Winnipeg, in order to assure that this Canadian will not be deported under an order in council that makes retroactive—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled on that question. It should be put on the order paper.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The man will be in the United States.

[*Later*:]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. L. SMITH (Calgary West): May I ask the Minister of Justice a very simple question? Will he not delay the deportation of a man named McCloy under order in council P.C. 6577 until the house has had an opportunity to discuss the matter?

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I do not think any hon. member of this house need feel any anxiety about the case of this brave Canadian veteran McCloy. The facts are not as had been stated to the hon. member for Lake Centre. This man was not in any sense a recent deserter, or alleged to be a recent deserter, from the American army. He had enlisted years ago in the American army and the allegation was that in 1927 he had become a deserter or had become absent without leave and remained absent without leave from that time until 1946. In 1939 he enlisted in the Canadian army and served overseas until the month of August, 1945.

As is well known to members of the house, since the order No. 6577 was tabled here, shortly after it was made, there was a reciprocal arrangement between Canada and the United States for the speedy return of deserters or soldiers absent without leave, but the spirit of that order was to deal with recent cases.

As soon as this case was brought to the attention of any one of the departments—the question is addressed to me, but the

order in council was made with the concurrence of five different ministers—it was immediately taken up with the American embassy here, and it was pointed out to them that it had never been intended that this order would apply to a case of that kind and arrangements are being discussed for the purpose of having it cleared up. In the meantime Mr. McCloy has been released on bail, and it is understood that his bail will be extended indefinitely until the matter is finally settled. If necessary there will be either a withdrawal or a modification of this arrangement, because neither side ever intended it to apply to a case such as this one.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): How simple that all was!

ATOMIC ENERGY

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION AT OPERATION CROSSROAD, BIKINI ATOLL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): Will the Prime Minister tell the house how many Canadian senators and members of parliament will be sent to represent Canada's interest at the forthcoming Operation Crossroad at Bikini Atoll?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Order my foot; that is a question.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend sent me notice of his question. I shall regard it as a notice and seek to give him a reply to-morrow.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

NEGOTIATIONS FOR WAGE INCREASES FOR STEEL WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I wish to ask the Minister of Labour whether the Department of Labour has received a request from the united steelworkers union asking the government to convene a joint conference of the steel manufacturers and the representatives of the steel workers union to discuss the matter of wage increases?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): My hon. friend sent me notice of the question but I did not get to my office until just prior to the opening of the house. I have had a number of communications from the organization referred to; and if he will let the matter stand until to-morrow I will give him an answer.

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

REGIONAL WAR LABOUR BOARD FOR QUEBEC—PAUL EMILE MARQUETTE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I have a question for the Minister of Labour of which I sent him notice yesterday. Was Paul Emile Marquette of Montreal appointed to the regional war labour board on recommendation of the Canadian Congress of Labour? Has the minister been requested by the Canadian Congress of Labour to remove Mr. Marquette from this position? If so, what action has been taken in the matter?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see any urgency in this question; it should be put on the order paper.

Mr. COLDWELL: I disagree.

LAY-OFFS IN C.N.R. AUTOMOTIVE DEPARTMENT, WINNIPEG

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Transport. Is it the fact that several hundred employees, many of them ex-servicemen, are to be laid off in the automotive department of the Canadian National Railways in Winnipeg?

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): The hon. gentleman sent me a notice of his question yesterday. I asked the officers of my department to ascertain from the Canadian National Railways what the position was. I received the report this morning and it reads:

> The Canadian National Railways management advises that the net earnings position of the railway has precipitated necessity of reduction of certain staffs and it seems inevitable that there will be certain lay-offs in the Winnipeg area at an early date, probably some during April. The management has as yet no advice as to the number of employees that will be laid off or as to what classifications will be affected. That depends entirely on the result of the analysis that is now being made as to where reductions would be indicated.

PEACE CONFERENCE

INQUIRY AS TO PROBABLE DATE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in his capacity of Secretary of State for External Affairs. As the house and the Prime Minister know, a tentative date has been mentioned publicly for the convening of the peace conference at Paris as of May of this year. Can the Prime Minister give us

information as to whether that tentative date still stands, or whether it is being advanced or brought back according to the exigencies of the situation?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I wish I could answer the question. Up to the present, however, there has not been a definite date fixed for the conference which it was expected would be held in Paris early in May. I am rather hoping that before the present week is out it will be possible for the powers immediately concerned to inform the different governments of the exact date.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Without the least intention of infringing upon the extra-territorial privilege of the hon. member for Peel in asking questions, may I ask the government whether someone has been designated to attend the funeral of the league of nations at Geneva?

RADIO BROADCASTING

"SOLDIER'S WIFE" — REQUEST FOR DISCONTINUANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. C. I. MERRITT (Vancouver-Burrard): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance arising out of the answer to a question on page 424 of yesterday's *Hansard* showing that the cost of the wartime prices and trade board broadcast "Soldier's Wife" is at the rate of $230,000 a year. Will the Minister of Finance direct the immediate discontinuance of this broadcast?

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I will take the hon. gentleman's request into consideration.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REDUCTION OF PENSION ON APPOINTMENT TO POSITION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): On March 29 I was asked a question by the member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) with reference to a point raised by the member for Regina City in regard to a pensioner whose pension was reduced because he had been appointed to a position under the crown. I looked up the case in question and I find it is under the Militia Pensions Act and has no relation to the Department of Veterans Affairs or to service pensions. My hon. friend asked whether this was a violation of the Pension Act. It is not.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

AMENDMENT OF ACT RESPECTING MINISTERIAL HEAD

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved the second reading of bill No. 6, to amend the Department of External Affairs Act.

He said: The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, as I explained at the time of its introduction, is to repeal section (3) of the Department of External Affairs Act, which was enacted in 1912 by the administration of Sir Robert Borden, and which provides that—

> The member of the King's Privy Council for Canada holding the recognized position of First Minister shall be the Secretary of State for External Affairs . . .

As it stands the section constitutes a statutory requirement that the Secretary of State for External Affairs can be no one but the Prime Minister. The present bill would remove this limitation and make it possible for some other person to occupy the position. The result of the present bill will be to place the Department of External Affairs in precisely the same position as the other departments of government in respect of which there is no requirement that any particular person must occupy the position of minister. That is all there is to the present bill.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I desire first of all to say to the Prime Minister that some years ago in the House of Commons a very eminent counsel who sat in this chamber for a good many years was asked to what he attributed his great success in the courts of Canada. His answer was that it was probably attributable to the fact that when he had the judge supporting his case in court he never tried to argue with the judge. There does seem to be an analogy to that in the matter now before us, because to-day we have the government with us in respect to a change in the legislation dealing with external affairs.

While perhaps we should not deny to the Prime Minister the immediate fatherhood of this measure may I say that its ancestry, as I think the right hon. gentleman will agree, goes much beyond the party now in power. Almost continuously and consistently since 1943 this official opposition has made an appeal, and in many instances an urgent appeal, for legislation such as that now introduced. The appeal was made in 1943, again in 1944 and in 1945, and again at the beginning of this session. I think hon. members will recall, and by reference will see, that there is now on the order paper a resolution proposed by myself

having in view the purpose which this legislation now purports to effect. I might read the salient terms of the resolution, which go I believe a considerable distance in indicating the need for the change at this time.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: I hope my hon. friend will not be too technical. If he is, I may decide to argue the point. However, I have not yet started to read the resolution, nor have I done more than suggest that I was going to give some salient points of it. Perhaps my hon. friend did not hear what I said. In the resolution I indicated that the Department of External Affairs had grown in size and importance to the point where a full-time minister was both vital and essential in the national interest.

In addition it will be recognized by every hon. member in this house that Canada's responsibility abroad has increased to the point where external affairs has become one of the major businesses of government and one of the principal concerns of parliament.

I shall not repeat what I said in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne when I dealt with this point, other than to say that it is a matter of vital necessity that a minister who has had the advantage of a close liaison or connection, knitting-in or meshing, with the men under him in the Department of External Affairs, should represent Canada at international gatherings. As I pointed out in my address at that time, without any reflection upon those who had represented Canada in a leading capacity at various international gatherings I was afraid that as time went on we should witness an extraordinary situation—that of the Prime Minister, because of his numerous and onerous duties in the domestic field, finding it impossible to attend all the international gatherings and having to substitute some other minister of the crown who may not always be conversant with the many moves that are taking place in the international field. We should then find ourselves with a delegation led by someone who perhaps while at the conference would have to learn many of the lessons on external affairs. This was one of the reasons which prompted me to place on the order paper for consideration in due course the resolution to which I have referred.

I wish to say to the Prime Minister that so far as our party is concerned we are prepared to accept and give support to the second reading of a bill which will enable this government to appoint someone as full-time minister of external affairs. Most hon. members will realize, particularly those who have gone to international conferences, that there is scarcely any nation in the world which is not led either by the head of the state, the prime minister, or the minister of foreign affairs. Australia, which is not as large a country as Canada, has had for some considerable time its own foreign minister, who in the conclaves of the world has done an exceedingly effective job on behalf of his country. Such nations as Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Belgium, and the Netherlands, to say nothing of many smaller countries, are represented at international conferences by their prime ministers, the ministers of external affairs or foreign ministers. No nation of Canada's size and importance can go longer without a full-time minister of external affairs.

I have only this criticism to offer. I think the government might properly have brought in this bill a year ago. After all, many pieces of legislation which contemplated the peacetime reconstruction era were brought in at the last session. We can no longer take the risk of going without this measure. We should have in harness at this very moment a minister of external affairs. The fact that on two occasions at least the Prime Minister has said that he will not run in another general election is an additional reason why this matter should be taken care of.

Mr. McIVOR: The Prime Minister is capable of changing his mind.

Mr. GRAYDON: I suggest to my hon. friend that he let the Prime Minister himself change his mind rather than doing it for him here. If the undertaking of the Prime Minister remains, it means at the outside that he will occupy his present position no longer than two or three more years. That is an additional reason why the Department of External Affairs should have a full-time head at the earliest possible moment. In the early days of the war there may have been good reasons why the Prime Minister should remain the head of that department, and that was one of the reasons why I and other hon. members did not press the matter at that time. But as the war went on and peace became a certainty, the reasons which may have weighed against the appointment of a full-time minister lost most of their strength and importance.

When the Prime Minister rises to speak on the second reading of the bill, or when we are in committee, there are two or three questions that he should make a note of and answer for the information of the house. If this legislation passes I should like to know how long we shall have to wait before the full-time minister is appointed. It is one thing to put a measure on the statute book and another thing to

carry its terms out. When the Prime Minister is in a generous frame of mind for giving information he might tell the house also who the new appointee will be.

I hesitate to move an amendment to the second reading of the bill, particularly when it has to do with only a technical change, but when we are in committee the Prime Minister might give consideration to a suggestion I am about to make. For this I am indebted to the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) who is an indefatigable searcher for technical knowledge and general information, and who is most industrious in all matters of this kind; I want to give him full credit for the suggestion which I now offer the house. He has pointed out that those who have been advising the Prime Minister in relation to the amendment of the statute have left the legislation in an odd position. By this measure we seek to repeal a section of The Department of External Affairs Act, to which royal assent was given on April 1, 1912. The section for which repeal is sought reads in this way:

> The member of the King's Privy Council for Canada holding the recognized position of First Minister shall be the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and in this act he is hereafter referred to as "the Minister."

I should like to discuss two points in this connection. First, as one looks through the various pieces of legislation which have been passed, not only in earlier days, but in more recent times, one finds language which I suggest is preferable to that now left as a residue in the act before us. It would seem to me that through this measure we shall have abolished the office without substituting anything in its place, and unless a new amendment is offered in substitution for the one now before us, we shall have left the matter hanging in the air.

If one refers to older statutes dealing with the Department of Justice, the Department of Finance, or the Department of Agriculture, he will find that the legislation was clear and unequivocal in that it first appointed the minister, and secondly, it detailed the duties the minister must discharge in the department over which he should have supervision.

The legislation which set up the Department of Reconstruction is perhaps the most recent in this class, and one of the last with which parliament has dealt. The act is found in the statutes of 1944-45; and in section 3 of chapter 18 one finds this:

> There shall be a department of the government of Canada which shall be called the Department of Reconstruction over which the Minister of Reconstruction for the time being appointed by the governor general by commission under the great seal shall preside, and the minister shall have the administration and direction of the department.

Then it goes on to speak about the deputy minister and various other officials. I suggest that in the committee stage consideration will have to be given to inserting, in the place of the section for which repeal is sought, something which is more operative than that contained in the bill.

In addition I must point out that the bill contains language which, I suggest, is incapable of being incorporated into a statute in any coherent fashion. As the act now stands there is reference in it to "the minister". I suggest that if we repeal section 3 we shall have no reference to the identity of the minister in the legislation. Those who are expert in the technical drafting of legislation will readily agree that drafting changes are needed in this instance before we can accept the measure now brought down.

I was interested in the Prime Minister's statement to the effect that the act now being repealed was passed in 1912. I find that the ministry of external affairs was first set up in Canada in 1909; before that time matters with which it has since dealt were handled in various departments. I have read with much interest the debates of 1909, in which the public men of that day pointed out that the growing importance of external affairs, and the amount of work then falling under that heading, by virtue of Canada's increased prestige and her position in the world, warranted the setting up of a separate department. I could not help thinking that if those older statesmen could now look in on this chamber and note the great increase in business and work of the Department of External Affairs, they might have added greater emphasis to what they said at that time.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the prime minister of that day, had this to say in the debate:

> All governments have found it necessary to have a department—

Previously there was none.

> —whose only business shall be to deal with relations with foreign countries, and in our judgment Canada has reached a period in her history when we should follow the example of other countries in that respect, as, for example, the commonwealth of Australia.

This would indicate that through the years the commonwealth of Australia has given a lead in external affairs, and that it had set up its department before Canada did. At a later time it followed the course which so many nations had followed, that of appointing a separate full-time minister before we got around to it in Canada.

I would impress upon the Prime Minister those two points I have mentioned in connec-

tion with draftsmanship. I believe that upon reflection he will agree the house could not let the measure pass in its present form.

The official opposition takes the position that this measure represents a step in the right direction. Indeed we feel highly honoured that a notice of motion standing on the order paper in the name of an hon. member in this party has been accepted in principle by the government. May I commend the Prime Minister upon this belated departure in policy. I do suggest that if he were to follow more of the suggestions coming from this side of the house he, the country and parliament would be the better for it.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the proposal now before the house. We are not recent converts to this point of view. My predecessor, the late Mr. J. S. Woodsworth, who was leader of this movement from its inception in 1933, used to offer the suggestion from time to time in the house that we needed a separate and full-time minister of external affairs.

We have always believed that Canada had grown to a stature, even during the years which intervened between the two wars, that entitled her to representation by a full-time minister. In saying this, let it be understood that I am not detracting in any way from the services rendered by the Prime Minister in that department. Let me make that perfectly clear.

I do believe however that the duties of the office of Prime Minister and those of the Secretary of State for External Affairs are to-day so onerous that no one individual, no matter how capable, can properly discharge them. In our opinion, therefore, the appointment of a full-time minister is long overdue. The very fact that we appointed last session and are reappointing this session a committee on external affairs makes it necessary that we have a minister who can devote his whole attention to the department and can sit with the committee. In the years I have been in the house—and before, because I read *Hansard* assiduously before I came—I have considered it tragic that so little attention has been given by Parliament to the affairs of this department.

I noted before the war that usually the estimates of the Department of External Affairs came pretty well toward the end of the session. Occasionally by agreement among the parties in the house a day was set aside when an item might be discussed, but with the exception of a handful of people in parliament there were few who between the two wars really took the interest in external affairs which that dpartment of government warranted.

[Mr. Graydon.]

Whatever may have been Canada's position among the nations before the present war, I think we are all agreed that in every respect she has now attained the stature of full nationhood. We have the obligations that come with nationhood. We have in Ottawa the representatives of many governments of the world, in the persons of ambassadors and ministers, and we in turn are represented in many other countries. There was a time when perhaps a British ambassador or a British consul might represent Canada, but that is no longer true. While we have the closest association, and must maintain it, with the British commonwealth of nations, we must never forget that we are a nation in our own right. As we have discovered in these international conferences, the component parts of the British commonwealth of nations do not speak with a single voice. If that needed to be demonstrated it was evident at San Francisco, it was evident at London, and at the recent meeting of the security council it was demonstrated anew by the action of the representative of Australia.

I have felt for a long time, years indeed, that we should have a full time minister in charge of this department. Canada has been particularly fortunate, and the Prime Minister as minister of external affairs has been particularly fortunate, in the type of personnel that has been gathered together in the Department of External Affairs. Nothing impressed me more deeply than the capability and the breadth of vision of the advisers who accompanied us to San Francisco. My colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who was present at the meetings of the united nations organization and the assembly in London, came back with exactly the same report, that Canada's external affairs officials and advisers compared favourably with those of any other country in the world. I am glad to have this opportunity of paying this tribute to them.

Our status as a nation makes us independent, yet we are associated with the British commonwealth of nations by many ties which I hope will be continued throughout the years. Canada is a nation in her own right. She speaks at interntional conferences as a nation independent of the United States, independent of Great Britain—speaks always as Canada. I believe the time has come when we should assume all the obligations of that position. We should have responsible to this house a minister of external affairs who will be prepared from time to time to meet the external affairs committee of this house in order that we as a parliament may understand more completely

the international obligations of Canada and be more fully aware of the policies that are being followed.

In a statement which he made to the house this afternoon the Prime Minister referred to the fact that while Canada is not to be a member of the security council, she is to become a member of the commission dealing with atomic power, because of the importance of Canada's contribution in regard to that great and in some respects terrifying, in other respects encouraging, discovery, with the implications of which the world now has to deal.

I am speaking not only for myself but for those associated with me in my party. As I have said, for many years we have put forward resolutions urging the members of parliament to provide for the appointment of a minister of external affairs, and we are glad to see that that is to be done.

With regard to the point made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) at the conclusion of his remarks, that is a matter which I hope the Prime Minister will deal with at the proper time and in the proper place. I do not think we can properly discuss the clauses of the bill on the motion for second reading.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, the measure before the house meets with the unqualified approval of the members of the Social Credit group. We entertain very much the same ideas as have already been expressed by the leaders of the two other opposition groups in the house. To emphasize the truth of what was said by each of those leaders, it is only necessary to point out that we are faced with problems the like of which have never before impressed themselves upon the minds of men.

In addition to our need to maintain the most harmonious and cooperative relations with the sister states of the great British empire and commonwealth; in addition to our need to have the most cordial fellowship with the United States; in addition to our need to extend the hand of good fellowship and good neighbourliness to all nations of the world who are kindly disposed—in addition to all these we have certain special problems that face us in this age.

The first, which should be impressed on all of us in all countries, is the need of developing a technique of distribution among nations. Very little is said about this matter, which is one of the greatest causes for anxiety that I see on the horizon to-day. The cause of the present troubles in the world is fundamentally the inability to distribute the goods of the world from nation to nation. That was fundamentally the cause of the last war and of the first world war as well. Instead of our talking about that cause and trying to remedy it, it seems to me that the nations of the world and the members of this house are talking about everything else. In the existence of that cause there is occasion for alarm.

It seems to me that the Department of External Affairs of Canada will have to study this whole matter of international distribution with the utmost care and formulate a solution very different from anything the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has ever mentioned in all his public utterances outside or inside this house. In order to emphasize that fact I should like to point out one thing which has developed during the war.

We have built at Sarnia a great rubber plant at a cost, I understand, of $51,000,000. The result of that splendid experiment and achievement is that we now are independent of all the world with respect to rubber. But in developing our own rubber supply we have put out of employment 100,000 people in the various countries that used to supply us with rubber. The question must arise in the mind of every thoughtful man: what is going to happen to those 100,000 people? Undoubtedly we were sound in developing our rubber supply, and it may easily be argued that we have no responsibility whatsoever for the welfare of those 100,000 people. But in this age, when we might be plunged into a war because of the unhappiness of certain peoples, we must assume a measure of responsibility for the welfare of those people. The nations of the world are developing towards economic nationalism, as has been pointed out two or three times already in debates in this house; and the more nearly they develop towards that state of affairs the more serious this problem becomes. There are nations—Canada and the United States, for instance—so fortunately situated in the extent and great variety of their resources as to be able in large measure to support themselves, but there are other nations whose resources are so meagre, and so one-sided, shall I say, that they cannot be self-sustaining. This state of affairs, alone, which is an exceedingly serious one, could occupy the Department of External Affairs pretty well night and day for enough years at least to enable them to reach a solution of the problem, which they can suggest to our fellow nations as they meet them.

There is another matter which requires special care at this time. During the Bretton Woods debate I pointed out that commercial rivalries and commercial warfare are far more

dangerous than they have ever been in the whole previous history of the world. I have no desire to offend anyone, but let me mention frankly one nation, our great, friendly respected and honoured neighbour, the United States. Because of her tremendous resources and wealth and her vast productive potential, the United States is capable of penetrating the markets of almost any nation in the world and displacing the products of the industries of those nations, throwing their people into the ranks of the unemployed and generally wrecking their economy. If the people of the United States so desired, having upset the trade balance between themselves and any other nation in the world, with the exception of Russia perhaps, they could acquire the fixed assets of that nation and virtually render it impossible for her to conduct a free and independent life. Somehow or other the nations of the world must discover a means of offsetting the great danger of economic warfare. I am quite disheartened sometimes when I reflect on how few members of this house ever give any attention whatsoever to this important matter. Yet it is one of the major causes of war, and always has been. It was one of the major causes of the last war.

Another serious problem which bulks large upon the horizon is the need for safeguarding national sovereignty. To me there is a situation in our house which is quite fantastic. May I illustrate it by what happened within the last few minutes. The member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) was speaking of our being independent of Britain, and I believe it was the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) who broke out with applause for that statement and said "hear, hear."

Mr. POULIOT: Independent of Britain and the United States—hear, hear.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am glad that the hon. member is so outspoken that everyone will know that I am not misrepresenting him. I can sympathize with the hon. member for Temiscouata, but let me draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that last fall we met together in this house and accepted the united nations organization, under which apparently we give up more of the sovereignty of Canada to an external body than was ever taken from us by Great Britain in perhaps the last seventy-five years, and that external body was an organization under the control virtually of the United States. Anyone who faces the facts cannot gainsay that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I am afraid the hon. member is getting rather far afield from the bill before the house, which is to amend chapter 65 of the revised statutes of Canada. I think the discussion should be confined to the bill before the house and should not extend to a discussion of trade and commerce and the united nations organization.

Mr. POULIOT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in defence of the argument made by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), I submit that the minister of external affairs will be bound by the policy of the government and by the policy of other organizations. There is a question now of abandoning part of our sovereignty and giving it to another organization called the UNO. Therefore it seems to me that the hon. member, the former leader of the Social Credit group, although I disagree entirely with him, is perfectly within his right as a member of parliament in discussing the question whether or not we should abandon our sovereignty to Great Britain, the United States and other nations comprising the UNO. I am for freedom of speech.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but may I point out that I am simply developing the reasons why we need a highly technical, highly skilled and highly specialized body of men in charge of the external affairs of this nation. That is obvious, is it not? I am not colliding with the speaker's ruling at all, because I shall say nothing more on that point. But certainly to argue that what I was saying had nothing to do with this bill is to adopt a line of reasoning which I find it impossible to follow.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must again point out that the matter of Canada's trade and consular appointments is in no way related to this bill. They come under a different department entirely. This bill is to amend an existing statute.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And the reason for amending that statute must be found in the burden which is placed on the Department of External Affairs; consequently anything which tends to show how that burden has increased of late years must unquestionably be in order. I am not challenging your ruling, Mr. Speaker. You will take the responsibility for my desisting along this line, but I will contend before any group of people in the future that I am perfectly in order in discussing the very matters that ought to be in the minds of all the members of the house when considering the Department of External Affairs.

There is one more matter which indicates how important it is that we have a full-time minister of external affairs. We need a greater

understanding to-day of the fundamental causes of international discord than I believe has ever been had by any nation in the past. We realize that the problems of Palestine, for example, may on very short notice plunge this nation into a war which might endanger our national existence. We have to be kept fully informed upon all matters pertaining to problems of the kind, and we have to have men in our external affairs department who are not burdened with any other matters except these, in order that they may have the mature judgment and the utmost of diplomatic skill to enable Canada to play her part in guaranteeing not only her own security and safety but the security and safety of the rest of mankind.

For these four reasons which I have brought forward I believe we are completely justified in accepting the bill with enthusiasm and without any form of reservation.

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): There is an aspect of this bill which I suggest hon. members thus far have overlooked. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) has said that the bill has been encouraged by a resolution of his which is on the order paper. Perhaps he forgets that last year, and earlier than that, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) did indicate his intention at some future date of bringing in the measure now before the house.

I do not rise at this time to take issue with the bill, but to point out what I think is a very important consideration arising out of its implications. The present Prime Minister of Canada has been minister of external affairs since 1921.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: While the government was in office.

Mr. MARTIN: While the government was in office, excluding the years 1930 to 1935. Since 1921, this country has emerged as one of the leading middle powers of the world. A former prime minister of Canada, the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, during the first world war, under whom both Canada and the Department of External Affairs entered a new phase, occupied at that important period in the history of the world not only the post of prime minister but that of minister of external affairs. From 1921 to 1930 and from 1930 to the present time, Canada has developed from the position of a self-governing dominion to the full status of an equal and powerful nation among all the other nations of the commonwealth and nations of the world.

One would of course be exaggerating to attribute that remarkable development of our national life as a member in the family of states solely to one man; that I do not propose to do. But the undoubted fact is that the experience, the devotion and the far-sightedness of the present Prime Minister of Canada have made him, as no other man in this country now is, equipped at this particularly difficult period in history to be not only Prime Minister of Canada but to act in the capacity—I trust, for some time to come as minister of external affairs. Reference has been made to the fact by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), who graciously acknowledged the great record of achievement of the present leader of the house as Prime Minister and minister of external affairs, that we have in the Department of External Affairs one of the best manned departments in the government of Canada. As he said, at the international gatherings which he has attended and at the four which I have attended, the members of that department hold their own with any corresponding group from any other country. That did not arise simply by chance; it arose because of the determination of the minister in charge of that particular department to see to it that it was manned by the best men and women we could get from Canada into that particular branch of the public service. I believe that in discussing this measure the least we can do, not only on this but as well on the other side of the house, regardless of our political affiliations, is to acknowledge what Canada owes to the present Prime Minister in his capacity of Secretary of State for External Affairs.

It is said that the time has come, not only that we should have a separate minister but that the nomination of that minister should be made forthwith. I would respectfully point out that at the present time the Minister of External Affairs in South Africa is the Right Hon. Jan Smuts, the Prime Minister of that country. The Right Hon. Peter Fraser, as Prime Minister of New Zealand, still represents his country at important international gatherings such as that at San Francisco and at the first general assembly in London of the united nations. In Australia it is true that Mr. Evatt has assumed for the first time the post of minister of external affairs without that post being attached to the office of prime minister. But it is to be noted that within five years Australia has had no less than three different prime ministers, one of whom was quite ill; one on his own admission did not expect to be able to hold the post of prime minister very long, and it may be presumed that in that great country there

were special reasons for creating, during one of the critical periods of the war, a separate minister of external affairs. But I would point out to the hon. member for Peel and he will recall that in London, Australia was represented, very ably, by two subsequently appointed resident ministers of the crown, neither of whom holds the portfolio of minister of external affairs in Australia, in the persons of Mr. Makins, a cabinet minister of that commonwealth, and of Mr. Beasley, now the resident minister high commissioner in the United Kingdom.

Mr. GRAYDON: In order to keep the record straight, my hon. friend will agree with me, I think, that there were special domestic conditions in Australia which prevented the foreign minister from attending.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not know what the alleged domestic conditions were. I am simply meeting the argument of my hon. friend by pointing to the fact that Australia was not represented by her prime minister. I do not say this by way of a criticism; presumably Australia had her own reasons, but she was not represented by her minister of external affairs.

But the big and cogent argument with respect to this particular matter is this. The house should not forget that one of the vital issues which in the last federal election we on this side laid before the people of the country was that the present Prime Minister as leader of the Liberal party should be returned because he was the one man in Canada best able to represent us during the period of his prime ministership at current important international conferences. That was one of the main issues in the election.

Mr. SKEY: Not in my riding.

Mr. MARTIN: My hon. friend says, not in his riding, but his riding does not represent the whole of this country. The fact is that we on this side of the house represent for the time being, and perhaps for a longer time than many hon. members believe, the majority of the people of this country. The people decided that, following the most difficult period in the history of the world, following a war involving the most fantastic experiences which man has known in his history, this country wanted to be represented at international gatherings, not by the only man available but by the best man available—the present Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. MERRITT: I should like to ask the minister if he is suggesting that the Prime Minister is the only possible man in the whole of Canada who can satisfactorily represent the country at these gatherings.

[Mr. Martin.]

Mr. MARTIN: I have just said that the Prime Minister is not the only man available, but he is the best man available.

Mr. BLACKMORE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning the truth of what the minister is saying, but I would ask Your Honour if you can tell in what respect the words the hon. gentleman is uttering now have anything to do with this bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would say the minister is definitely in order. The purpose of the bill is to make it possible to separate the office of Prime Minister and that of Secretary of State for External Affairs, so the remarks are in order.

Mr. POULIOT: He is in order because he speaks of the present incumbent of the post.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I cannot see how it has anything to do with the passing of this bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order; I have given my ruling.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And I am questioning it.

Mr. MARTIN: There is another aspect, Mr. Speaker, which I think the house and the country will not overlook at this time, because this matter is one of tremendous importance. During the war important conferences were held at Quebec and, recently, at Washington. Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt conferred on extremely important matters affecting not only the welfare of the united nations but that of the post-war world. On two occasions these conferences were held at Quebec. The Prime Minister, representing Canada, participated in many of these discussions. To-day he is perhaps the only living man at the head of a government who has had constant contact with these two great world leaders, one of whom is no longer living and the other no longer in power. The Prime Minister of Canada is the only contact of continuity, from one point of view, with respect to many of the matters discussed and decided at those important meetings. More important still was the recent conference at Washington with respect to the important scientific discovery of atomic energy. The present Prime Minister of Canada, conferring as he did with Mr. Truman, the President of the United States, and Mr. Attlee, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, in the light of his discussions at Quebec and in the light of his great experience during the war, being the sole survivor of that trio, undoubtedly was able to contribute immeasurably to the important discussions on atomic energy. And I do not think I am

being indiscreet when I say I am sure the present Prime Minister of Great Britain would be the first to acknowledge, as he has said in my presence on two occasions within the past three months, when he said: "It is fortunate for the world that at this time we have at the head of certain governments men of the experience and prestige of the present Prime Minister of Canada and the Prime Minister of South Africa."

So at this time I rise not only in respect of a matter that has to do with the welfare of our country and the pursuit of its foreign policy, but to pay tribute to a distinguished member of this house, a great prime minister in war and a great prime minister in peace, and one of the most experienced and mature minds, in the field of international relations, to be found in any country in the world at the present time.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) has spoken very well about the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), but I regret to say that in some respects he has stolen my speech. I always listen to him with great pleasure, as I do to the other hon. members who have spoken. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) spoke as a jurist who might be sitting on an international court somewhere in Europe. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) spoke as a good Canadian, and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) made a delightful speech in his own way.

Of course opinions are free. This bill is very short, but it covers a very wide field. It covers the whole external policy of Canada. The question is not so much that of changing the incumbent of the post, though the Prime Minister knows what personal regard and admiration I have for him. The question is whether or not Canada will be what it has been described as being among the nations of the world. We hear the finest speeches about the role of Canada, about Canada being a great nation. I agree with that, but I always disagree with the sordid idea of making Canada in the first place a small nation and afterward making Canada a middle nation or middle power, adding "power" to "middle" to deceive the universe about the real role of Canada. Canada has been minimized by the three big powers who want to control the destinies of the world, but who are unable, unqualified and incompetent to do so. They are only troublemakers who come to secret arrangements on other things, arrangements which they are ashamed to publicize. They are incompetent to stop the evil menace they have started.

Here we are with Canada being described as one of the great nations of the world. I agree that Canada should be a great nation, that it should be considered as such and should be invited to participate when decisions are made. Canada was not elected to the security council; we had to take it for granted that what was decided by the representatives of the three big nations was good for us. "Take that cure; it is good for you, my boy. Take your medicine; it is good for you. Take that spanking; it is good for you. That is good for you. Pay for us; it is good for you. Give to us; it is good for you." We have to receive the prescription for our external policy from other nations, and here we come to the abandonment of part of sovereignity, which means that the Canadian people, those living within this country, will have no complete freedom and no liberty if our country has none. I regret that a gentleman with the intelligence of the former leader of the Social Credit group should deny freedom of speech to the point of being surprised when a member of parliament says he wants this country to be free from England as well as free from the United States.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Surely the hon. member is misrepresenting what I said. I did not deny any freedom of speech; I was denied freedom of speech.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend should not be angry. *Hansard* speaks for itself, and we will read it to-morrow.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member for Lethbridge said he did not intend to say—

Mr. BLACKMORE: I did not say it; it is not a question of intention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: —I am sure his statement will be accepted by the hon. member for Temiscouata.

Mr. POULIOT: I quite agree with you, sir, that he did not say it, but he did it, which is worse.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is not right at all; I did not deny the hon. member freedom of speech.

Mr. POULIOT: I am glad to have so converted my hon. friend that he agrees with me now, but I must qualify what I have said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order; I understand—

Mr. POULIOT: I have accepted everything the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member for Temiscouata accepts the statement which was recently made by the hon. member for Lethbridge.

Mr. POULIOT: Every bit of it. I must qualify what I have said regarding the independence of this country. I do not mean that this country must be independent of the people of Great Britain and of the United States, not at all. What I wish to qualify in my former statement is that in my humble view Canada should be independent of all those who are the official representatives of any other country, France, England, The Netherlands, China and so forth, to make her own decisions regarding our external policy, regarding the relations of Canada with other nations. That is why I find that I cannot subscribe to the united nations organization. Perhaps I am ahead of my time; but when we see the trouble that is existing throughout the world to-day and when we read column after column and page after page of the papers telling us of the intrigues that have been taking place in New York and in all other places where there have been UNO conferences, are we to be governed by those people whom we do not know? I asked the question the other day. If I were in the United States I would favour Governor Dewey of the state of New York and I would vote Republican. If I were in England I would be very much embarrassed to decide between the two main parties, now that the Liberal party is dead in England. In Russia I would not be at liberty to express any opinion. It is these three big countries that rule the world now. It is the labour government in England; it is the democratic party in the United States and it is the government of Soviet Russia joined together. Sometimes they do not agree among themselves in sharing the spoils but they dictate as to what we shall do. I am against it. I believe in the sovereignty of Canada, in the complete and full sovereignty of Canada, just as much as I believe in the freedom and liberty of the Canadian citizen, if one man is ever to be so named officially. I believe in liberty, and I cannot conceive how citizens of any country could be free when the country itself is under the yoke of other nations. This I cannot subscribe to.

We have representatives throughout the world. Here in Canada we are young; we are childish, we are naive; we are credulous; we talk of diplomats. They are just commercial agents. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) said it last year or the year before. The high commissioner for Great Britain is only a commercial agent; so are our high commissioners. They come under the Secretary of State for External Affairs. They should be under the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have high regard for our high commissioners, especially for one of them whom I know very well. He is a former judge, my old friend, Mr. Justice Davis, high commissioner for Canada in Australia. What has he to do except looking after commercial interests over there? I admit that on certain occasions the high commissioner for Canada to Great Britain has something else to do. He is known as the go-between between the dominion government and His Majesty's government in England. That is a particular case, but all the others are there precisely to promote trade. They are there as consuls de luxe, a little above consuls general.

I said that we are naive. I take the *Parliamentary Guide* and I look at it. For a long time we had no ambassadors in this country. We had one high commissioner, but no others. We had several consuls. Well, these consuls were given official precedence as follows:

> Ambassadors, foreign ministers and foreign consuls general accredited to Canada, though not provided for in the table of precedence, are given a courtesy precedence, the ambassadors and ministers following immediately after the lieutenant governors of the provinces, and the consuls general immediately after the prime ministers of the provinces. The high commissioner and other representatives of the British commonwealth have been granted precedence immediately after the moderator of the Presbyterian church in Canada.

Sir, the gallery has been cleared of members' friends and relations to make place for the so-called diplomats. There is no one in the gallery facing the chair and very few people in the gallery to your left. These galleries were held *in petto* for the so-called diplomats and they do not even come to hear the discussions on a bill of this importance. It would have been beneficial to listen not to my remarks, but to those which have been made so ably by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and by the former leader of the opposition and the other hon gentlemen who have spoken; but the so-called diplomats shine by their absence to-day.

What is the present position of Canada with regard to trade, for instance? As high commissioners' duty is only to look after trade and as they come under the Secretary of State for External Affairs, it is incumbent upon them to be completely independent of the official representatives of any other country, including Great Britain, the United States, and the part of the world to which

they are assigned to perform their duty. Their duty is not to promote English trade, United States trade or Chinese trade; their duty is to promote Canadian trade and they should be independent of all these agencies. They should not be under the tutelage of the ambassadors of the United Kingdom, they should be independent of the high commissioners, independent of the consuls of Great Britain. Why? Because if there is the least difficulty respecting trade they must not look after the interests of any other country; they must look first after the interests of Canada. That is my point of view with regard to the usefulness of high commissioners and consuls general. — I think there is only one in the United States at the present time — and all the commercial attaches that we have throughout the world. What can we expect with regard to trade if these gentlemen have to give obedience to any English gentleman who is there, have to report to him or have to seek his advice?

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) was perfectly right when he said that we should have a Canadian policy applied to trade. I remember distinctly when a well-known imperialist who was the former member for York-Sunbury, Mr. Hanson, and a former leader of the opposition in this house was sitting here and I said to him that perhaps it was not the time for Canada to be politically independent of the United Kingdom. I said that during the war, but I also said on the same occasion that Canada should be economically independent of Great Britain. I said that if the time ever came to choose between the interest of Great Britain and any other country, France as well as any other, on the one hand and that of Canada on the other, our choice should unquestionably be Canada. I will choose Canada and I shall try to help my fellow-Canadians. That is the byword that should be given to all the men who come under the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Our only hope, our only life-preserver to prevent Canada from falling into bankruptcy is a resumption of our pre-war trade with all the nations of the world, not by way of gift, not by the Santa Claus policy, but by actually receiving payments for what we sell them. That is my point of view; I may be wrong. But I believe that in the event of any discussion, or in the event of a division of opinion, all the men under the Secretary of State for External Affairs, or under the Minister of Trade and Commerce — all those who represent Canadian interests overseas must be one to defend and promote Canadian interests and trade, as well as any other matters.

We hear some say the Prime Minister is a great man. I believe so. I believe his name will be written in golden letters in the annals of Canada as a man who wanted his country to be one of the greatest in the world, a man who has acquired world-wide fame, one of the most able conciliators to be found in diplomatic circles.

I agree with all that. And that is precisely why I was so much disappointed and my heart was so full of sorrow when I thought of the Big Three who were meeting together, and talking so psst, psst, psst—but who did not invite the Prime Minister of Canada, so as to have the benefit of his wisdom and vision and perhaps save the situation.

The right hon. gentleman has the prestige of a quarter of a century or more as Prime Minister of Canada. He has the knowledge of the past, and the knowledge of great men of the past. He knows that, although it may be a matter of regret to all, when he thinks he has performed his duty, he may retire.

But now he is opening the way for the creation of another department. Everybody is enthusiastic for it. Well, I know there are some able men in the cabinet, men for whom I have deep respect. But that is not enough. If we want Canada to be respected through and through by the other nations of the world, then the position of Secretary of State for External Affairs must be considered by the government of this country as the most important in the interests of Canada. The man who will be in charge of that department must have enough prestige to have influence within the cabinet, and to impose Canadian views upon his colleagues when they are about to jump the fence because of sentimentality.

If the Prime Minister made a success of his term as Secretary of State for External Affairs it was precisely because he was Prime Minister of Canada. Without his learning, without his sagacity, without his shrewdness, or his experience, and had he not had the prestige of Prime Minister of a country I consider the greatest in the world, he would not have succeeded half as well.

Therefore we must be cautious. It is not a matter of the Prime Minister's letting anyone get into his shoes as Secretary of State for External Affairs—although I know there are some able ministers. The point is that the next Secretary of State for External Affairs in Canada shall at the same time be the Prime Minister, in spite of this legislation, so that he may control the destinies of this country throughout the world. It will be a hard fight. It will no longer be a matter of conciliation. Rather it will be one of facing interests that are ready to do anything to control the trade of the world, the riches of

the world, the natural resources of the world. The Secretary of State for External Affairs will have to watch all those racketeers in international finance who want to control all we have in this country, and all there is in the world. A man will need the highest of all qualities in order to defend our birthright and to protect our interests. He shall not be governed by sentimentality; rather he shall be governed by a word which has been deprecated—he shall be governed by patriotism. For a time everyone would raise his shoulders when patriotism was mentioned, when it was called nationalism. Now the word has changed; it is called isolationism. Am I an isolationist if I want my country to prosper, if I want my country to be the greatest in the world? I am not an isolationist. I am a patriot, and I want Canada to be what she is described to be.

Otherwise let us speak no more about the greatness of Canada. Let us say that we are a colony, but we have no reason to be impressed by our creditors from other nations who come here, look at us from the galleries and say, "Those are the people who make the gifts; how silly they look!" I do not say that they use that expression, but we read that in their eyes.

Let us not be concerned about them. Let us have that dignity that is required of all those who are at the helm of all nations. Let us think of the present time and of the future; let us not be impressed by anyone from outside. Let us think first of the citizens of our own country. Let us think first of our country—and that does not mean that we are unwilling to deal with any other nation. But when we do so, it will be done in the interests of Canada and for the protection of our fellow citizens.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the bill before the house is to amend the Department of External Affairs Act, which was passed in 1927. The amendment is not as simple as it looks, because there are many principles involved.

While I would speak with great respect about the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and about the hard work he and his officials have done in the department, and while I have respect for his wide experience, I would offer some constructive objections to the proposed policy.

While I cannot speak with authority respecting the policy of this party, and would speak only as a private member, might I say that our policy has been consistent. Notwithstanding what has been said by the hon. member who has just taken his seat, the hope of the world is that France and Great Britain will work together.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

I do not wish to discuss external affairs at this time, and shall be content only to speak concerning the principle involved in the bill. It must be remembered that the policy of the mother country is to restore France to the great nation she has always been in the past. I hope our friends from Quebec will not forget that.

Speaking back in 1938, and paying tribute to what the Prime Minister had done, I said:

> Under our constitutional practice, however, as the Prime Minister is aware, seeing that he has had a great deal of experience in diplomatic affairs, it is the duty of parliament to inquire into estimates such as those we have before us to-day.

I pointed out that on the government of the day rests the responsibility for the conduct of external affairs, and not on the opposition. We as an opposition should not act as life-preservers for the government because on the government of the day as long as they are the government of the day is the onus and responsibility for the conduct of Canada's external affairs. We are spending on this Department of External Affairs now a total of four and one-third million dollars.

The question arises as to the cause and effect of the proposed amendment. The external affairs policy to-day is totally different from what it was in 1927 when this statute which it is now proposed to amend was passed. After all is said and done, external affairs, as a great textbook writer, Walter Lippmann, said, should be largely a matter of what one might call a chartered accountant's policy by which you strike a balance sheet of assets and liabilities and decide as a country what commitments you have to meet and what you will be able to do with them in the event of war. That is a very good definition.

As I see it, the foreign policy of this country should be based on two principles. It will be remembered that when the proposal to appoint parliamentary assistants was up a couple of years ago I stated that I did not believe in the principle, although I understand it has worked out very well in some departments. I know the Prime Minister has a heavy load to carry in this particular department, and at that time it was suggested that a parliamentary assistant should fill this office instead of a minister of the crown. That policy was adopted with regard to other departments.

I do not think it is in the interest of responsible government that representatives of the opposition parties should be sent abroad on external affairs missions to represent the government. I am not objecting merely to spending money and I always believe it is a

good thing for members of parliament to travel. The principle was adopted of sending these deputations abroad a few years ago to the league. First, I think the Secretary of State was a delegate once and now it is continued on foreign affairs. The government of the day must accept responsibility alone for foreign affairs.

There are a great many people in this country who are becoming alarmed at the way our foreign affairs are being conducted. They are comparing the principles which were laid down by the government and by others before this war with those being laid down to-day. In 1938 I suggested to the Prime Minister of the day that he should avail himself of the facilities of the radio, and I believe he did that a little later on. On March 24, 1938, I proposed that to the Prime Minister and, as I say, that practice was carried out during the war. If that had been done in connection with external affairs I do not think there would be the criticism there has been. I suggest to the Prime Minister that there should be an empire conference of the dominions on cooperation and coordination if this amendment is passed. This has been suggested for many years and it is the only way of settling these problems. That should be done instead of sending abroad these deputations to which I have referred. There should be a meeting of the dominions to lay down a common, after the war, empire policy. As has been said by President Poincaire of France, we are the hardest country in the world with which to make a treaty, as Britain always spoke with so many divergent views.

I object to the amendment because the Department of External Affairs of to-day is not the same as the department that was set up under the act of 1927. It has been expanded, and we are assuming responsibility which it was never intended the department should take under responsible government. I have looked into this matter for a long time. We are a country of only 10,500,000 people and we are spending $4,300,000 on this particular department. When I see the deviations which have been made from the statute of 1927 in our foreign policy I become alarmed and many thoughtful people are becoming alarmed over what is going to happen to our policy.

In conclusion, I wish to say that a great many thoughtful people believe that this work could be carried out by a parliamentary assistant. Are we to have a foreign minister like the old country? I have referred to the fact that all Britain's foreign ministers were trained men, and also their permanent officials on diplomacy, such as Spring-Rice and Lindsay at Washington. If the Prime Minister wants this particular bill to pass, all very well and good, but I suggest that the province of Ontario should receive some consideration for such a new minister, especially the Toronto district, which has not had a cabinet minister since the present government came into office, and even long before that.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just a word before second reading is given. First of all, may I say that my reason for introducing this bill has been to further not only the wishes of many hon. gentlemen opposite but my own wishes as well. I think I have made it clear from time to time that I was not over-anxious to carry the extra burdens of the Department of External Affairs in addition to those of the Prime Minister. I certainly would not be carrying both portfolios at the present time if it were not that the questions which are uppermost in this and other countries to-day are for the most part international questions which call for as much in the way of experience and knowledge as it is possible for one to command, and also for the fact that the two departments, the department of the Prime Minister and that of the Secretary of State for External Affairs have been so interlocked for the past thirty or forty years that the separation of those two departments at a given moment is not something that can be very readily brought about.

Let me say a word first in regard to the latter point. I know that hon. gentlemen are anxious to know why it is, being desirous of being relieved of certain burdens, one has not found it possible to find that relief up to the present time. In that connection I have to explain the position of the Prime Minister when he comes into office as contrasted with that of other ministers of the crown. As hon. gentlemen know, when a minister other than the Prime Minister assumes a portfolio he goes into a department of state which is already thoroughly organized and has been organized for years past. His department has a deputy head; it has a secretary; it has its various branches; it has its staff of civil servants who know all the aspects of the work of the department and who possess the accumulated knowledge and information of which the department has become the repository over many years.

When the Prime Minister assumes offices he enters what to all intents and purposes is an all but completely empty office. If he is fortunate enough to have had them, he takes with him one or two secretaries who have served him in his capacity as leader of the opposition if he comes into office after having

been the leader of the opposition. Otherwise he has no officers whatever in his department until he has had an opportunity to organize the Prime Minister's office. He has no deputy head; he has no secretary of his department as such; he has no leading officials as such. There may be a few stenographers and typists and possibly a few members of the service who have had to do with the filing of communications. He has to ask himself immediately whether those particular officials who have been serving political opponents are the ones whom he wishes to have continue in the office with him having regard to all the intimate affairs of government with which the Prime Minister finds he is confronted. I am happy to say that I have found that it was not necessary to change these members of the service to any extent, and one of the reasons is that they have been so few in number.

The one criticism of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) with regard to this present step was that it was not taken two or three years ago. If the measure is to be criticized for coming so late, my criticism would be that it did not come many years ago, and in particular that it did not come at the time when his leader, the then Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, was prime minister of Canada and also secretary of state for external affairs. I am wholly right, I believe, when I say that when Lord Bennett became prime minister he had previously entertained the view that it would be desirable to separate the two offices, but he had been in office for only a very short time before he expressed quite frankly the view that it would not be wise to separate the two offices. He found that the Department of External Affairs was in many important particulars concerned with the work that the Prime Minister's office would have to undertake in connection with very many of the questions that came up, and throughout the five years that he was in office he continued to hold the two positions. If those positions had been separated during the term of Mr. Bennett's prime ministership of this country it would have meant that we would have had a separate minister of external affairs in 1935. I mention 1935 as a significant date because in the years immediately following, as all hon. members know, the question of foreign relations became a matter of grave concern not only for a secretary of state for external affairs but very much a matter of deep concern to the prime minister. Those were the years when we were approaching the possibility of war in Europe, and it fell to my lot to have the administration of both positions at that time. I should have found it perilous and indeed impossible to have separated those two positions at that particular time, and had they been separated I am sure I am quite right when I say that once we came to the period of the war, it would have been almost imperative for the Prime Minister to hold the position of Secretary of State for External Affairs as well as the office of Prime Minister. There would otherwise have been duplication of the work all the way through with resulting confusion. Through the period of the war the work of the two departments became necessarily more intertwined than ever. May I say to hon. members of the house that so far as the Prime Minister's office to-day is concerned nearly all the officials on whom he relies in the Prime Minister's office have been seconded to that office from the Department of External Affairs. It has been necessary to have experienced officials. Experienced officials, with like qualifications, were not to be found in any other department of government or outside the government service. More than that, let me say in passing, there can be no better field of training for the officials of the Department of External Affairs than the Prime Minister's office. I think it is very desirable, when these departments are separated, as I hope they will be before very long, that some members of the Department of External Affairs should continue to serve in the Prime Minister's office and to obtain, while there, all the knowledge they possibly can on questions that are all-important in government. It is the best school of training for the young men and women who are to be entrusted with the larger responsibility, of later filling great positions and representing our country in other lands.

And so it is that if these offices were separated immediately a good deal of care would have to be exercised in untwining the threads that have formed so complete a strand uniting the two offices. If it were not for that difficulty I can assure hon. members that the severance would have been made some considerable time before this. As an illustration of how much this is the case I might mention that at the present time, so far as the Prime Minister's office is concerned, all the accounting of that office and practically all its business administration is managed from the Department of External Affairs and has been so managed since 1912.

I would remind hon. members that when the act creating the Department of External Affairs was introduced by Sir Robert Borden in 1912, it provided:

The member of the King's Privy Council for Canada holding the recognized position of First Minister shall be the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and in this act he is hereunder referred to as "the minister."

Sir Robert Borden did not insert that clause without having very strong and good reasons at the time for so doing, and as I have pointed out, Lord Bennett, when he was prime minister, allowed that clause to remain in the act, having the very best of reasons for feeling it was essential that the Department of External Affairs should be so closely united with the Prime Minister's office. As I have just said, I have found, particularly through the years of war, and, indeed, in no less degree since, that it was imperative that the Prime Minister should have the closest possible contact with the officials of the external affairs department, thus bringing him in immediate touch, as he only could come in immediate touch, with those who were representing Canada in all the different countries in which we have missions, and also all who were representing Canada at important international gatherings.

I pause for a moment to refer hon. members to the estimates as they have been presented to this house for the present year. Hon. members will see in a moment to what an extent much of the business that would otherwise have to be separately provided for in the Prime Minister's estimates is to-day provided for in the estimates of the Department of External Affairs. In this year's estimates for 1946-47 there is provided for the Prime Minister's office a total of $78,073, and for the Department of External Affairs, $2,436,325. That speaks for itself of the extent to which these two departments have become interlocked, and that over a period of thirty-four years. I want the house to understand this very clearly because some people may think that I am desirous of holding on to more in the way of administration than in fact I desire to do. A main reason, I wish to repeat, why a complete division of the two departments had not been made before this is that it will involve, when finally made, a very considerable readjustment of what will have to be provided in connection with the Prime Minister's office and also changes of importance in the Department of External Affairs as well.

I appreciate the solicitude of hon. gentlemen opposite for my health and strength and all the rest of it that on occasions they have been kind enough to express. But I take all that with a grain of salt. I must say, I ask myself, just why do they want me out of this office? If I were not of some value to the country as head of the Department of External Affairs, I am certain they would be glad to see me stay there, and they would not be asking me to retire as quickly as possible. As I say, I question a little what some of them, at least, may have in mind, but I agree with them that as soon as matters can be properly arranged with due regard to the public interest, it is desirable that the two departments should be separated.

But I come then to the question of whether at this particular moment it is best to make that change. The first step is being taken now. It is a wholly necessary step in that we are removing what up to this time has been at the instance of parliament a bar to anyone other than the Prime Minister holding that office. I am hopeful that very shortly another step may be taken, though I cannot at the moment say just how soon. That, I know, is the main question in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, how soon are we going to get this man out of that particular position? I wish I could satisfy my hon. friend, the member for Peel on that, but he will just have to wait and see in regard to that, as to much else. May I remind my hon. friend, when he undertakes to tell me what should be done in the Department of External Affairs, that I have had experience in that department which runs nearly to twenty years. Such experience as he has had in international affairs has resulted, I think, from my own act in appointing him as a delegate to the United Nations conference on international organization at San Francisco, also a member of the Canadian delegation to the preparatory commission of the united nations, and still later as an alternate delegate of the first session of the general assembly of the united nations. I am glad to see that he has profited somewhat by that experience. But let me tell him that twenty years experience with international affairs is worth a great deal more than one year, or a few months, and that if he had had a little wider experience I think he might have been somewhat more cautious in suggesting that the changes he proposes should be made at this particular moment.

I ask myself this question: with what countries has Canada very important relations at the present time? First of all there are our relations with the United Kingdom and other parts of the British commonwealth; there are our relations with the United States, with France, with China, and with Russia. This house knows that the problems we have in all these relationships have not grown up in the last few days, or weeks, or years; they have come into being over the years, and with

respect to them, wide knowledge and information is a very great asset in reaching highly important decisions. The movement of international affairs is so rapid in these days that unless one has some of the direct knowledge of the background out of which these situations have sprung it would be next to impossible with respect to many of them to make with any sense of security the decisions which are essential if the proper steps are to be taken. I shall give but one example of what I mean. I ask the house this question: supposing I were to resign to-morrow the position of Secretary of State for External Affairs, what would the reaction be in Russia to that resignation? Would it be represented that I still commanded the confidence of the parliament and people of Canada in international affairs, or would it be represented that, having taken the position which I have taken in the interests of this country, this House of Commons and the people of Canada hold a very different view with respect to the manner in which I have discharged my responsibilities? That is something which has not occurred to my hon. friend. But I tell him that considerations of the kind in international relations are vital in reaching decisions as to what particular moment it is best for changes to be made.

Reference has been made, very kindly, on the part of my colleague the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) and the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) to what it may mean at some international gatherings at this time to have the experience of such a person — such a great leader—as Jan Smuts, who holds the position of Minister of External Affairs as well as Prime Minister and whose influence at these gatherings arises out of the great part which he has taken in international affairs over the years. It is not for me to say whether or not a new minister of external affairs coming into office to-morrow would be able, in the critical situations which have to be dealt with at some of the international gatherings which are to take place this year, to render, perhaps, the same service to Canada as one who has known at first hand the international situation as it has grown up over the years. As has been referred to this afternoon I have had —and I am very proud of it, and I believe it is an asset of national value—a very close and intimate association with both Mr. Churchill when he was Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and with the late President Roosevelt of the United States. Very few men living to-day know what was in the minds of these men when certain decisions were made, as well as I do myself; and of some of these decisions, may I say, I think I have of those who are in office to-day, an almost exclusive knowledge. I say this in no boasting spirit but I know the value of authority in some things when one is speaking at international gatherings, and I know also the value of personal acquaintance and friendship with leading men in different parts of the world, and of having had what grows out of such an intimate association in years like those of the recent past.

I want to say this to my hon. friends opposite: I am prepared to accept from them as much in the way of advice as they may wish to tender and to consider it very carefully. But there is one group of gentlemen to whose advice and counsel and opinion I must give even more attention than to theirs, and that is, the colleagues who sit with me in the government, and the hon. members who through many years have been my loyal supporters in this House of Commons. When it comes to the matter of the responsibility of government for foreign affairs in times like the present one's colleagues have to be consulted, their views taken into consideration and their wishes considered as well as one's own. I have not found among my colleagues thus far a desire that I should give up this particular post at this particular time, nor have I found that wish among members of my party.

After all, it is our responsibility to govern. Having been sent here for that purpose, having been sent here, as the Secretary of State, without possibility of any contradiction, said, by the Canadian people because they believed that this particular government was best qualified to deal with external affairs at a time which was very critical in the world, that responsibility is something which in fact I have to recognize in my obligation to the people of Canada.

I say these things that hon. members may realize that it is not all just as easy to bring about a change as they themselves may think. I am anxious to lighten the load in as many directions as I can. Thank God, I have around me ministers who are taking more of it from my shoulders day by day. It might appear that I am carrying a great deal of the load. I have to take the responsibility for what is said and done, but if hon. members will notice how matters related to external affairs have been dealt with in considerable part by one minister after the other they will realize that the burden of the Department of External Affairs is not wholly on the shoulders of any one man, but is shared by a large part of the ministry.

That I say simply to clear up what my hon. friend seems most concerned about, namely as to when I am to get out of this particular position. May I say what I have in mind is that I know hon. members are very anxious to discuss external affairs at an early stage of the session; also that they are anxious to have the estimates of the Department of External Affairs referred at any stage to the committee on external affairs. I had thought that if it suited the convenience of the house I might try to bring forward the debate on external affairs within another fortnight, and as soon as the house had passed an item, refer the estimates at once to a committee, where they might be gone into thoroughly. But I must say to my hon. friend that I do not think it would be in his interests, in the interests of this house or in the interests of this country for me to attempt within the next few weeks to have one of my colleagues appointed as Secretary of State for External Affairs and put upon his shoulders the responsibility of conducting the first discussion and the main discussion we shall have on external affairs. I must take that responsibility myself. I hope it may be the last time I shall have to assume it.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. MacDonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—Repeal.

Mr. GRAYDON: In speaking on second reading I believe I made mention of the draftsmanship of this clause. Has the Prime Minister given consideration to that? If I may say so, I think it is important.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have been giving consideration to it. There may be some technical advantage in further amending the act respecting the Department of External Affairs, but I really think what is now proposed is quite sufficient, for the reason that the original bill itself provided for a Secretary of State for External Affairs. Section 2 of that bill is as follows:

> There shall be a department of the government of Canada to be called the Department of External Affairs, over which the Secretary of State for External Affairs shall preside.

That makes provision for a secretary of state to preside over a Department of External Affairs. Then the Salaries Act provides:

> These salaries of the following ministers, members of the King's privy council for Canada, shall be as follows, that is to say:
> The Secretary of State for External Affairs, $10,000.

So that $10,000 is voted for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and the act defines him as a minister. It seems to me, therefore, that all that is necessary to meet the situation to which my hon. friend has referred is fully covered. The act makes provision for the department; it makes provision for the Secretary of State for External Affairs to be at the head of the department; another act defines him as a minister; and wherever the word "minister" is referred to in this act the minister would be the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. COLDWELL: If I might just ask a question, because I heard this comment, I understand that the salary provision becomes operative only if a separate minister is appointed for the department.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is right. The salary has been there for the last two years. I made the suggestion that it should be included a couple of years ago, hoping someone other than myself would get it; it will be there when a new minister is appointed.

Mr. FULTON: With due respect to what the right hon. Prime Minister has said I might point out one further matter. That is, while I appreciate his statement, it is normal in an act setting up a department to provide for the appointment of a minister who shall preside over that department; and as the act would now stand no such provision is made. So that I would ask, for instance, under what authority would the Secretary of State for External Affairs be appointed?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The act says:

> There shall be a department of the government of Canada to be called the Department of External Affairs, over which the Secretary of State for External Affairs shall preside.

I am afraid I do not quite catch my hon. friend's objection. Does he feel that this is not enough?

Mr. FULTON: It is a matter of statutory form, if you wish. I am merely pointing out that the clause says, "over which the secretary of state shall preside," but still we have no provision for the appointment of a Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is normal to provide that the minister shall be appointed under the great seal, and shall hold office, and so on, and I merely point out that there is this exception. It is a small matter, but we have asked if the Prime Minister would be willing to introduce an amendment. I should think that in order to bring this act into conformity with other acts setting up departments he might well consent to that request.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that I might have gone meticulously into this matter were it not that the act respecting the Department of External Affairs needs very considerable overhauling, and I should hope that would be one of the first steps to be taken once there is a separation of the two departments. The officers of the Department of External Affairs have drawn my attention to the fact that they feel it would be preferable to wait until we revised the entire act rather than attempt to make any unnecessary changes at this time.

I drafted a section after the hon. member for Peel spoke. I do not know whether this might meet the situation. It is that section 2, which I have just read, be amended by the insertion of the words "a minister of the crown to be known as" after the words "over which" in line 3, and the words "and hereafter referred to as the minister" after the words "external affairs" in line 3. The section would then read:

There shall be a department of the government of Canada to be called the Department of External Affairs, over which a minister of the crown to be known as the Secretary of State for External Affairs and hereafter referred to as "the minister" shall preside.

If that is acceptable to my hon. friends opposite I would be happy to have it moved.

Mr. McIVOR: If the Prime Minister still occupies the position of Secretary of State for External Affairs there will be no extra expense. If a new minister is appointed the only extra expense will be his salary?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, no; there will be much more extra expense. As I have said, the minute the office of Prime Minister is separated from the office of external affairs, there will have to be an enlargement to a considerable extent of the machinery in that office. For example, to-day there is no accounting branch in the office of the Prime Minister; all that is done in the Department of External Affairs. There is no provision for a staff for the Prime Minister. The staff of the Prime Minister for the most part are members of the Department of External Affairs who are seconded to the Prime Minister's office. There are other changes which do not come to mind at the moment but which are far-reaching. If there had been time to work out that division quickly within the last few months I would have been only too happy to do so, but I think it will take some short time to have it properly worked out.

Mr. McIVOR: I asked that question because some of us are asking for a reduction in the income tax on salaries of married folk and an exemption of $2,000. If we are putting it on one way and trying to take it off another it does not seem logical.

Mr. GRAYDON: In connection with the proposed amendment may I say to the Prime Minister that it does not quite meet what we had in mind. It is perhaps not as strong as we should like to have it, but it does meet the point in that it does provide for a minister of the crown. Second, it does make a reference to the minister, and is applicable to the remaining parts of the sections, which is, I think, rather difficult from the draftsman's point of view.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I beg leave to move that

Section 2 of the Department of External Affairs Act shall be amended by the insertion of the words "a minister of the crown to be known as" after the words "over which" in line 3 and the words "and hereafter referred to as the minister" after the words "external affairs" in line 3.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 1 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of bill No. 7, respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens.

He said: Since I propose to make a fairly extended statement may I now ask the indulgence of the house to call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

WILD LIFE

PROVISION FOR APRIL 10 AS JACK MINER NATIONAL WILD LIFE DAY

The house resumed from Thursday, March 28, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacNicol for the second reading of bill No. 2, respecting the Jack Miner National Wild Life Day.

Hon. J. A. GLEN (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the second reading of bill No. 2, respecting Jack Miner national wild life day, has created an incident which is not only unusual but, I think, unique in the annals of this house. We are asked to commemorate the life of a citizen, and with it to identify him with his life's work.

The speeches which have so far been heard are a worthy tribute to one who, in his lifetime, became known far and wide, and especially on this continent, for his great and valuable contribution to the knowledge of wild bird life. He began his life's work under circumstances very adverse, and sometimes under the sneering comment of his contemporaries which might have daunted a lesser man, but which only served to prove the indomitable spirit of this remarkable man.

It was given to few men, as it was given to Jack Miner, to receive in his lifetime the acclaim not only of those on this continent, but of those of many foreign lands. He exhibited the truth of that old and true saying, "Seest thou a man diligent in his business; he shall stand before kings."

Jack Miner in his life did stand among kings—kings of industry, political life and of every field of activity known to our civilization. But, above all, he stood a peer among his fellowmen—the common man. With it all he exhibited a robust Christianity which endeared him to those who believe in humanity and the eternal verities.

Full of years and his task showing promise of a prominence which his family are now endeavouring to consolidate, Jack Miner passed on, leaving his heritage to his immediate family, who are carrying on as he desired and as he would wish.

The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) has told the house that there is a foundation called the Jack Miner foundation, which is carried on by the members of his family, and which is subject to the scrutiny of any who may wish to investigate. The hon. member for Davenport, because of his respect and admiration for Jack Miner, has brought this bill before the house. He was privileged to call Jack Miner his friend, and by this bill he has shown his desire to perpetuate that friendship and admiration in the form of the bill we are now discussing.

It is evident from the expressions from all sides of the house that the hon. member for Davenport has considerable support; and I am sure that as a recognition of the merits of Jack Miner, that support is universal on every side of the house. I should like to add that what I shall now say is not in opposition to or in any way to detract from the eminence of this great Canadian and great Christian gentleman. However, I should like the house to consider some angles of the bill which come to my mind.

The house will recall that last session I indicated, when my estimates were before the committee, and when the sum of $2,500 was being asked as a grant to the Jack Miner foundation, that I had received many letters from hon. members on all sides of the house asking that the grant be restored to the amount at which it had formerly stood, namely $5,000. I stated at that time that when making up my estimates again I would endeavour to place the amount at $5,000, as before. I am now happy to say that I have been able to do so, and that hon. members will find in the estimates that the grant for the Jack Miner foundation is restored to its original sum of $5,000.

I am sure the house will agree that that estimate should pass, without discussion. Sometimes I think of the story of the old Quaker who was accosted by a friend who, in turn, was commiserating the condition of another friend. The old Quaker said, "Well, show us your sympathy", and he pulled out a pound note, saying, "There is the extent of my sympathy."

Perhaps the expression of the house in the grant of $5,000 is that form of expression which will be duly appreciated by those who will receive it. It may be that this bill, which is unusual and the first of its kind, would raise questions in the minds of hon. members as to the precedent about to be created. I do not know where we should stop, whether we should commemorate the life of any citizen in Canada in any field of activity. Shall we do so in the political field? If so, I can well understand that some hon. members might wish to commemorate the life of Sir John A. Macdonald, the father of Confederation, and whom, now that the partisan politics with which he was connected have passed away, we now view only as a great Canadian. If there were a suggestion to commemorate his life I am sure there are many Liberals on this side of the house who would recognize in Sir John A Macdonald not only a Conservative leader, but a leader of the Canadian people. I should imagine any suggestion of the kind I have mentioned would receive the acclaim of the country.

Then we might have a day set apart to commemorate the life of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, because, as hon. members will recall, he came into office as Prime Minister at a time when unity within the country was very much needed. We had not passed far from colonial days and he was faced with a task which might have daunted any lesser man. I think any fair-minded Canadian will agree, however, that the efforts made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, while he was Prime Minister of this country, tended to consolidate the nation to a point where he could visualize a united Canada. I am sure that Conservatives or others throughout the country would recognize his worth as they recognize the worth of Sir John A.

Macdonald. They were leaders of Canada, and it might be fitting, in some minds, to have a day commemorating their memory.

Then, while we are still in the political field, there is Sir Robert Borden. Sir Robert Borden did noble work during the last war, as every one will recognize. But in my judgment he did still greater work when he became one of the proponents of the Statute of Westminster which consolidated Canada as an autonomous nation. These men in the political field have passed away, and I can understand that in the days to come there may be a day set aside to commemorate their memory.

I would expect also that many would like to set a day aside to commemorate the present leader of the House of Commons and Prime Minister of Canada. I know the day will come when party strife has left the minds of men and they will look only to the great events and achievements of his life and recognize fully, as with these others that I have mentioned, that he is one of the leaders of Canada, one of the makers of Canada. It may be that in the days to come there may also be set apart a day for Mackenzie King.

Leaving the political field, I have in mind one outstanding citizen of this country who has also passed away, namely, Doctor Saunders, the man who brought into being Marquis wheat. I know of no greater contribution that any citizen of this country could make than that of Doctor Saunders who brought into being our Marquis wheat. That wheat revolutionized farming in western Canada; it gave stability to the economy of our country. Only recently there has been evolved another wheat with qualities even greater than wheats that preceded it and they all stemmed from that product which he evolved, namely, Marquis wheat. If one is to consider a field of endeavour such as that of Doctor Saunders, one covering the whole of Canada, one having an effect upon all our lives, then it should be proper that he also should have a day of commemoration set apart such as is now being asked for in this bill for Jack Miner.

I have another great Canadian in mind, Doctor Banting, that great physician who evolved insulin. The effects of insulin are not only national, they are international. He devoted his life to the work of evolving that great medicine. In the pursuance of his profession and in an effort to assist in the war effort he lost his life on the shores of Newfoundland. One might also say that a day should be set aside to commemorate Doctor Banting because he was a benefactor of all mankind and was a citizen of Canada.

[Mr. Glen.]

Recently I had an invitation to address the prospectors' and developers' association in Toronto. About one thousand men and women were gathered together there. I was asked to give these prospectors and developers an address, but before doing so I met the president of the association, Mrs. Viola McMillan, and she asked me to speak about and further, if necessary, the setting up of a miners' day in Canada. I felt then as I feel now that an innovation of that kind should not come from me. I thought that while it was a proper thing to have a miners' day for Canada in order that the people of this country may have an opportunity to gather in all the information they can about the development of our land, that suggestion should not come from me. The world looks upon Canada as the last great mining field on this continent and these people feel that something should be done to propagate and to extend their activities.

I felt that it was not something that I could give official sanction to, however I might feel as an individual. However, they had decided already that they were going to have a miners' day. They proposed to take the initiative and do the spade work to bring it into being. They set up a fund and many of those present contributed. I was impressed by a most colorful character who was there, whom many hon. members know, Jack Hammil, who there and then gave his cheque for $500 to help carry on an educational programme among these prospectors and developers and also throughout the provinces. These people will lay the foundation whereby miners' day might become identified with that industry and create interest in it which would be of value to the industry.

I notice that the explanatory notes to the bill state:

> The purpose of this bill is to create public interest in the wild life of Canada and educate Canadians in the value thereof by setting aside a day when school teachers can stress in schools bird life, humane education, conservation, a day to judge bird-house contests . . .

The word "education" is brought into this, and it struck me that this bill should not be brought before this House of Commons at this time. My feeling is that the timing is not good. If there is a desire throughout Canada to have such a day, then it seems to me there ought to be some preparatory work done before such a bill is presented here. After all, we represent the dominion; we do not represent the provinces as provinces. The matter of education is wholly within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces, and it might seem somewhat impertinent for the

House of Commons to distinguish a day which would be related to the educational systems of the provinces when, indeed, they might be desirous of commemorating some of their own citizens. I would not be surprised if some of the provinces might desire that one or more of their eminent men should be commemorated in a form which this bill suggests.

At all events, my feeling is that this matter should not be brought before the House of Commons at this time. Communication should be entered into with the provinces to see what their viewpoint is. We are dealing with the provinces in the dominion-provincial conference, and it seems to me that we should not bring before them something which we propose to merge into their educational system and curricula without at least giving them an opportunity to say whether or not they desire it.

I did not wish to speak at any length upon this bill. I wish to make a suggestion to my hon. friend the member for Davenport, and I do so with some degree of timidity. He has proposed this bill with a desire to commemorate his friend and the friend of many in this house. During the discussion on this bill many hon. members have acclaimed the work of Jack Miner and of the foundation which now exists. I think the hon. member has done his duty, and he should now consider whether or not this is the proper time to bring a bill such as this before the house without some effort being made to find out the reaction of the provinces toward such a bill.

With the high regard that I have for the hon. member for Davenport I do not like to appear as being opposed to anything he may wish, but I would suggest to him that some communication should be had with the provinces and their points of view obtained. If, later on, the consensus is that the life of any citizen should be commemorated in this unique manner, then it might be brought before the house again. If the hon. member desires I shall be glad to assist him in obtaining expressions from the provinces of their points of view with regard to the bill.

I am hoping the hon. member will take this suggestion as a helpful one. I know he would wish to have, not only the acclaim of this House of Commons but the acclaim of all the provincial legislatures in Canada for the work done by Jack Miner. When that day comes, then he could again introduce a bill which would give effect to that desire.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I do not like to see the hon. member's bill killed by the minister in this way. I would suggest to the minister that during the recess this bill should go either to the committee on natural resources, mines and all that or be considered by the select committee considering Indian affairs, or taken up in the recess with the provinces and municipalities.

There is a principle to consider in connection with this bill. Our countryside is perhaps one of the most beautiful in the world, and yet I have heard many tourists complain of its reckless destruction, and anything which the government can do to prevent this destruction will help to preserve a natural asset for years to come. Our roads are also another great asset, although it is true that more people have been killed on the great roads, at level crossings and elsewhere, than were killed in the great war. Roads help to open up a country. The great lake Muskoka district is a beautiful one; yet it, like others, is being wiped out by the wilful destruction of the countryside. Nothing has contributed more to the education of the people than the motor car.

There is some merit to this bill which is sponsored by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol), who always adds a great deal of light to any discussion in which he takes part.

The Hamilton-Dundas highway runs through one of the most beautiful market-garden districts in Ontario; yet I never saw such destruction of the countryside, the wild flowers, the birds, in my life, and many visiting people have expressed the same view. I hope that the minister will consider these suggestions and that during the recess some of the officials will take up this question with the provinces and municipalities and get some action.

We remember Cowper in "The Task" when he speaks of the beauty of the old English countryside and says:

> I would not enter on my list of friends
> (Though graced with polish'd manners and fine sense,
> Yet wanting sensibility), the man
> Who needlessly sets foot upon a worm.

And again he attacks the pleasures of the chase:

> Detested sport that feeds on another's pain.

He describes the need of care of the countryside and the bird life of England.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the minister for his remarks and for his suggestion that I withdraw the bill now and allow the government to confer with the provinces in connection with the matter he mentioned, namely, the educational matter, and then I can reintroduce a similar bill next year. I do not know

why I should refuse to accept his suggestion, but before doing so I should like to express my warm appreciation of the addresses of all hon. members who have spoken in favour of the bill. All of them have been unanimously in favour of it, including the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin), the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Brown), the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Clark), the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Ross), the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor), the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) and in particular perhaps, the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette), and I know that had the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) been here before the minister spoke, he, too, would have supported the bill. I quite realize that after the minister has spoken the government supporters have to take back what they said and support the minister. I do not blame them for that because it is likely that I would do so myself if I were over there. In order to have government in this country it is the duty of party followers to be loyal, and I have never objected to that.

I am sure that what has been said in this debate will be helpful to the foundation. I am concerned that Canada recognize the great achievement of the late Jack Miner. The minister has mentioned a number of other distinguished naturalists and all that he has said of them is true. But their achievements were quite different from those of Jack Miner in this regard, that his life was associated with the service he performed through children, and the main purpose of a bill such as this would be to educate the children. I am sure that teachers would welcome an hour or more on a Friday afternoon to teach children the importance of conservation of wild life. The bill was never intended to establish a holiday or anything like that but was patterned after the bills in the United States where many states have wild life day, and there is also a national wild life day. But no other country has had such a character as the late Jack Miner to hang a bill on, so to speak. What other conservationist did work at all comparable with that done by Jack Miner? None that I know of, though all the men mentioned by the minister were great men.

I do not think I need say any more. I shall withdraw the bill and next year reintroduce another bill on the understanding, as the minister indicated, that in the meantime the government will inquire from the provinces if they have any objection. I do not see why they should have. I am sure they would welcome his inquiries. I cannot conceive of any province not desiring to teach children to conserve wild life. Think of all the insectivorous birds and what a wonderful job they do for Canada and any other country, but how many children know their names or indeed anything about them? Not many. I remember, as a boy going to school, reading a poem by the late Lord Tennyson, the first verse of which ran something like this:

> I come from haunts of coot and hern,
> I make a sudden sally,
> And sparkle out among the fern,
> To bicker down a valley.

I remember that as a child one of the first things I wanted to know was, what was a hern? There are two spellings for it, "hern" and "heron"; the poet uses "hern", which may be poetic licence. I wanted to know what a heron was and what a coot was. This kind of thing is educational. I cannot conceive of any educational body not being intensely interested in the opportunity to allow children to be instructed in wild life conservation, to know something about waterfowl, to understand the habits of geese and ducks. It is an interesting study and should be welcomed by boards of education. In the United States the national wild life association of Washington sends out large quantities of literature which are very popular with boards of education throughout the country.

As I said the other day, the Jack Miner foundation is one in which this country will have a part after the present members of the family pass on, because new managers are to be named by the Prime Minister of Canada, the President of the United States, and the treasurer of the foundation. So that we are part of it. The foundation had planned, if the bill had passed, to follow the plan of the national wild life association in the United States. That is all to the good. It would be better here if our national wild life association were not a government association. I do not believe that a government could do as well as the wild life association does in the United States or as the foundation could do here, because of the intense interest of those associated with it to make it a great success and to inculcate the principles of conservation in the minds of youth. I have had letters from various bodies, including sportsmen's and tourists' associations wanting to cooperate. That is all to the good.

However, there is not much use in my prolonging the matter any further at the moment. I accept the minister's undertaking to consult

the provinces, and I withdraw the bill. I hope next year it will receive the unanimous support of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house that the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) shall have leave to withdraw his bill?

Bill withdrawn.

RAILWAY ACT

POWER TO PROHIBIT SOUND SIGNALS AT CROSSINGS IN OR NEAR CITIES AND TOWNS

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel) moved the second reading of bill No. 3, to amend the Railway Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the consent and the direction of the hon. member for York West (Mr. Adamson) to proceed with the motion for the second reading of bill No. 3, and I desire at this time to make some observations relative to the legislation proposed. I do so with some pleasure because it is a matter to which both the hon. member for York West and myself have during the past year given close study and careful attention. His constituency and mine adjoin, and in so far as the train whistling problem is concerned which is involved in this amendment to the Railway Act, both of us find our constituents in the same unfortunate and embarrassing dilemma. I should like in the unavoidable absence of the hon. member for York West to pay tribute to the industrious way in which he has pursued the matter in the interests of his constituents, and which has reflected upon my constituents in a very favourable way as well.

The question involved is an amendment to the Railway Act. The notes on the bill itself are, of course, partly explanatory of the purposes and intent and purport of the bill. Roughly speaking, larger places—cities, for instance, and towns—have the right, where railways pass through their midst, to pass a by-law prohibiting the blowing of train whistles within the boundary limits of those municipalities. So far so good. The difficulty which now is arising in many suburban parts is that these suburbs have grown up and their population has increased so that, while they may still only qualify as townships and villages, the frequency of train whistling, with the ever-increasing population, has presented an embarrassing nuisance problem to the residents. I know best, perhaps, the problem of the Lake Shore area between Toronto and Hamilton, because part of that area is in the constituency of Peel which I have the honour to represent. Take, for instance, the township of Etobicoke, very close to the city of Toronto; the township of York, the village of Long Branch, the township of Toronto and the village of Port Credit, and so on. All along that line of railway are found to-day heavily populated areas, and still some of those municipalities have not the right under the Railway Act to regulate the whistling nuisance which is caused by the tremendous number of trains going to and fro each day.

I take the liberty of detaining the house for a moment to indicate the extent of the problem and how serious it is to the residents. A man named George S. Warner, of the township of Etobicoke, in the constituency represented by the hon. member for York West, took the trouble last fall, by staying awake until the early hours of the morning and making a survey, to ascertain the extent of the nuisance. I shall not go over all the details which appear in a report over his signature, but he speaks of one situation near his own home. He says:

> There are six level crossings in my area in less than one mile in a closely congested area of approximately 9,000 people. From 7 in the evening until 7 in the morning thirty trains blow four shrieking blasts for each crossing.

Or, as he refers to it, a "terrible total of 700 sleep-disturbing whistles every night." In connection with that, the medical officer of health for that township and the principal of the large collegiate there, as well as many others who are interested in the matter, have asked the hon. member for York West to bring this matter to the attention of the house. One of the newspapers in my own riding, the Port Credit *Weekly*, conducted a campaign last fall against the whistling nuisance in the Port Credit area. I have here on my desk only a few of the many hundreds of ballots or coupons which were sent to me, indicating that no small amount of interest has been taken in this problem in that area.

The hon. member for York West and I went to the board of transport commissioners for some relief from our problem. Last fall I received from the board a long report indicating that many people in my constituency had been interviewed and the problem had been gone into very fully, but there seemed to be what on the farm we used to speak of as a nigger in the woodpile, and in this legislation we are trying to get the nigger out of the woodpile; that is the purpose of the amendment. I think the need of this amendment will become apparent when I read a paragraph of the report of the board of transport commissioners. This is what the secretary of that board said in a letter to me:

Mr. W. K. Rogers, assistant superintendent, Canadian National Railways, stated that train movements per twenty-four hours were as high as 134. On a basis of four blasts for each crossing, of which there are two in the village of Port Credit, this would total 1,072 per day or 53 per hour.

He goes on to say that on two particular days the train movements totalled 91 and 96, but these were admittedly light days. Then this is the point I wish to bring particularly to the attention of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier). The report from the secretary of the board goes on:

It must appear fairly obvious from the above, that the complaints on file are well founded. It was pointed out to them that theirs was a problem that would be difficult to solve, inasmuch as the railways were but carrying out the requirements of the law, which law makes no provision for a township or a village taking advantage of section 308 of the Railway Act.

So that both the hon. member for York West and myself, in following this avenue of approach in an attempt to solve this problem, found ourselves up against a stone wall in the act as it stands at present, particularly section 308. At this point, if I may, I should like to indicate to the minister just what section 308 of the Railway Act actually says. This is the section, without any proposed amendment:

When any train is approaching a highway crossing at rail level the engine whistle shall be sounded at least eighty rods before reaching such crossing, and the bell shall be rung continuously from the time of the sounding of the whistle until the engine has crossed such highway.

2. Where a municipal by-law—

This is the further point involved.

—of a city or town prohibits such sounding of the whistle or such ringing of the bell in respect of any such crossing or crossings within the limits of such city or town, such by-law shall, if approved by an order of the board, to the extent of such prohibition relieve the company and its employees from the duty imposed by this section.

Therefore the purport and intent of the amendment moved by the hon. member for York West is to enlarge the jurisdiction and power of municipalities which do not qualify as either cities or towns but are known as villages or townships, with large populations in suburban areas, or close by or contiguous to large centres of population, giving them the same privilege and power given to a town or city to pass a by-law in the hope that upon submission to the board of transport commissioners it may receive approval and result in having the train whistling abated.

I do not wish to go on too long with this matter, because it seems to me this is a very simple, yet a very important and urgent sort of amendment. But I should like to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that what is suggested in this legislation must, I think, be regarded as a move toward the abatement of this nuisance within the limits of public safety. And public safety is paramount. I think that must be said, because, after all, the railways to-day, no matter how much they may cooperate in an attempt to abate the nuisance on their own, by virtue of this section of the Railway Act still find that if they do not blow the whistle or ring the bell they may be in a serious position in case of accident.

I should like to deal with one further point before I sit down. Of course I believe this bill goes a long way toward solving an important problem; but in these congested areas I think the time is coming and in many instances has already arrived when the whole question of grade separation must be dealt with intelligently and effectively. I know that in some of the very instances cited the ultimate solution of the problem may well be grade separation. So that I would suggest to the minister that when this bill is given second reading and sent to the apropriate committee, some consideration might be given to some changes in the phraseology of the bill itself so that it will not be restricted in its scope only to municipalities which immediately adjoin large cities or populated areas which at present have power to pass by-laws of the kind to which I have just referred. I am anxious that this important point be considered by the committee. I hope I may have an opportunity to appear before that committee, even though I may not be a member of it, because I should like to see the township of Toronto and the village of Port Credit, in which I am particularly interested, given an opportunity of coming within any amended legislation. Therefore I hope that will be made clear in the bill when it finally emerges from the committee stage.

I ask for the support and sympathy of the house in connection with this power which, it seems to me, should be given to municipalities which find themselves in such an embarrassing and awkward position as I have just outlined. I also commend this amendment to the Minister of Transport, whose courtesy is so well known in matters of this kind and who, as time goes on, I am quite sure will feel as I do with respect to the merits of the bill.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Does not the hon. member think everything would be solved if we adopted the rule they have in

the United States? They eliminate whistling altogether, but they have a rule which says, "Stop, look and listen," rather than "Look and listen" as we have it in Canada. Then we would save thousands of lives every year; then your little children could sleep with their heads pillowed on their hands, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, it is not only in the townships that this nuisance of whistles and bells has been created; it applies equally in the cities and towns. As far as I can see, the only solution of this problem is the electrification of all railways in the Toronto district within a radius of thirty miles of the city. Surely that could be done, with the large amounts the two railway companies are receiving to-day. After all, the Canadian National made most of its money in the province of Ontario, and I think the time has come when the steam railways should do something about the electrification of their systems in the vicinity of Toronto, as they have done in the Montreal area.

The Railway Act provides for equality of treatment. I support the principle of the bill because I know something about it. Under section 275 of the Railway Act the board of transport commissioners is required of its own volition to go out and see these things. As the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) said about another department, they should not be just a commission sitting in swivel chairs. They are supposed to go out into the highways and byways and see what is going on and carry on an inspection.

There have been a large number of complaints along the lake-shore road and the Dundas highway and in other parts of the constituency of York West. I remember the time when the city of Toronto bought up all the light, power and electric railway franchises in the two counties of York and Ontario in order to transport the people by cheap fares.

Another section of the Railway Act which has to do with commutation tickets has been violated. Oakville and Brampton have them. That section has not been carried out. In my opinion the board of railway commissioners are empowered to act. They hear applications with regard to these whistle matters, and they do not do anything about it. The board of railway commissioners does not function in the way it should and in the way it did when the late Mr. Justice Mabee was appointed chairman of the commission. As I see it, something has to be done about the electrification of railways in the Toronto district. Take the Don valley in the constituency which I represent and also in that of the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman). When I first bought a house in North Rosedale and lived there for eighteen years the ringing of bells, the sounding of whistles and the shunting all day and night were something that one could hardly imagine. I never heard anything like it in my life. It went on all night long. Complaints were made to the railway commission and applications were made by the township and city, but nothing was done about the matter. The only solution of this problem that I see is for the board of railway commissioners to act on its own volition. It has the power under the Railway Act. Why do they have to wait for an application to be made by a private citizen or a municipality? They have certain functions to perform. In New York state they are compelled to act. If our board of railway commissioners fulfilled their functions we would not have matters like this coming before the house. The Canadian National Railways should do something about the Toronto district. They have plenty of money to build a tunnel in Montreal costing $25 million. Surely they could afford to electrify their system and use the new diesel type of engines they have. There is no reason why something should not be done. I urge that this bill be passed because there is a great deal of force in it.

I call the attention of the house to the last three lines in the bill. I remember an accident a few years ago which happened on the Brown's line, I think it was, near the home of Monsignor O'Leary on Brown's line below Dundas street. In that accident three or four schoolteachers were crossing a railway crossing in a car. There was a good view for half a mile, nothing but farm lands around. The whistle was blowing, but they did not see the train and three or four people lost their lives. The house will note that the last three lines of this bill relieve the company from any liability or penalty under the section in case of an accident. Therefore an individual will have no action for damages if a person is killed on a level crossing in this district. If that should happen the railway company can plead not guilty by statute. If a person were injured he would have no action for damages in a civil court. Let us not, when we are considering this bill, forget the huge loss of life that takes place at these level crossings in Canada.

Mr. C. E. STEPHENSON (Durham): The only changes I can see in this railway bill is that it gives the townships and villages the same rights as a city or town to pass a by-law

with respect to whistling and ringing of railway bells in their communities. In the town in which I live two main lines, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National, run through it. On these two main lines seventy trains travel up and down every day, and there are five level crossings in the town. There are no automatic signals on at any of these crossings. We are in this position. If we appeal to the board of railways commissioners to have the whistling stopped and it is granted and there is a fatal accident the town council is blamed for passing such a by-law. In the town of Port Hope there is a hospital a short distance from these two tracks and the Trinity college school, which is a boarding school. Both institutions are greatly disturbed. I have had several letters from residents of this town asking that something be done to have the blowing of the whistles stopped in the town. If the town passes a by-law to stop the whistling and someone is killed the council is blamed. If we do not do this, then we have to put up with the whistling nuisance. Therefore we are between the devil and the deep blue sea.

In the last few years we have had nine deaths at these crossings. Although I am in favour of having the nuisance done away with by applying to the board of transport commissioners, yet I feel the government should take steps to instal automatic signals on every level crossing in the country. I understand that this can be done by applying to the board. But the municipality must stand the greater part of the cost of installing these signals. As the house knows, the only income available to the municipalities is the tax they levy on small properties and the dog tax, yet they are asked to bear the greater cost of installing these signals. The nuisance is so great that one man said to me, with seventy trains passing through this town every night, whistling and blowing four times each, by the time he jumped out of bed seventy times and back in again, it got on his nerves to such an extent that he did not get any sleep. If the installation of a signal will save a human life, surely it should be done. I ask the government to consider bearing a greater share of the cost of installing these automatic signals, and that they be installed on every level crossing in the country.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): In moving second reading of this bill may I state at the outset I believe this measure parallels the development of Canada as a nation. The bill arises from the fact of pride, common pride, in the achievements of our country, based upon the great exploits of our people. I would suggest that it symbolizes our aspirations as a nation for the future. When I spoke to the house on first reading last October I concluded with these words—and I beg the indulgence of the house to repeat them to-night:

> For the national unity of Canada and for the future and greatness of this country it is felt to be of the utmost importance that all of us, new Canadians or old, have a consciousness of a common purpose and common interests as Canadians; that all of us be able to say with pride and say with meaning: "I am a Canadian citizen."

That, sir, in a general way, sets out the main objective of the bill. But the bill seeks to do more than that. As I shall endeavour to show, it seeks to avoid many complexities and confusions which arise from existing legislation. For some time now, indeed for many years, it has been felt in the country and in the house that the time has arrived when ambiguities arising out of the Naturalization Act—both the act before 1914, and the one of 1914—the Canadian Nationals Act, and the Immigration Act, should be treated in such a way as to provide an unambiguous definition of the status of Canadian citizenship.

It may be of interest to note that in 1931 the then Secretary of State, the Hon. C. H. Cahan, felt exactly as I do with regard to the necessity of removing the anomalies in existing legislation. He felt, as I feel, that the time had come when Canada, having matured into full nationhood, should give her people the right of being able to designate themselves Canadian citizens. In these words he expressed his views:

> I think we have reached the stage in the policy of our national life that we should seriously consider the foundations for its future development. For sixty-four years we have had a very satisfactory material development. We have been promoting great national works, grafting out new provinces, providing organized governments for the great Northwest Territories and I think we have succeeded far beyond the expectations of the fathers of confederation in the material and commercial development of Canada. In connection with that development, however, if we are to assume the status of a nation within the British commonwealth, we must also assume very serious duties and responsibilities. Among the responsibilities resting upon the parliament of Canada is that of framing a clear definition of "Canadian nationals" for whom the government and parliament are responsible, whether they are resident in the dominion or temporarily resident outside of our territorial jurisdiction. So long as they retain the status of Canadian national, they should, in my opinion, be treated as such and as holding a status within the dominion equal to that which any others individually enjoy.

That was the view of a diligent secretary of state, who sought to put before the parliament of that day, not in the details of the present bill, but following its main principle, the measure to which I am now asking the house to give second reading. That bill was proceeded with to the stage of second reading, but for some reason or another not made fully known at the time, the then secretary of state advised the house that he was not proceeding with the bill. But that his convictions had not been disturbed, in spite of the decision not to proceed, is noted in the observations he made later in this house in 1937, when he used these words:

> I repeat that sometimes I fear we have more of the colonial spirit of inferiority than even our fathers and grandfathers had and certainly the time has come in the history of this dominion when, if we seek to ascertain who are Canadians and who are Canadian nationals, we should be able to find it in some substantive enactment outside of the Immigration Act, the real purpose and intent of which is to exclude certain classes of people from obtaining domicile in Canada. Why we should be compelled to look to that act for a definition of who are Canadians, who are Canadian nationals, I cannot understand. I think it is a discreditable condition in which we find ourselves to-day.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say it is a discreditable position in which we find ourselves as a nation among the nations of the world to-day not to be able clearly to address one another with the full sanction of the law and for all purposes as citizens of our own country.

Under this bill we are seeking to establish clearly a basic and definite Canadian citizenship which will be the fundamental status upon which the rights and privileges of Canadians will depend. We hope at the same time to remove a great many anomalies and difficulties which exist under present legislation, as I have noted, and which have not only been irksome and troublesome to the country and its people, but occasioned real hardship to persons who have had the misfortune to be caught in them.

Under the present Canadian Nationals Act, which was passed in 1921, on introduction by the Right Hon. C. J. Doherty, the purpose was to meet certain commitments this country had made as a member of the league of nations, and also to permit our taking advantage of possible nomination to membership in the International Court of Justice. That was the only purpose—the very limited purpose of the Canadian Nationals Act—so that we could say, for the purposes of that act, having in mind its immediate objective, that there was such a thing as a Canadian national.

But the definition of Canadian citizenship in that act was a definition by reference. The only unrelated and existing definition of Canadian citizenship is to be found in the Immigration Act. The Canadian Nationals Act defines a Canadian citizen as one who comes within the meaning of the definition of the Immigration Act.

There are few countries in the world who define their citizenship within the clauses of an immigration act. Even the definition within the Immigration Act is a limited one. It is a definition of citizenship only for the purposes of that act, namely for the purposes of immigration.

The Naturalization Act, passed in this house in 1914, which sought to provide for the application of extra-territorial powers to give to naturalized British subjects in Canada the right to have that designation not only in Canada but throughout the world, followed earlier acts which came into being shortly after 1867. But because of the difficulties, the great injustices, the natural pride and urge of every Canadian, the time has come, and I think unmistakenly, if I can judge by reactions of public opinion throughout this country since the introduction of the bill, when not only those on whose shoulders rested the primary responsibility of representing Canada on the fields of battle during the late war, but all Canadians generally, proud of their country, have reached the stage where, in the form of a legal enactment, they want an undoubted right to be able to call themselves Canadian citizens, the right to be able to say when they cross the border that they are citizens of Canada, the right to be given a passport on which the words "Canadian citizen" will appear. They want the right, in other words, which is recognized by every country, and every government in every country with respect to its own people.

I would point out that under the present legislation, the three acts I have mentioned, the wife of a Canadian citizen, or a person born out of Canada whose father was a Canadian national at the time of his birth, would be entitled to receive a Canadian passport, even if it was perfectly clear that the applicant did not possess Canadian citizenship under the Immigration Act. There is also the problem of the prohibited immigrant to Canada.

The curious picture is thus presented of a person who cannot enter Canada under the Immigration Act being entitled to receive a Canadian passport which requests assistance and protection for him in foreign countries. This is but one of many like instances that could be recited of the confusion which now exists and which by this bill we have made an honest and complete attempt to remedy.

Generally speaking, by this bill we are seeking to make the status of Canadian citizenship the paramount national status of persons who are Canadians. I find in the administration of my department considerable difficulty in connection with administering certain acts such as the Copyright Act and the Patent Act, largely because of the indefiniteness and, in many instances, the absolute lack of a legal basis for determining nationality, or citizenship as I prefer to call it.

Further, in other departments of government there is great difficulty of administration in connection with matters arising out of the treaty of Versailles and out of the early reparations treaty. I suspect that if this bill is not made law we shall have difficulty in dealing with some subsequent reparations agreement that will arise as a result of the war from which we have just emerged.

Considering the question of convenience and the recognition of our status as a growing nation, I submit that I need not labour the great need, urgency and desirability of having this measure passed. As I said, other departments of government are interested in the matter. For instance, the Department of External Affairs has a vital interest in the determination of status because it is concerned with the issuing of passports and with the diplomatic protection of Canadians and Canadian interests abroad. I am told that this is made exceedingly difficult by reason of the lack of any national status test. Neither the Canadian Nationals Act nor the Naturalization Act nor the Immigration Act afford any satisfactory way out as far as this matter is concerned.

Then, again, that department is concerned with the maintenance of understandings which exist with other members of the British commonwealth concerning nationality questions and with general international problems and arrangements concerning the protection of Canadians and Canadian interests in enemy and enemy occupied countries. The present legislation does not furnish any adequate test of personal status for this purpose. That department is also concerned with the definition and position of Canadians and Canadian interests in treaty negotiations; with the problems of deportation, both coming and going; with the problems that arise out of naturalization and the requirements of the revocation of naturalization certificates; with the need of establishment by proper legislation of a status which would determine the right of a person to regard himself as a Canadian and of documentary evidence which would enable an individual to claim such a position.

This measure in its present form will meet the difficulties I have enumerated in the case of the Department of External Affairs, as well as meet some of the problems that I have mentioned in the administration of the Department of the Secretary of State. When the bill is passed it will mean that a Canadian citizen will be entitled as a Canadian citizen to receive a Canadian passport, to enter Canada, to be deported to Canada under circumstances in which deportation is required under existing principles of international law, to receive diplomatic protection, to enjoy full political and economic rights within Canada and to own a Canadian ship or part of a ship.

Hon. members may find it rather unusual that these six enumerated benefits, among others, will follow from the passage of this bill. The fact is that there are constant administrative difficulties with regard to these six minimum requirements of nationality in the department of immigration, the Department of External Affairs and the Department of the Secretary of State.

The measure before the house is not without its complications. I may say frankly that the bill in its present form represents a great deal of effort and study on the part of the officials of four departments of government, the Department of External Affairs, the Department of Justice, the Department of Immigration and the Department of the Secretary of State.

My colleague, the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen), authorizes me to say that when this measure becomes law it will be followed by an amendment to the Immigration Act which will remove from section 2 of that act the only real definition, although for a limited purpose, of Canadian citizenship that is to be found. As I said at the outset, it will be remembered that the definition of a Canadian national in the Canadian Nationals Act is a definition by reference.

This measure is one that has behind it no political purpose. I think it is one that will commend itself to the consideration of all hon. members. When we come to the committee stage I shall welcome any suggestions which may be made to improve the draftsmanship, if that be found possible, or even the content of the bill in order to make the measure as nearly efficient as it is humanly possible to make it.

One thing we hope to do, following the passage of this measure, is to provide a more effective and impressive ceremony of admis-

sion into the Canadian family. Our citizenship is made up not only of people born in this country and of people who acquired domicile as British subjects under the Immigration Act, but of many thousands of new Canadians living in all parts of our country who have come from other lands and who have made a notable contribution to the development of Canada. There are people who came from many parts of central Europe and who are now living and working as Canadians on our farms and in our factories. Many of those people came here without being able to speak the two languages of the country and without being accustomed to its traditions. Most of them have rendered notable service to Canada. We should not lose the opportunity of impressing ourselves and reminding them that just as we are glad to welcome them to our shores, now that they are here they should enjoy with us the full measure of partnership in the Canadian community.

There will be others who will come after this bill has passed and who in the years ahead will add to our numbers and share our traditions and aspirations. Many hon. members have expressed themselves on this subject, notably the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) and the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross). We are convinced of the desirability of emulating the form of ceremony which characterizes the admission of persons into United States citizenship. An attempt is made to impress upon potential United States citizens the nature of the undertaking as well as to indicate the opportunities and the privileges and the responsibilities of a United States citizen.

It may be that in Canada for some reason or another ceremonies of admission here and there in the country have been a little more perfunctory than we would have liked to have them, and it is our determination under the statutory provisions of this bill to frame regulations that will make these ceremonies more than an ordinary procedure, and one of a memorable character.

Many hon. members belong to service clubs, and the ritual of attendance and admission into these clubs oftentimes is so impressive as to place in the candidate's mind an indelible impression of the nature of the obligation assumed. But there is no finer club in the world so far as we are concerned than the club that I would characterize as the Canadian family. We should want, therefore, to impress upon new Canadians whom we shall welcome and want to share in our national endeavours that they are joining no mean society but a society that will give them freedom and an opportunity perhaps that they have not had in other lands, and at the same time to point out to them the nature of the obligation undertaken and tell them something of the kind of country and the kind of general political basis of the Canadian society itself.

I have endeavoured since becoming Secretary of State to perfect the machinery of these ceremonies to the extent that time and the law allowed. I have gone myself to a number of these ceremonies. I went a few months ago to the city of Toronto, where perhaps these ceremonies are performed in as fitting a manner as one will find in any part of the country. There His Honour Judge Parker, the senior county court judge, who for a number of years has taken a great interest in these matters, has had ceremonies which I know have made a deep impression upon every new Canadian who has obtained Canadian naturalization in that city and through the avenue of that particular judge. I have gone to these ceremonies and to others, not because my personal presence is of any account but because as minister of the crown, speaking in the name of the government and the people of Canada, I have found it useful to invite and to welcome these new Canadians to our national family. I believe that if we pursue this approach to the matter we shall do a great deal to make these new Canadians more valuable citizens who will the more readily appreciate the great opportunity which under our law we hope we shall be able to give them.

I wish to pay a tribute to-night to such organizations as the Daughters of the Empire, to Canadian and service clubs, to Mr. Justice Dysart of Winnipeg, to His Honour Judge Gordon of Windsor, men and organizations who have in a very special manner contributed greatly to the kind of work which I think will be found to be a very valuable ancillary feature to the bill now before the house.

In the new Citizenship branch, which has been transferred to the Secretary of State from the Minister of National War Services, an opportunity is given of dealing effectively and more fully not only with foreign language newspapers but with new Canadian groups. We hope to be able to use, as I shall show when we come to a detailed discussion of the bill, this new Citizenship branch as a means of furthering the kind of suggestions which were made by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) and others when speaking in this house two or three years ago.

The bill is not in its essence a difficult one, even though some of the clauses may require more than ordinary attention. It will be of

assistance to non. members to note that out of the 47 sections of the bill 18 are virtually reenactments of existing sections and 17 are new. What we are dealing with is really a comprehensive revision of the Naturalization Act done in such a way as to produce a status of Canadian citizenship that will be sufficiently inclusive to serve as a basic definition for immigration and for all general purposes and that will eliminate the need for subordinate definitions.

Hon. members will have observed from an examination of the bill that it is divided into seven parts, in addition to three preliminary sections and two concluding schedules. The three preliminary sections form what is really an interpretative portion containing the definitions necessary for the proper drafting of the substantive parts.

It has been a long-standing source of irritation to many Canadians to be told on occasion, in reply to a question as to their national status, that there is no such thing as a Canadian and that some other national status has to be declared. In this bill we now provide that so far as any questions coming within the competence of the Canadian government are concerned the answer "Canadian citizen" in reply to an inquiry as to national status shall be sufficient. So far as national status is concerned the description "Canadian citizen" will hereafter be sufficient.

Part I of the bill deals with natural-born Canadian citizens. The first section of this part attempts to set forth that persons now in being are immediately to have the status of Canadian citizens as of right of birth. The people who will be natural-born Canadian citizens are of two classes, those who are born in Canada or on a Canadian ship, and those who were born to Canadian parents outside Canada before the passing of the act, except of course for such of these persons as may have become aliens before the act comes into effect. There are refinements in the bill, but on a broad generalization those are the categories of people now in being who will be natural-born Canadian citizens immediately.

The second thing done in part I is to define what persons born after the act comes into force shall be natural-born Canadian citizens. In general, the provisions here for persons born before the act are similar to those to which I have referred and do not differ greatly from the definitions of a natural-born British subject that are now contained in the Naturalization Act. The principal difference is this, that in future all Canadian children born abroad will have to be registered within two years either at a diplomatic, consular or trade commissioner's office or in Ottawa. Hitherto registrations have not been necessary in all cases of children born abroad who have acquired the status provided for in existing legislation. There is, I believe, good reason for this. There is a slightly greater strictness in the new bill. Hereafter Canadian children born abroad will as Canadian citizens have the right of entry into Canada. They have never had this before. In giving this important right it is felt necessary to have some record and some form of evidence that will serve for immigration purposes. Children born in Canada will in all cases have birth certificates. In a parallel manner we are requiring the registration of children born abroad, in order that there may be a basic record to establish their rights as Canadian citizens.

Apart from registration there is nothing that is essentially new or different in part 1. The relevant provisions concerning foundlings and children born after the death of their father fill in gaps that exist in existing legislation.

Part II of the bill deals with the second broad division of Canadian citizens, those who were not born to citizenship but acquire it at a later stage. There are two cases to provide for: the people who are to be Canadian citizens at once because of action taken before the passage of this act; and those who may become Canadian citizens hereafter. Provision is made to cover persons other than natural-born Canadian citizens who are to be Canadian citizens immediately upon the coming into force of the act. This section I will frankly state has been a particularly difficult one to draft. It was revised repeatedly in successive drafts of the bill. The present section is somewhat altered from the form in which it was presented in the bill introduced in this house last October by way of first reading. I think the section now says what we wanted it to say. The broad intention is to provide that the people who have been naturalized in Canada hitherto, non-Canadian British subjects who have resided in Canada for five years or more, and non-Canadian women who married Canadians and have come to live in Canada, shall become Canadian citizens immediately. This matter has been thought over and discussed carefully, and I think the definitions will cover all those who should be Canadian citizens at once, and no others.

The second portion of part II provides for future acquisition of Canadian citizenship through naturalization. The qualifications for future naturalization are almost exactly the same as those now in force, except that only

one year of residence, rather than five, will be required of persons who served out of Canada in our armed forces during time of war. Actually, because the time that a man has served in the armed forces of Canada is to be taken as a period of residence in Canada, this will mean that men in the armed forces will in fact not have to spend any prior time in Canada before being admitted into Canadian citizenship, on the theory that if a man is prepared to fight for this country there should be no hesitation in granting him what we can grant by way of labelling him a citizen of this country.

Although it is not set forth in the Naturalization Act, but only in the regulations, we have since 1943, required "a declaration of intention" to become naturalized to be made before actual naturalization is applied for. This declaration has to be made at least one year and not more than five years before naturalization takes place. As the house will recall, essentially the same requirement is made in the United States. In future, under the bill now before the house, such declaration will be necessary for aliens who wish to become naturalized in Canada, but not for the wives or husbands of Canadians or from non-Canadian British subjects. With regard to the other naturalization requirements, a certain relaxation is provided in that twenty years' residence may substitute for a knowledge of French or English.

I will frankly say to the house at this stage why that provision was put in there. It came to my attention not very long ago that a man who had lived in this country, in the province of Saskatchewan, for thirty-two years had for reasons best known to himself not been able to acquire the slightest kind of proficiency in either of the two official languages of this country, and under the act the judge was precluded from granting him the right to receive a certificate of naturalization. It later developed that this particular person had sent two sons to fight in the armed forces of Canada; one of these sons had won the Distinguished Flying Cross and the other gave his life for Canada. I felt, and I hope the house will agree with me, that that kind of person is entitled to Canadian citizenship. This provision will enable the naturalization of many people, especially in western Canada, who have proved to be good citizen material but who have not for one reason or another learned to speak French or English.

On the other hand, there is a slightly greater strictness in the new qualifications in the bill in requiring a knowledge "of the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship." Coming into the Canadian family is, of course, a great honour, but it entails certain obligations; and we hope in an objective manner, without trying to coerce, merely to lay before these new Canadian citizens the recognized facts of the Canadian scene, to lay before them through properly prepared material, prepared perhaps by non-governmental organizations who have the sanction of educational authorities, historians and so on, facts which will inform them not only of the opportunities and the privileges which they will acquire as future Canadian citizens, but of the obligations, for we cannot emphasize too much that along with privileges go obligations in citizenship. As one reads the report of the judges who sit on these applications for naturalization, one of the salutary things to note is that in so many instances, in fact the vast majority, there seems to be a recognition of the duties which these new citizens have to acquire. I attended recently a ceremony in Toronto when thirty-two persons were admitted into Canadian "citizenship" under the existing legislation, and I use the word "citizenship" here in quotation marks because it is not a correct statement of the legal situation. One of these new citizens wrote to me afterwards stating that he wanted to do something to show his appreciation of the kind of country to which he had been admitted. Both his mother and his father, though civilians, had been slaughtered by the nazis. He had come to this country in 1933, had returned in 1935 for two years, and came back at the end of that time. He was so impressed with the opportunities of this country that he wanted to tell the government and the people of his appreciation; and what could he do? I told him that it would be very difficult for me to suggest, other than that I trusted he would live up to the obligations entailed in being a good citizen of this country. I am pleased to state that that man showed his appreciation of the work of Judge Parker and the attempts that were being made by the naturalization branch, by giving to one of our universities, only Saturday last, the sum of $35,000 to be used by a particular university in encouraging and disseminating desirable information about Canadian life and the great opportunities which this country affords.

With regard to the other naturalization requirements, as I say, the relaxation consists in giving a knowledge of these responsibilities as well as these privileges. Apart from these minor points the general naturalization requirements remain unchanged.

There are, however, two points affecting particular categories of people I should like to deal with now. Heretofore British subjects became Canadian citizens for purposes of the Immigration Act only after five years' residence. The residence period remains unchanged, in the new bill, but for the purposes of evidence, to provide a prima facie proof of citizenship, papers will hereafter be supplied, and this, I think, will be an advantage. It will mean that once they are in possession of their papers there will be no further doubt as to their right of entry into Canada, their right to Canadian diplomatic protection, and their right to the general privileges of citizenship in Canada.

The second group of people affected by the change in this part are future non-Canadian wives of Canadian citizens. Hitherto the general principle has been that a woman marrying a British subject thereby became a British subject. There are some advantages in this method of approach, but it is a formula based on the old idea that a married woman lost her legal personality in that of her husband. Married women have been hitherto classed as persons "under a disability" for purposes of naturalization in all British countries. However, married women have been removed from the disabled class in this bill and have been given control of their national status. In keeping with this, it has been necessary to delete the old provisions for automatic change of national status upon marriage. If women are to have control of their national status there must be nothing automatic about it; it must be a matter of discretion. Nevertheless, while that as a principle is desirable, it is undesirable that non-Canadian women who marry Canadians should have to wait five years before acquiring Canadian citizenship. To meet the point it has been provided that women who marry Canadians may become citizens after only one year's residence. This, I think, will impose no hardship on anyone, yet will establish the principle of full control of national status by married women.

The only other portion of part II of the bill to which I think I need refer at this time is the provision with regard to the rehearing of naturalization proceedings in certain cases. Under the Naturalization Act now in force it is open to the Secretary of State at his absolute discretion to grant or refuse a certificate of naturalization even though the court may have approved the case and decided that a certificate should be granted. I feel, however, that this is too wide a discretion for the minister to exercise. Consequently, the specific provision for discretion has been deleted, and instead provision has been made for rehearing in cases where it seems doubtful whether the applicant properly should be given a certificate of naturalization, or where there appears to have been some omission in the hearing; and the decision of the court on the rehearing will be final.

Part III of the bill deals with the loss of Canadian citizenship. In general, there are now and will be in future two types of loss of citizenship: loss by any citizen after the acquisition of a foreign nationality, and loss of the citizenship of naturalized persons under prescribed conditions. The provisions with regard to loss upon the acquisition of a foreign nationality have not been substantially changed from those now in effect. The principal change is that in future Canadian women will not automatically lose Canadian citizenship upon marrying an alien and acqiring his nationality. In accordance with the general principle of giving women an equal position they will be allowed a discretion as to whether or not they wish to give up their Canadian citizenship.

With regard to the remainder of this part, in my statement of October 22 I referred to the new provisions for automatic loss of citizenship by naturalized persons who stay abroad for six years or more and do not protect their citizenship. As I mentioned at that time, this provision does not apply to naturalized persons who have served in the armed forces of Canada. In addition, the six years do not run during absence as a representative of the Canadian government or a Canadian firm, or for other specified purposes.

The provisions for revocation of certificates of citizenship are virtually unchanged from those now in effect. The remainder of this part of the bill consists of ancillary provisions which, while new in form in some cases, bring in no new principles.

I come now to part IV of the bill, which deals with the rights and obligations of naturalized Canadian citizens, and represents no change from the present situation. Sections 26 and 28 are complementary and provide for the continuation of the common status of British subjects that has always prevailed through the commonwealth. Another provision provides that Canadian citizens are British subjects, while another provision provides that subjects or citizens of another part of the commonwealth, who are considered to be British subjects under the law of that part, shall be recognized as British subjects in Canada. In effect, what these provisions do is precisely what has been done hitherto in a slightly different manner under the Naturalization Act, to perpetuate the common status,

although for Canadian purposes the basic national status is to be that of Canadian citizen.

Parts V and VI of the bill need little reference, as they involve no change of any consequence from existing legislation. Part V deals with the status of aliens precisely as it has always been dealt with, and part VI deals with matters of procedure and evidence.

In part VII there are a number of general provisions. One section concerns the power to make regulations to carry out the purposes of the act, and is virtually an unaltered reenactment of an old section in the present Naturalization Act. One of the sections in the new bill, as I have already mentioned, preserves the status that anyone has already acquired under existing legislation. This is really a form of insurance to make certain that no one who has now any rights or status in Canada will suffer by the coming into force of this act. It is provided that the act is to come into force "upon a date to be fixed by proclamation of the governor in council." The reason for this is that the new act will operate successfully only with some correlated amendments in the Immigration Act, and when these have been made the act will be proclaimed.

The bill concludes with two schedules, one giving a list of countries for the purposes of the interpretation section and the other the form of the "oath of allegiance." Both schedules are in the present Naturalization Act but in a slightly different form. Hitherto the first schedule has been a "list of dominions." It was drawn up in 1914 and never changed. We have now brought this list up to date in point of time and constitutional theory by referring rather to "countries in the British commonwealth." As far as the second schedule is concerned a change is made by adding to the oath of allegiance the following words:

> . . . and that I will faithfully observe the laws of Canada and fulfil my duties as a Canadian citizen.

When it is Canadian status that is being given to a new citizen upon naturalization it would be absurd, it is submitted, to have in the oath no reference whatever to Canada. I think the additions to the oath are highly desirable in every particular.

This summary, Mr. Speaker, I think may be of some assistance in explaining what the bill seeks to do. I believe the bill, complicated and necessarily so in regard to some of its provisions, does meet as far as may be humanly possible the hundreds of different situations that arise out of the status of citizenship; out of the acquisition of nationality by birth, by blood relationship or by any one of the many combinations which may create, in one form or another, the legal status of nationality, here as well as in other countries.

The main purposes of the bill, however, apart altogether from these necessary mechanical details, is seen in the important part Canada has taken as a nation among the nations of the world, an important part far beyond what the numbers of her population alone would merit. We have, in two wars, borne our full and serious responsibilities for the preservation of peace and civilization. In two wars, our fighting men have brought glory to Canada. Now with half the world in ruins, with starvation and chaos besetting the countries of Europe that were once the seat of power and influence, the responsibilities of this country are greater than ever before. For a young nation, Canada has done great things and Canadians have derived a growing national pride from what Canada has accomplished. We feel that we have great things in common; that we can afford to hold our heads high and be proud of the fact that we are Canadians. And it is time we know what a Canadian is.

Some may say that this is an invitation to nationalism. a regression to that selfish introversion that has brought war and chaos to the world. I do not agree for a moment. It is not consciousness of community and of national bonds that is dangerous, but the perversion and exaggeration of that consciousness. There has been too little, not too much, national pride in this country. We are part of a great commonwealth that has been an example to the world. We hope for much from the new united nations organization, in which we will play our full and active part. Our gaze is turning more and more outward, and in carrying out our responsibilities in the new world we shall be better fitted to do our part if we have an essential feeling of internal unity and oneness. That is why, sir, I think it is important to give greater emphasis to the fact that we are all Canadians.

In the best sense, the Canadian citizenship bill is an act of faith in ourselves and in our country. Recently the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) referred to the respect Canada has achieved in the eyes of other nations, and in the debate this afternoon this was further emphasized. But the respect of others, no matter how great, means little unless we have respect for ourselves and for our nationhood.

I feel that this bill is an important one, and that it represents a great step forward. If there is one thing from which we in Canada

have suffered, to the detriment of this magnificent country, it is from a feeling of divisiveness—lack of that fervent and urgent unity that can make a people work together as a great community with conviction that the welfare of all is the goal of their effort. It is not enough to be a good "Bluenose" or a good Ontarian or a good Albertan. Sectional differences and sectional interests must be overcome if we are to do our best for Canada. The only way this can be done is through encouraging a feeling of legitimate Canadianism. No matter where we come from or what our origins, French, English, Scandinavian, Scottish, Ukrainian, Irish or whatever else, one thing at least we can all be, and that is Canadians.

Citizenship means more than the right to vote; more than the right to hold and transfer property; more than the right to move freely under the protection of the state: citizenship is the right to full partnership in the fortunes and in the future of this nation.

With this bill we are linking our past with our future. We are saying to history and to our posterity: Here is the definition of Canadianism. Here is the common status in Canada, a common stake in the welfare of the country, a common Canadian citizenship.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask the minister a question? Is it the intention that the bill be sent to a committee of the house? I believe that was the intention last fall.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman is quite correct; that was the intention last year. The reason for the decision to proceed before a committee last year was to facilitate the passage of the bill because of the shortness of the session; but at the moment it is not the intention to proceed to committee.

Mr. FLEMING: May I ask the minister a further question? Would the minister be kind enough to indicate whether the provisions of the bill are intended to have any relation to the franchise?

Mr. MARTIN: I do not know whether I am in order in answering.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MARTIN: I prefer to deal with that when we come to the sections of the bill. We are now dealing only with the principle of the bill.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): With much, if not all, that has been said by the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) I am in agreement, particularly where he said that this measure symbolizes our aspirations as a nation.

As I conceive it, this measure translates into the days of peace the unity of our nation in war. During two wars men without regard to racial origin served this nation as Canadians. Now the opportunity and the privilege is to be given to them in peace to serve their nation in the years to come as Canadians.

The minister has gone at some considerable length into the questions of domicile, citizenship and naturalization, matters most difficult of concept and interpretation. I realize that this bill goes a long way to resolve many of the difficulties that prevail in these subjects; nevertheless I am sure that in the committee stage all of us will be able to contribute some suggestions that may result in beneficial improvements of the bill.

This is one measure where political considerations fade and where we as Canadians can view it free and untrammeled. With the bill the official opposition is in agreement. Indeed in one of the first utterances of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), after he was chosen as the leader of this party, in Kingston at a memorial service to the memory of Sir John A. Macdonald in 1943 he called upon the people of Canada to establish in this country a citizenship free from racial origin and unhyphenated. He called upon the people to carry out the dream of founders and builders of confederation that all may be privileged to call ourselves Canadians.

This bill achieves a lifelong dream of mine. Ever since my earliest days I have advocated the necessity for a change in the attitude in the law and of officialdom toward Canadians. One criticism that I voiced on the first occasion that I ever spoke in this chamber was that the bureau of statistics in insisting on the census being taken by racial origin was denying that citizenship which Canadians had the right to ask for, and which our friends and kinsmen across the line have established for many years.

I realize that there has been a Canadian nationality, in an abstract sort of way, for many years, under the acts referred to by the minister. But that citizenship has been denied, in effect when in each succeeding census paternal racial origin has been required of our citizens.

This is an important piece of legislation and will give to Canadians a new vista of their responsibilities and privileges as citizens. But legislation of itself can never build a united citizenship. If there is one thing on this occasion that we should do, when we pass this bill and make it the law of the country, it is to determine that individually, henceforth, we owe ourselves the compulsion, regardless of

our racial origin, of understanding each other's point of view. We must dedicate our determination to encourage and develop in this country mutual trust and mutual tolerance. Above all, we must restrain the undermining of our Canadian confederation through encouraging or developing a dislike of Canadians of other racial origins, for Canada's destiny and Canada's future can and will never be achieved on the basis of racial prejudice.

The minister has said that Canada has served civilization well in two wars. But the prophetic dreams of nationhood, the vision of Macdonald and Cartier, remain as yet to be completed. Legislation of itself will not complete it. Canada must develop, now that we achieve this citizenship, unity out of diversity —a diversity based on non-homogeneous peoples of many religions, peoples of clashing economic differences based on distances, and jurisdictional differences as between federal and provincial authorities. The great challenge to our generation is to fuse these clashing differences, and to build for that unity which, beginning with the dreams of the fathers of confederation, has been cemented by a common sacrifice in two wars.

I repeat that in my opinion one of the most destructive features that has prevented the creation of an unhyphenated nation has been the census requirements, carrying forth from generation to generation racial origin, and not service and citizenship as a basis of registration.

I remember well discussing this matter in the house on August 11, 1944, upon which occasion the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) gave the promise to the people of Canada that at the earliest possible occasion he would bring in a measure to assure an unhyphenated Canadian citizenship. Instead of repeating the arguments I then used, may I with the indulgence of the house repeat the words I then uttered. We were then in the midst of a war.

The minister has mentioned an example of sacrifice and service to our country on the part of one of alien origin. As he uttered those words my thoughts went back to an occasion in 1942 when, while visiting a town in southern Saskatchewan, a man came up to me and asked me whether because his son was serving as an air gunner he was being discriminated against because he, the father, came from Germany a matter of twenty years before. I told him that such was not the fact. Proud he was of the service of that son. Two weeks later the boy received the Distinguished Flying Medal; later on he was commissioned. Throughout Saskatchewan to-day, in the homes of families the parents of which came from continental Europe, are to be found young men who were honoured in the service with decorations, young men proud of their citizenship and, what is even more important, prepared to fight for that citizenship which had been gained only a few years before.

The words I uttered on that occasion were these:

> As one reads the casualty lists each day one is impressed with the fact that without regard to racial origin Canadians are living and dying for their country and their empire. Yet when these young Canadians return to this country, what do they come back to? They come back to a Canada which insists that they shall not designate themselves as Canadians, but shall prefix their paternal national origin, regardless of the number of generations their families have been in this country.

Then a little later on:

> As I have said before, no one thinks of Mr. Roosevelt as a Dutch-American. No one thinks of General Eisenhower as a German-American. No one thinks of Mayor LaGuardia of New York as an Italian-American. They are great Americans. We perpetuate this thing every ten years in our census, the excuse being that it is necessary to have the information as to ethnic groups.

And I concluded with these words:

> Those who serve in the Canadian armed forces are proud of the "Canada" on their shoulder straps, and without regard to hyphenated considerations. While they serve they are Canadians. I ask the Prime Minister to round out this great programme which he has placed before the house in the last few days for the benefit and rehabilitation of our men who serve by making the necessary amendments which will once for all and without regard to origin enable men and women of this country to call themselves Canadians, and by so doing unite this country as never before.

The Prime Minister followed me on that occasion, with these words, which to-day have been translated into the bill now before the house:

> I wish to conclude by referring to what my hon. friend said about hoping that we might, in some way, find it possible to have the citizens of this whole nation bound together as Canadians and so recognized and recorded in all government records and registrations. He said that, without regard to racial origin, Canadians are living and dying for their country, and that, above everything else, we should see particularly as respects those brave men who have been fighting overseas, that upon their return they should be all classed as Canadians. He hoped that, irrespective of racial origin, they would be recognized as Canadians without having to put any prefixes before their names. May I say to my hon. friend that in that I am in entire and wholehearted agreement with him. I cannot express too strongly the feeling I have that some of these practices which have been carried on by the census branch for statistical purposes, or possibly for ethnological purposes—I believe that is the way it is described—might be done away with. I would be happy to join with my hon. friend and with any others in seeking to

do my part to see absolute recognition, or recognition made in an absolute way of men and women who were born in this country, and those who have become Canadian citizens being regarded as Canadians first, foremost and all the time.

I cannot understand the idea behind the census that blood counts should loom so large in determining Canadian citizenship. When the statistics were collected they were inaccurate. As a matter of fact, the manner in which nationality was determined is set forth in the instructions issued for the last census. These are contained in a pamphlet, a page of which I have before me, and are as follows:

> As a general rule a person's racial origin is to be traced through his father, e.g., if a person's father is English and his mother French, the racial origin shall be entered as English, while a person whose father is French and whose mother is English, shall be entered as French.

On the basis of that the ethnological argument disappears of itself. In the United States the idea that racial origin is important was done away with many years ago. Under the census regulations of that country the only persons who are required to register on the basis of racial origin are those who are naturalized, the only separation in the registration being that those of the negro, Indian, Chinese and Japanese races are required so to register.

This bill is an important step forward. In my opinion it will do more to join this dominion together in unity in the days of peace than any other measure that has come before this parliament. But within the last few days something has happened that I think should be brought to the attention of the house because it indicates that even now the rights of Canadian citizens are not being respected as they should be. I referred this afternoon to order in council P.C. 6577, passed on October 23, 1945. The preamble to that order in council reads:

> And whereas it is therefore deemed necessary, by reason of the war, for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada that provision as hereinafter set forth be made for the arrest and deportation of persons in Canada suspected of being deserters from the United States forces or of being absent from the United States forces without leave.

This order in council passed in October, 1945, provides that any person suspected may be arrested without warrant. It provides that any person arrested who does not sign a release permitting his deportation to the United States shall be brought before an immigration board and the question determined as to whether or not he is a deserter from the United States army. As far as that order in council is concerned, if the purpose were to assure a mutual exchange of deserters as between the countries, I would not argue against it, in so far as it affects American citizens. But what I do object to is this: Whereas under the extradition law of this country no Canadian can be deported for an offence committed beyond Canada, except certain designated offences, this order in council is passed and provision is made whereby a native-born Canadian or a Canadian citizen may be deported to another nation at the request of that nation. That is a denial of the rights of Canadian citizenship.

What has happened in the last few days in Winnipeg? A Canadian by the name of McCloy went to the United States in 1929 and joined the United States army. Later on, he went absent without leave and was sentenced subsequently to two years' imprisonment. He escaped after a period of six months and came back to Canada in September, 1939. He joined the Canadian army and went overseas and served until August, 1945, when he received an honourable discharge.

On March 26, 1946, this man was arrested, put in gaol and later granted bail. When I endeavoured to ask a question about this matter of the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) this afternoon he did not give me very much assistance in having it answered. This was a matter of great moment to a Canadian citizen. The minister glossed it over as being unimportant. The man came up to-day before the immigration board in Winnipeg. I am informed that the evidence against him consisted of a letter from Mr. Hoover of the F.B.I. in Washington and another letter from another official in Washington. The man went on the stand in his own defence, and after he gave his evidence the commissioner said that he had received instructions that the matter was to be held in abeyance for the time being.

This order in council was passed after the war by this government when it realized that it could not get through an extradition treaty that it had dangled before this house last session. That order in council denies to Canadians the right to be tried in their own country and not in any other country or at the direction of any other country. Furthermore, it made retroactive on October 23, 1945, an offence that was not extraditable until the order in council in question was passed. Is this another order in council that somehow found its way into the mill without being properly examined?

I suggest to the minister that the order in council be amended so that it will not cover Canadian citizens and make them deportable for military offences. This is but another example of orders in council passed by the government that would never be passed by this parliament, an order in council denying to Canadian citizens their rights and depriving them of the privileges incident to Canadian citizenship, the privileges which were so eloquently stated by the Secretary of State.

This order in council cannot be glossed over with suave phraseology. I ask the minister, and I know Canadians in all parts of this country would ask the minister also if they had the opportunity, to change it, to alter it and to revoke it so that it will not make Canadian citizens subject to deportation for trial in any other country except under legislation passed by this parliament.

I pass on to another phase. The minister dealt somewhat briefly with section 10. Section 10 provides, among other things, that a British subject coming to Canada from the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Ireland or Newfoundland cannot become a Canadian citizen unless he files notice of intention with the court and unless he comes before the court in the same way as any other person coming from any other country would be required to do. I ask the minister to explain why at this time when we in all parts of the empire are desirous in the interest of our own security to bind still closer the various parts of the empire together, should a British subject coming into Canada and properly entering this country under our immigration law be required to go through the same formalities as persons coming from other parts of the world?

I ask, too, this question: Is it not a dangerous principle to adopt at this time? Is it not one which may well strike at the unity of British citizenship everywhere within this empire?

These are questions which I think the minister should have answered. But he went over that section very quickly and indicated that there was a very small change made. There is a very important change made because for the first time in our history we are requiring a British citizen, under a common king and with a common loyalty, coming to this country to have to go through the same formalities as those coming from foreign countries.

Having established the basis of Canadian citizenship and having given a new unity to this country, I suggest that citizenship, if it is to mean what our citizenship does mean, requires that at this time—I referred to this incidentally the other day—we should consider the adoption by Canada of a Bill of Rights. There have been recent infringements upon citizenship by this government which have been a denial of the heritage that is ours. But Canadian democracy means something when public opinion speaks. The order in council P.C. 6444 of October 5 last has passed into history only because of the force of public opinion in this country, for when the people realized what its provisions meant to them individually, the government found itself forced to revoke that order in council.

I may be asked, why do we need a Bill of Rights? The British North America Act contains no personal safeguards against unwise or discriminatory legislation that might be passed by federal governments. It vests in the Minister of Justice or in the government the power to annul provincial encroachments on our rights, but it contains nothing to prevent the government of this country by order in council from doing things which deny to Canadians the rights that flow from the achievement of Canadian and British citizenship. Some may ask me why the British North America Act does not contain such a Bill of Rights. I do not know. But I believe this, that when the fathers of confederation drafted that act the theory of personal liberty was so embedded in English common law that the fathers of confederation did not believe that further safeguards of individual liberty were necessary.

The United States of America had no Bill of Rights in its original constitution, but it found it necessary to establish a Bill of Rights in order to prevent infringements upon its citizenship which, with too great regularity in recent months, in continuation of what was taking place during the war, have characterized this government under order in council.

In the United States, federal and provincial legislatures under their Bill of Rights were forbidden to interfere with certain basic rights common to all citizens, regardless of race, religion or colour. Freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures was guaranteed. In the Bill of Rights of the United States it is provided that no person may be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

The order in council P.C. 6577, and the order in council of October 5, 1945, P.C. 6444, which I believe will always be remembered as the forgotten order in council, interfere with the fundamental rights of citizenship which were referred to by the Secretary of State.

Is it not time that in this country as in Great Britain these rights shall not be interfered with except under a law passed by the parliament of Canada?

When I think of the abrogation of habeas corpus in recent months I find upon an examination of British constitutional development that only nine times in British history was it interfered with in Britain, and then only by statute or under powers contained in a statute to abrogate habeas corpus. We grant the greatest privilege to an individual, that of Canadian citizenship, conveying as it does as well the right of British citizenship. We have gone a step forward. We are making a great advance under this bill. Now let us go one step farther and assure to generations yet to come and assure to our people who will become Canadian citizens that they shall not be denied at any time in the future by order in council those rights that ordinarily are incident to our citizenship.

My time has almost elapsed, but I should like to say this too. In the development of a Canadian nationality everything should be done by the government to encourage and develop Canadian literature and drama and art. The minister has taken a great interest in his department of state. His officials and the officials of other departments worked hard in the drafting of this bill which in every section reveals careful application and much study. I believe that his department might well be utilized as a department for the purpose of widening still further our Canadian citizenship. I believe that his department should establish scholarships available to worthy students to encourage the study of Canadian literature, drama and art, to the end that we should have not only a citizenship but a distinctive Canadian art and a distinctive Canadian culture. What would the development of a department like that mean? It would stimulate and support artistic endeavours and assure that Canadian writers, musicians, painters and others would have the support which only the state can give. It would assure that Canadians would extend their cultural heritage for the benefit of Canadians of this and future generations; for we must not forget that one of the most trying problems in this country to-day is that having given our young Canadians an opportunity of securing a wide education, when they have finished that education, too often by reason of the greater monetary attractions of the United States the cultural development which they should have left in our country is lost to us because there is no department of government to encourage and stimulate their endeavours and to assist them.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

For 140 years my ancestors on both sides have made this country their home. For 140 years they and other Canadians have been denied true citizenship. They have been denied the use of those proud words which the minister used: "I am a Canadian." All my life I have hoped for this day. I believe it means much to this country and to our future. Canada to me means more than the ownership of acres; it means a citizenship which maintains in this part of North America the highest heritage of British peoples everywhere in the world. It means to Canadians, without regard to racial origin, freedom and tolerance and liberty. It is because it means those things to me, sir, that from time to time during the period of the war and since, I have been critical of the invasions and encroachments on our rights and on these principles of citizenship which constitute the heritage of British peoples.

To-day in this world two ideologies face one another. If ever there was a time when we should assert and practise what our citizenship means, it is now. The minister has given the lead in that regard in the establishment of schools to the end that citizenship will be taught, and also in the ceremonies which hereafter will be established in order to imbue the minds of those who come to our country with what that citizenship will mean to them. But, believing in freedom, I think we give a poor lead to these people when we endeavour to justify the adoption, in times of peace, of totalitarianism in order to oppose totalitarianism. It is our duty and responsibility as Canadian citizens to maintain those principles and traditions which mean so much to us and to guard against infringement of the great principles of freedom; for, sir, the hallmarks of liberty can be erased as a result of the acts of a zealous person who is misdirected, no less than by one who destroys those principles with evil intent. We will give a great citizenship to Canadians hereafter. We will give them freedom—that we promise—in this country. Let us not deny freedom by executive action on the part of the state, for in doing that we destroy all for which our citizenship stands.

The pages of history tell their story. They tell the story that freedom, like capital, cannot be overdrawn, nor can freedom be preserved while it is being destroyed piecemeal fashion.

Mr. F. E. JAENICKE (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, as the minister so eloquently stated, is to give further expression to the progress which Canadians have made on the road toward sovereignty. It has

been a gradual progress and evolution; and in laying this bill before parliament the government, I know, is giving way to the desire of the majority of the Canadian people to establish a distinctly Canadian citizenship.

Canadian citizenship is a fact to-day, and it is but proper that we give a legal status to that fact. If this condition is true; if a majority of Canadians are anxious to put upon this Canadian citizenship this stamp of legal approval, and if all these eloquent words which the minister has told us are true, I think he should have put a preamble to this bill which would give the development of our sovereignty and express pride in the progress we have made and that we are now ready to put this legal status of Canadian citizenship on the people.

While I am in full agreement with this measure, which I believe was actuated by the government upon the principles stated by the minister this evening, I have grave doubts as to the legality of parts of this legislation. I say that in all seriousness and in all friendliness towards the minister.

To make my argument clear, I should like to trace briefly the development and the history of naturalization and sovereignty. Prior to 1914, as the minister stated, we had a Naturalization Act under which aliens were made British subjects within Canada only. The adoption by the parliament of Canada of this legislation prior to 1914 was undoubtedly an act of sovereignty on our part. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said at the imperial conference in 1911:

> The power of naturalization is one of the incident powers of sovereignty and one of the most important attributes of sovereignty.

However, while this old law was an act of sovereignty, we were at that time by no means as sovereign as we are to-day. The old naturalization law was not of much use to a naturalized citizen when he travelled beyond the boundaries of this country, because then he lost his British citizenship and he was a man with no country at all. When I said that we were then not as sovereign as we are now, I may point out that at that time we had no embassies, no legations, no high commissioners and no consulates to which a Canadian might apply for protection in case he got into difficulty in some foreign country. It was no doubt owing to this state of affairs that in 1914 the British parliament passed an act concerning British naturalization and the status of aliens. This act deals with the naturalization of aliens, and it was provided in part II of the act that it might be adopted by any legislature of a British possession or dominion, and, if so, then a certificate of naturalization granted by such a dominion should have the same effect as a certificate granted under this act. This meant that if we adopted the Biritish act any persons who were naturalized would be recognized as British subjects all over the world. Pursuant to this British act we passed our own Naturalization Act in 1914; that is the law which is at present in force, and part II of our act is identical with part II of the British naturalization act. However, this enactment of 1914 was no advancement in sovereignty over the old act. It was not passed in consequence of the powers which we possessed under section 91 of the British North America Act, but by virtue of the British statute already referred to, and the British statute gave it legal effect and force.

I have already said that we adopted verbatim, with only minor necessary changes, part II of the British act. We therefore became entitled to issue certificates of naturalization to aliens as British subjects, who were supposed to be recognized as such all over the world; and I presume that was the case. It seems to me that now under this new legislation we want to have a Canadian citizenship, which I endorse and which is quite proper and natural, and at the same time we also wish to legislate as to British nationality. I maintain that we cannot do so, at least not as the present act is worded. If the present bill becomes law we repeal the present Naturalization Act; that is provided in the last or second last section of the bill. By repealing the present act we would also lose our power to pass any legislation as to who shall be a British subject, because we would also repeal the applicability of the British act.

On the strength of this argument I would say that section 26, which says that a Canadian is a British subject, is beyond the powers of this parliament to legislate. I have no personal objection to this section; I rather like it, but I simply doubt the legality of it. Perhaps it was necessary for some reason unknown, but I submit sincerely that only the British parliament can legislate as to who is a British subject. However, I think I have a way out, and I suggest as an alternative to section 26 the following.

Mr. MARTIN: I am very much interested in the argument of the hon. member but at this stage the rules of the house provide for a discussion of the principle of the bill only. When we come to deal with the sections I am sure the suggestion of the hon. member will be of great interest to the house as it certainly will

be of great interest to me, but at the beginning I think it would be well to establish clearly in this general debate the desirability of maintaining the rules of the house, which at this stage call for a discussion of the principle of the bill only.

Mr. JAENICKE: The minister dealt with these sections, and surely I can deal with them in the same way.

Mr. MARTIN: With great respect, all I did was deal with the principle of the bill and certain provisions of the bill. I did not discuss the sections.

Mr. JAENICKE: This portion of my remarks is very short.

Mr. MARTIN: I think we shall find that the debate will be more helpful and efficient if we observe the rules. The important suggestion the hon. member is making now, which interests me greatly, I think could be dealt with more effectively if he would make it when we come to discuss the particular sections. I am sure he will find this is the best way to deal with the matter because it will give his suggestion a much better opportunity for consideration.

Mr. JAENICKE: I would suggest—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would call the attention of the hon. member for Kindersley to Beauchesne, third edition, paragraph 656, at page 228:

> The second reading of a bill is that stage when it is proper to enter into a discussion and propose a motion relative to the principle of the measure. On the motion for second reading it is out of order to discuss the clauses of the bill.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I respectfully submit to Your Honour the hon. member for Kindersley is discussing the principle of citizenship, the principle of this bill. His argument, as I understand it, is that a certain part of this bill is ultra vires of the power of this parliament, namely to decide who shall be a British citizen, which is the right of the British parliament. Since this includes a principle of Canadian citizenship I submit that the hon. member has the right to proceed with what he is saying.

Mr. GREEN: May I add, Mr. Speaker, that all the members of the opposition are very much concerned about any ruling of this type being made. In order to review the principle of the bill it is necessary to refer to what is contained in certain sections. That is exactly what the minister himself did. Surely if he could do that we should have the same privilege. If we are to be restricted as the minister suggests it will be impossible effectively to debate the principle of this bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not call the hon. member to order. Since he was a new member last session I just wished to draw his attention to the fact that in the House of Commons it is the practice on second reading to discuss only the principle of a bill.

Mr. JAENICKE: Well, instead of suggesting an amendment, as I tried to do, I shall put it in this way. I mentioned that section 26 in my opinion is beyond the powers of this parliament because we have no right to say who is a British subject. But we can say this, that a Canadian citizen is a subject of His Majesty as sovereign of Canada, and I think that would be the proper way to put this section. I believe such a section would be quite legal and ought to satisfy all persons, while at the same time it is a true statement of the status of a Canadian citizen. It is still debatable just how far we have progressed on the road to sovereignty, but there is no doubt that we have advanced far enough to say who shall be a Canadian citizen. According to the statute of Westminster the dominion has full power to make laws having extra-territorial operation, and since the passing of that statute we have exerted our power extra-territorially. We can now take our nationals anywhere and they will receive protection. There is also no question but that Canada, especially during the last ten years, has been recognized as a sovereign state. The debate this afternoon and the remarks of the minister this evening bear this out. If for no other reason than that, we should assert our right to create Canadian citizens, and in so doing we can assert and emphasize our British connection in a natural and quite legal manner. I think the suggestion I have made as to section 26 should meet the objections of those who have an extreme desire for sovereignty, as well as of those who hold the British connection dear to their hearts.

For these reasons, of course, the act would have to be amended in a great many other places. For instance, it would seem to me that section 22 is beyond the powers of this parliament, in that it presumes to revoke a certificate granted in another country within the British commonwealth, even though this is done with the concurrence of the government of that country. Likewise section 28 is not only ultra vires but is unnecessary, because other nations of the British Commonwealth are sovereign states, just as we are, and we recognize the status of the nationals of sovereign states by the amity of nations.

I do not wish it to be understood from my arguments that I am against the sentiments contained in these sections. I am all in favour of them, but both sections presume some authority which we do not possess. It is up to the British parliament alone to say who is a British subject. I think the way the act is framed it might entail some serious consequences to a naturalized Canadian if he wants to assert his British nationality.

In view of the fact that the house wishes to go into committee of supply, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Mr. Jaenicke the debate was adjourned.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Administrative service—
1. Departmental administration, $163,190.

Item stands.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

200. Departmental administration, $422,774.

Item stands.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

76. Departmental administration, $170,340.

Mr. COLDWELL: How many departments were agreed upon?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Three.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is quite a number to go in at one time.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is the same as last year.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am raising the point that, three departments going in, in the one night does restrict the members of this house in bringing forward anything on going into supply.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We shall have two the next time.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, April 3, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE

OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT—EMMA WOIKIN—PRESS REPORT OF STATEMENT OF SENATOR HORNER

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I rise to a question of privilege. It has reference to a statement which is alleged to have been made by Senator Ralph Horner and which appeared in the Ottawa *Evening Journal* of April 2. The article is headed, "Western senator recommended Emma Woikin," and the first paragraph reads:

> Mrs. Emma Woikin, one of the twelve temporary civil servants charged as a suspect in the investigation of the Russian spy network, was recommended for a government job by Senator Ralph Horner.
>
> "Yes," the Progressive Conservative senator from Blaine Lake, Saskatchewan, to-day told the *Evening Journal*, "I recommended Emma Woikin—but for the char service—not as a cipher clerk in the code room of the external affairs department."
>
> The senator, a big, bluff and frankly-spoken man, has been "a little annoyed" at the way things have worked out.

The paragraph to which I wish to refer to particularly is as follows:

> "The only reason Emma Woikin found her way into a stenographic position, first at the passport office and then in the cipher division of external affairs," said the senator, "was because her father and brothers year after year have voted Liberal for Mr. Mackenzie King."

I asked the under-secretary of state for external affairs if he would give me a statement as to how Mrs. Woikin came to be employed in the Department of External Affairs, and I have the following from Mr. Robertson:

> Due to the pressure of work in the passport office in the autumn of 1943, the Department of External Affairs, on September 8, 1943, requisitioned the civil service commission for three additonal clerks grade 2 and two typists grade 2. At the same time, treasury board was requested to establish temporary positions to take care of the new appointees. On September 10, 1943, Mrs. Emma Woikin, who was classified as a typist, grade 1, was assigned by the civil service commission to one of the new temporary posts as no grade 2 typist was then available.

That is the official statement on the matter. I might add that until I heard the name of Mrs. Woikin mentioned in connection with the investigation now proceeding I had no knowledge of there being any person of that name, either in Prince Albert constituency or in the public service of Canada. Unlike Senator Horner I neither recommended Mrs. Woikin for a government job nor was I

requested by her or by anyone to make a recommendation on her behalf. I know nothing whatever about her appointment; it was entirely a civil service matter and procedure.

PRESS REPORTS REFERRING TO SPEECH OF MR. KNOWLES ON MARCH 19

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege which has to do with a newspaper report making reference to a speech which I made in this House of Commons on March 19. The report appeared in yesterday's Winnipeg daily newspapers; as a matter of fact it is exactly the same in both the *Free Press* and the *Tribune*. It reports a political meeting held on Monday night at which Mr. David Graham charged, on the basis of the speech which I made on March 19, that when I was in Moscow recently I failed to present the Canadian viewpoint to the Russian people whom I met, and that I failed to assure them that they need have no fear of our western democracies. It is stated also that I had urged friendship for their spy activities and that my advocacy of understanding was a one-way proposition.

I rise to this question of privilege because it is statements of this kind that make it difficult to establish the type of relationship which we all want between this country and the Soviet Union, and also because the facts are the very opposite of the statements made by Mr. Graham. Not only did I in my speech urge various efforts such as the publishing in Moscow of a Canadian paper in Russian so as to interpret Canadian ways to these people, but when I was there I made the same kind of appeal I am now making here. I am now seeking to persuade the Canadian people to understand the Russians. Similarly when I was in Moscow I went to a great deal of effort to try to get the people with whom I was in conversation to understand our ways and to realize that what we really want is friendship. I shall continue my effort to achieve understanding and friendship on a mutual basis.

Mr. POULIOT: If you had not been to Moscow you would not have risen to-day.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

WAR EXPENDITURES

Second report of the special committee on war expenditures and economies—Mr. Isnor.

NATIONAL FLAG

Mr. W. E. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce) presented the first report of the joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons appointed to consider and report upon a suitable design for a distinctive national flag, and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

TRAVEL ABROAD

ABOLITION OF EXIT PERMITS—CONDITIONS AFFECTING PASSPORT CONTROL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table order in council P.C. 1272, April 2, 1946, revoking order in council P.C. 1841 of March 10, 1942, as amended, concerning the issuance of exit permits to women, and children under the age of sixteen years, proceeding to destinations outside the western hemisphere.

I should like to say something about the order in council which I have just tabled. It removes a form of travel restriction which has been in existence since March 10, 1942. Under the regulation that was introduced at that time, and which has been amended on several occasions since, the movement of women, and children under the age of sixteen, to destinations outside the western hemisphere has been limited by the necessity of their securing an exit permit before being permitted to leave Canada. As I mentioned on Friday last, the government is anxious to relax war-time controls wherever possible, and in view of the gradual improvement in travel conditions it has been decided to abolish the requirement of an exit permit immediately.

The result of the present order in council is that, subject to the existing rules of passport control exercised by the Department of External Affairs, women and children residing in Canada are free to make their own travel arrangements without first obtaining an exit permit from the immigration branch of the Department of Mines and Resources.

I wish, however, to emphasize that, although the improvement on general travel conditions has made it possible to remove the exit permit restrictions, this step should not be taken as an indication that the strain on transportation facilities to Europe and the far east has ceased to exist. Moreover, as the Minister of Mines and Resources mentioned in his statement on Monday last, there are severe difficulties in connection with travel from Europe to this country, and these necessarily affect any plans for travel from Canada that involve a later return trip back to Canada. The transportation of Canadian servicemen and their dependents from the United Kingdom and the continent to this country is

being granted the highest priority in the allocation of west-bound shipping space. This movement will require a very large percentage of available passenger accommodation for many months to come, and the government desires to warn persons intending to travel to the United Kingdom and Europe during 1946 that no assurance can be given of return transportation until the needs of the repatriation programme have been filled. It is further pointed out that a very large waiting list has developed in the United Kingdom of persons who are not at present eligible for westbound shipping passage. These applicants, which number in the thousands, will be accommodated first, and temporary visitors to the United Kingdom and the continent will of course be required to take their places on the waiting list. As far as can be foreseen, this will unfortunately involve very long delays.

So far as passport control is concerned, I have already mentioned that certain types of administrative control on passport endorsements are being exercised by the Department of External Affairs. These have been necessitated by the limited housing, food and transportation facilities in Europe and the far east, and by the desire of the government to restrict non-essential movement from Canada to the countries where conditions are particularly serious as a result of the war. The past few months have been marked by a gradual improvement in these conditions, and I am able to state that the question of passport control is at present under review.

ATOMIC ENERGY

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION AT OPERATION CROSSROAD, BIKINI ATOLL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) made mention of a question of which he had sent me notice and which I said I would reply to to-day. With the permission of the house I will now read the question and give the reply. His question was:

In view of the fact that Canada is one of the three partners in the development of atomic energy, and that the United States has made provision for 120 senators and congressmen to attend Operation Crossroad at Bikini Atoll, will the Prime Minister tell the house how many Canadian senators and members of parliament will be sent to represent Canada's interest?

The answer is: I understand that the United States government had invited a small congressional committee of less than ten senators and congressmen to attend the operation which it was proposed to have held at Bikini Atoll. As the hon. member knows, this operation has been postponed sine die. The operation was to be entirely sponsored by the United States government, and invitations were therefore issued by them. We had received an indication that some Canadian observers would be welcome. It has not been decided who would be selected for this mission.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

PRAIRIE PROVINCES AIRPORTS

Mr. McKAY:

1. What airports have been disposed of by the Department of National Defence for Air in each of the following provinces (a) Alberta; (b) Saskatchewan; (c) Manitoba?

2. What disposition has been made of building equipment and landing fields at each of the following points in Saskatchewan (a) Estevan; (b) Weyburn; (c) Assiniboia; (d) Mossbank; (e) Moose Jaw?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. (a) Alberta: Airdrie, Blackfalds, Bowden, Champion, DeWinton, Ensign, Frank Lake, Gladys Ridge, Granum, High River, Holsom, Innisfail, Inverlake, Lethbridge (in part), Medicine Hat (in part), Netook, Penhold, Shepard, Standoff, Whitla, Woodhouse.

(b) Saskatchewan: Assiniboia, Brada, Boharm, Brora, Burdick, Buttress, Caron, Chandler, Davidson, Davidson West, Dafoe, Estevan, Hagen, Halbrite, Lethburn, Mossbank, North Battleford, Osler, Outram, Prince Albert, Ralph, Regina (in part), St. Aldwyn, Vanscoy, Weyburn, Wymark.

(c) Manitoba: Brandon, Chater, Dauphin, Douglas, Eden, Elgin, Hartney, Lanore, MacDonald, Neepawa, Netley Lake, North Junction, Oberon, Petrel, Rivers, Souris, Valley River, Virden.

2. Buildings and Landing Fields

(a) Estevan: Transferred to Department of Transport on direction of Crown Assets Allocation Committee, 19-12-44.

(b) Weyburn: Transferred to Department of Transport on direction of Crown Assets Allocation Committee, 6-10-45.

(c) Assiniboia: Transferred to Department of Transport on direction of Crown Assets Allocation Committee, 20-8-45.

(d) Mossbank: Transferred to War Assets Corporation on direction of Crown Assets Allocation Committee. 9-11-45.

(e) Moose Jaw: No disposition as yet.

Equipment

(a) Estevan: Arrangements have been made for the removal to other RCAF units of any equipment required for continued use by the RCAF. Surplus equipment has been declared to War Assets Corporation for disposal.

(b) Weyburn: This site is being used for the storage of equipment required by the RCAF. Some equipment, however, has been declared surplus to War Assets Corporation.

(c) Assiniboia: Same as (a).

(d) Mossbank: Same as (b).

(e) Moose Jaw: Same as (b).

EXPORT PERMITS—MEN'S AND CHILDREN'S CLOTHING

Mr. HAZEN:

To what firms were export permits issued in 1945 and to March 1, 1946, for the export of the following commodities and in what quantities (a) men's shirts; (b) men's socks; (c) men's pyjamas; (d) men's shoes; (e) children's clothing?

Mr. MacKINNON: The department cannot divulge the names of applicants for export permits, inasmuch as this information is obtained in confidence from the firms applying for export permits.

	1945		1946—Jan. and Feb.	
	No. of Permits Issued	Quantity	No. of Permits Issued	Quantity
(a) Men's Shirts	691	280,926 units	209	89,265 units
(b) Men's Socks	596	39,558 prs.	106	7,666 prs.
(c) Men's Pyjamas	154	30,813 units	18	21,249 units
(d) Men's Shoes	441	227,711 prs.	87	36,193 prs.
(e) Children's Clothing	1,714	905,752 units	197	103,748 units

WAR ASSETS—MOWING EQUIPMENT

Mr. LENNARD:

What steps have been taken to dispose of the mowing equipment at No. 6, F.S.T.S., Dunnville, Ontario?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Preliminary arrangements only, having in view transfer of this equipment (with the exception of three items required for continued use by R.C.A.F.) to the Department of Transport when that department takes over the airport through Crown assets allocation committee.

DEPENDENTS' BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mr. BENTLEY:

1. What is the dependents' board of trustees?
2. To whom is it responsible?
3. Who appoints the members of the board?
4. Who are its members?
5. What are its duties?
6. Is it still operating?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. The dependents' board of trustees was established in January, 1942 to administer the dependents' supplementary grants fund established in the same year. The purpose of the said fund as administered by the said board is to establish a method of providing supplementary grants or special assistance on an equitable basis for dependents of members of the Armed Forces below the rank of Warrant Officer Class I in cases not provided for by the marriage allowance and dependents allowance regulations in circumstances where such dependents have special or emergency needs.

The board has its headquarters in Ottawa and operates through twenty-two regional dependents' advisory committees—twenty-one in Canada and one in the United Kingdom. All members of the board except the executive secretary and all members of the committees serve without remuneration.

2. Minister of National Defence.

3. The governor in council, on the recommendation of the Minister of National Defence.

4. The board consists of a chairman and not more than nine members. Present active members are:

Jack Pembroke, Esq., Montreal, P.Q., (Chairman).

Arthur Huntingdon Brown, Esq., O.B.E., Ottawa, Ont.

Mrs. Catherine R. Collier, Bracken, Sask.

Philip Sydney Fisher, Esq., Montreal, P.Q.

John Walter McKee, Esq., Ottawa, Ont.

Frank Neal Stapleford, Esq., Toronto, Ont.

J. Douglas Winslow, Esq., Woodstock, N.B.

Garnet Wesley Dunn, Esq., Winnipeg, Man. (Executive Secretary).

The Chairman of the dependents' allowance board is an advisory member of the board.

5. See also answer to question 1. The duties of the board are:

(a) to appoint chairmen and members of committees, as required, including as members of such committees local representatives of all or any of the following, namely:—the dependents' allowance board, the Department of Pensions and National Health, the Soldier Settlement of Canada, the Canadian Legion of the B.E.S.L., and local welfare or service agencies;

(b) to administer the dependents' supplementary grants fund in accordance with the terms of this order;

(c) to receive applications for such supplementary grants or special assistance not provided for by the marriage allowance or dependents' allowance regulations, as may be forwarded by the committees or submitted in such manner as may be designated by the board and to obtain such reports on the applications as the board may deem necessary and to determine whether any supplementary grant or special assistance should be made or given.

(d) to pay such supplementary grants or to give such special assistance not provided for by the marriage allowance or dependents' allowance regulations as the board may determine to or on behalf of or for the benefit of dependents in those cases where the board are satisfied that such supplementary grants or special assistance are necessary to prevent hardships, to relieve misfortune, to meet domestic emergencies or to enable dependents summoned to hospital in respect of members of the forces "seriously ill" or "dangerously ill" to meet the necessary travel and transportation expenses.

(e) to determine subject to the approval of the Minister of National Defence the terms and conditions upon which special advances may be granted to committees for the purpose of enabling such committees to provide supplementary grants or special assistance to dependents in cases of emergency requiring immediate remedy for which moneys payable under marriage allowance or dependents' allowance regulations are inadequate and to make such advances from time to time in accordance with the terms and conditions so determined;

(f) to carry out any investigations relating to a dependent which may be required by the Department of National Defence and to report thereon.

6. Yes.

RADIO BROADCASTING—GOOD FRIDAY AND EASTER PROGRAMMES

Mr. CHURCH:

What arrangements are being made by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for suitable programmes on Good Friday, Holy Thursday and Easter Sunday?

Mr. McCANN: The Broadcasting Corporation has advised that programmes announced for these days include the following: April 18, Holy Week meditations April 19, Good Friday church service; special Easter time programme for children; periods of special music; April 21, religious period; church of the air; special Easter music.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

Mr. POULIOT:

1. How many permanent R.C.A.F. stations are there (a) in Ontario; (b) in Quebec?

2. What decison has been reached concerning the stations of (a) St. Hubert; (b) Ancienne Lorette; (c) Mont-Joli, and (d) St. Jean, in the province of Quebec?

3. How many French-speaking officers have been kept in the interim air force, from the grade of squadron leader upwards, and who are they?

4. What happened to the Escadrille des Alouettes, and what was the reason of any decision taken in that case?

5. Are there any other squadrons in the air force and what and where are they?

6. How many high ranking R.C.A.F. officers who were on the staff of the air defence department on November 23, 1944, are still on that staff?

7. Who are they and what do they do?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. (a) Eleven; (b) two.

2. (a) An R.C.A.F. (Regular) Station Headquarters and two Auxiliary Squadrons will be located at St. Hubert; (b) An R.C.A.F. (Regular) Detachment and one Auxiliary Squadron will be located at this site; (c) Reserve Aerodrome; (d) Will be disbanded and declared surplus.

3. Eleven French Canadian Officers—Wing Commander J. A. D. B. Richer, DFC; Wing Commander L. G. G. J. Archambault; Wing Commander J. J. M. Viau, DFC; Wing Commander J. H. L. Lecomte, DFC; Wing Commander D. B. Bamineau; Squadron Leader L. P. J. Dupuis, DFC; Squadron Leader F. M. Gobeil, AFC; Squadron Leader J. R. A. E. Emond; Squadron Leader J. T. E. M. Paquette; Squadron Leader V. E. Gagne; Squadron Leader E. J. I. Gauthier.

Only a portion of the selections for the interim force have been made and it is anticipated that additional French Canadian names will be added to the above list.

4. This squadron was disbanded on 5th Sept., 1945, as a result of the termination of hostilities with Japan and will be re-formed as an auxiliary squadron for Quebec City.

5. Yes. Two Heavy Bomber Squadrons, Overseas; Three Transport Squadrons, Overseas; Three Fighter Squadrons, Overseas; One Air Observation Squadron, Overseas; One Transport Squadron, Dartmouth; One Ferry Squadron, Rockcliffe; One Communication Squadron, Rockcliffe; One Photographic Survey Squadron, Rockcliffe.

6. Air Commodores and above in Canada and Overseas, 23.

7. Air Marshal R. Leckie, CB, DSO, DSC, DFC, Chief of the Air Staff.

Air Marshal G. O. Johnson, CB, MC, Air Officer Commanding-in-Chief, RCAF Overseas.

Air Vice-Marshal W. A. Curtis, CBE, DSC, Air Member for Air Staff.

Air Vice-Marshal T. A. Lawrence, CB, Air Officer Commanding North West Air Command, Edmonton.

Air Vice-Marshal K. M. Guthrie, CBE, Air Officer Commanding, No. 2 Air Command, Winnipeg.

Air Vice-Marshal A. L. Morfee, CBE, Air Officer Commanding, Eastern Air Command, Halifax.

Air Vice-Marshal R. E. McBurney, CBE, Air Officer Commanding, Maintenance Command, Uplands.

Air Vice-Marshal A. L. James, CBE, Air Member for Research and Development.

Air Vice-Marshal G. E. Wait, CBE, Air Member, Canadian Joint Staff, Washington.

Air Vice-Marshal E. E. Middleton, CBE, Air Officer Commanding, No. 1 Air Command, Trenton.

Air Vice-Marshal C. R. Slemon, CB, CBE, Air Member for Supply and Organization.

Air Vice-Marshal H. L. Campbell, CBE, Air Member for Personnel.

Air Vice-Marshal J. L. Plant, CBE, Air Officer Commanding, Western Air Command, Vancouver.

Air Commodore A. L. Johnson, CBE, Director of Aeronautical Inspection.

Air Commodore F. G. Wait, CBE, Chief Staff Officer, Eastern Air Command.

Air Commodore A. D. Ross, GC, OBE, Commandant, R.C.A.F. Staff College, Toronto.

Air Commodore J. G. Bryans, OBE, Director of Construction Engineering.

Air Commodore W. A. Orr, OBE, Deputy Chairman, Senior Officers' Selection Board.

Air Commodore D. M. Smith, CBE, Chief Staff Officer, Western Air Command, Vancouver.

[Mr. C. W. G. Gibson.]

Air Commodore J. M. Murray, CBE, Director of Accounts and Finance.

Air Commodore D. E. MacKell, CBE, Deputy Air Member for Personnel.

Air Commodore J. L. Hurley, CBE, Chief Staff Officer, No. 2 Air Command, Winnipeg.

Air Commodore F. R. Miller, CBE, Chief Staff Officer, Maintenance Command, Uplands.

ACCIDENTS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many people have been (a) killed; (b) injured through traffic accidents on highways in Canada since the beginning of the war in 1939 to August, 1945?

2. How many fatal accidents from drowning have there been in Canada during the same period?

3. How many (a) fatal accidents; (b) injuries have occurred at level railway crossings in Canada during this period?

4. How many persons, adults and children, have died or have been injured as the result of fires in dwelling houses and homes, in Canada, during the same period?

5. How many persons have been killed or injured in Canada from other causes during the same period?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. (a) Persons killed in motor vehicle accidents September 1, 1939 to June 30, 1945, 9,028; (b) Persons injured through traffic accidents January 1939 to December 1944, 149,019.

2. Fatal accidents from drowning September 1, 1939 to December 31, 1944, 5,097.

3. (a) Fatal accidents at level railway crossings January 1, 1939 to December 31, 1944, 727; (b) Injuries at level railway crossings January 1, 1939 to December 31, 1944, 2,264.

4. Persons who died in conflagrations September 1, 1939 to December 31, 1944, 1,221, on basis of data for three years 87 percent were in homes.

5. Persons killed from other accidents September 1, 1939 to December 31, 1944, 22,488, number injured not-available.

*CIVIL SERVICE—DISMISSALS—OTHER MEANS OF SUPPORT

Mrs. STRUM:

How many men have been dismissed from the civil service because they have other means of support through (a) inheritance; (b) by virtue of marriage to women who can support them; (c) returns from accumulated savings, to make employment for (1) returning service women; (2) unmarried women who are self-supporting; (3) unmarried women with dependents; (4) married women who must by their earnings supplement family income; (5) widows of veterans?

Mr. MARTIN: Perhaps I might answer this question orally. The civil service commission advises me that no dismissals have been made under any of the headings mentioned in the question. Certainly the general replacement or reduction policy takes no account of such considerations.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—OUT-OF-WORK BENEFITS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

How many ex-service men and women, by provinces, are at this date in receipt of out-of-work benefits?

Mr. TUCKER:

As at March 31, 1946	Male	Female
Prince Edward Island ..	1,288	9
Nova Scotia	5,120	30
New Brunswick	2,751	19
Quebec	7,067	33
Ontario	12,163	54
Manitoba	6,818	72
Saskatchewan	3,827	36
Alberta	3,592	25
British Columbia	4,239	61
	46,865	339

Combined total, 47,204.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

FISH PRODUCTS—UNDERSTANDINGS BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND CANADA

Mr. WINTERS:

1. Were fish products included in discussions leading up to the understandings reached between Great Britain and Canada and announced by the Minister of Agriculture on the 26th March, 1946?

2. If so, were understandings involving fish products arrived at?

3. If understandings involving fish products were arrived at, state types, quantities and sections of Canada from which purchases will be made.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—SASKATCHEWAN—FIELD INSPECTORS AND SUPERVISORS

Mr. McCUAIG:

1. What are the names of the field inspectors and supervisors who operated in the province of Saskatchewan under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act in 1945?

2. How long was each of them employed during the said year?

3. What salary did each receive during 1945?

4. What amount of travelling expenses was paid to each during 1945?

PROPERTIES UNDER FEDERAL LEASE OR RENTAL—HAMILTON AND WENTWORTH COUNTY

Mr. ROSS (Hamilton East):

1. What properties in the city of Hamilton and the county of Wentworth are under lease or rental to the dominion government?

2. Who are the owners of each property?

3. On what basis is each one rented?

4. What are the terms of each lease?

WAR ASSETS—ORDNANCE STORES AND MEDICAL BUILDINGS, KAMLOOPS

Mr. FULTON:

1. How many buildings were (a) built by; (b) leased by the dominion government at Kamloops, British Columbia, to house the branches of (1) No. 11 district ordnance stores; (2) No. 11 district medical stores, and (3) R.C.E. personnel and stores, located there?

2. How many buildings for each branch?

3. How many buildings for each branch have now been vacated?

4. What action has been taken or is contemplated to dispose of these buildings?

5. Have any buildings yet been listed for sale or sold or leased by War Assets Corporation, and if so, which buildings?

SUBSIDIES, 1945-6

Mr. FRASER:

1. What subsidies were paid by the government during the year 1945?

2. What subsidies have been paid since January 1, 1946?

WAR ASSETS CORPORATION—STAFF

Mr. FRASER:

1. How many employees are employed by the War Assets Corporation?

2. What are the names of all employees of War Assets Corporation receiving salaries, or wages, of $3,000 per year or over?

3. In what departments of War Assets Corporation are these people employed?

4. Where are they employed?

5. What is the total amount of salaries, and wages, paid by War Assets Corporation per month?

VETERANS LAND ACT—SALE OF JAPANESE FARMS IN FRASER VALLEY

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. How many Japanese farms have been sold in the Fraser Valley, under the Veterans Land Act (a) veterans; (b) civilians?

2. What is the legal description and the purchase price to the Japanese and the sale price of each property, either to a veteran or civilian, under the Veterans Land Act or any other branch?

VERNON, B.C., BRIGADE CAMP

Mr. STIRLING:

1. On what date is it intended to close (a) the training centre, and (b) the brigade camp presently located at Vernon, British Columbia?

2. Will the buildings erected to house the personnel stationed at Vernon during wartime (a)

be left empty ; (b) be disposed of through War Assets Corporation, or (c) be kept available for the use of the reserve army during summer training?

3. If (c), is it intended to dispose of some of the buildings or will all the buildings be kept for this purpose?

4. What will be the strength of any permanent personnel held at Vernon to maintain and supervise this camp?

Mr. ABBOTT: Order for return.

Mr. STIRLING: May I demur at the answer suggested by the Minister of National Defence with regard to this question. It refers only to one department. The answers, I should have thought, would have been quite short and simple enough to find their place in *Hansard*, instead of an answer being delayed until a return is brought down.

Mr. ABBOTT: Well, I said "order for return" because there was a question as to how many would be disposed of through War Assets Corporation, but it seems to me there are two departments involved.

Mr. STIRLING: The minister knows that; he knows what will be described as surplus, and not until then can another department come in.

Mr. ABBOTT: But I do not know how many will be disposed of through War Assets Corporation. That is determined by the crown assets allocation committee. We declare them surplus in the army, and they may be disposed of by War Assets Corporation, or they may be disposed of by some other department. There are, I think, two departments involved.

Mr. GRAYDON: Could they be disposed of through any other department than War Assets Corporation?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes. War Assets Corporation is a separate corporation. They might go to the Department of Health and Welfare, for instance. That would not be determined by the Department of National Defence.

Mr. GRAYDON: For disposal?

Mr. ABBOTT: No, for use by other government departments.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

ILE-AUX-COUDRES AND LES EBOULEMENTS TRANSPORT SERVICE

Mr. DORION:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents concerning a contract awarded by the Department of Trade and Commerce and the post office department for the transport service between Ile-aux-Coudres and Les Eboulements, Charlevoix county, from September 1, 1935, to date.

[Mr. Stirling.]

Mr. DORION: I ask leave to withdraw this motion; I have received the information.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion withdrawn.

CITIZENSHIP AND NATIONALITY

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all correspondence, resolutions, telegrams, petitions and other documents exchanged between the government or any officials thereof and any person or persons relating to Bill No. 20, 1945, and Bill No. 7, 1946, an Act respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens.

B.C. SOUTHERN PROVINCIAL HIGHWAY—DIVERSION INTO UNITED STATES

Mr. HERRIDGE:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents exchanged between the Prime Minister of Canada or any member or official of the government and the premier of British Columbia or any member or official of the government of British Columbia, between January 1, 1943 and January 1, 1946, relative to the diversion of the British Columbia Southern provincial highway into the United States territory between the towns of Laurier and Patterson in the state of Washington.

IMMIGRATION

PLANNED IN RELATION TO ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY, ECONOMIC NEED AND DEVELOPMENT POSSIBILITIES

Mr. W. R. THATCHER (Moose Jaw) moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should give early consideration to the advisability of instituting a reasonable immigration programme, planned in accordance with Canada's absorptive capacity, its economic needs and possibilities of development.

He said: In introducing this resolution on immigration, I do so with the knowledge that perhaps no single issue in Canada to-day is fraught with so much emotional thinking and prejudice.

Notwithstanding this, the fact remains that to-day thousands of Europeans are knocking at Canada's door, eager to make new homes in this country. These people are not cast-offs or failures; many are the best their respective countries have to offer. Among them are men who fought long and gallantly for the allied cause during the recent war. This parliament must decide, and decide soon, whether it is in the national interest to admit into Canada a number of these people, or whether it is in the national interest to maintain our present immigration laws.

Whatever the view of hon. members may be, there is no denying the fact that immigration has been the life-history of this nation. There

are few Canadians who do not trace back their ancestry to at least one nation of the old world. In this very House of Commons thirty-four members originally were European immigrants.

You will note that the resolution before the house is framed in a very general way. It asks the government to consider "the advisability of instituting a reasonable immigration programme." I hope that that wording will not give offence to hon. members on either side of the house.

Suppose we look for a moment at Canada's present immigration policy. Very few realize how extremely restrictive that policy is. Dating back to 1930, it is based largely on the economic fears and errors of the great depression. The policy was founded on the hopelessness and lack of faith in the country's future which was prevalent during the nineteen thirties. All immigrants other than British and American subjects, with a few minor exceptions, are virtually excluded. In the five year period 1940 to 1944 an average of less than 10,000 immigrants were allowed to enter Canada annually.

In my opinion there are three main weaknesses in our present immigration policy. First it is based on racial discrimination and outworn prejudices. The law sets up several preferred and non-preferred groups. Britons and Americans are included in the preferred category, and also in the select group are the citizens of such nations as France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, and one or two others. The law places in the non-preferred category those who come from Poland, the Ukraine, Austria, Czechoslovakia and a few other countries. In a final category are placed those who come from Turkey, Roumania, Greece, Italy and those who are of Jewish nationality. Those people can get into the country only by special permit. It seems strange that during the recent war, at the very time Canadians were being urged to enlist to help in eradicating racial intolerance abroad, our own nation was practising similar intolerance at home in selecting its immigrants. Surely it is more sensible to pick out immigrants for their skills, for their trades, for their physical backgrounds, than to take them for their race. For instance, it is quite conceivable that a central European, a hardy sturdy peasant born on the soil or, say a Finlander, an experienced logger, would make a better immigrant that a slum dweller from some city in England. I believe, therefore, that the first weakness of our immigration policy is that our immigrants are picked primarily for their race.

In the second place, it is very difficult to justify our present immigration policy on purely humanitarian grounds. The war in Europe resulted in millions of people being uprooted and scattered far and wide. Many of them cannot return to their old homes, and most of them are living in abject poverty. There is widespread lack of shelter and clothing. Food is so scarce that thousands of them are dying of malnutrition. Confiscation of property has been fairly general throughout many European countries. Certainly racial and religious prejudices prevail at every hand. Hundreds of thousands of orphans are homeless in Europe.

Will you permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote from a letter written by W. Wanka, a Sudeten German who emigrated to Canada in 1939:

> In 1939 Canada opened her gates to 1,000 Sudetans. They settled on the land and found happiness in this great country. The mere fact that we are here to-day has kept many of our friends and relatives still in Europe from succumbing to black despair during the misery of the past months. The hopes of many thousands of anti-nazi Sudetens are centred upon us. Hardly a letter reaches us in which we are not asked to voice their plight, and to ask Canada anew for homes for them.

Many of those who are suffering to-day are former allies. The vast majority of these refugees were active opponents or victims of the fascist countries. The condition of these people, which is beyond description, pleads for them. Canada, in the interests of justice and humanity, cannot indefinitely ignore that plea.

In the third place, I believe that our immigration policy is contrary to the interests of the nation as a whole. No thoughtful person can travel across Canada without a feeling that there is an immense area whose economic resources have not yet been properly exploited. The general process of settlement has been neither complete nor satisfactory. A moderate, well-planned immigration policy would have numerous advantages for Canadians generally. In the first place, the larger population, by increasing the home market, would aid the economic stabilization of our economy. To-day, to a considerable degree, the prosperity of Canada is dependent upon our foreign export markets. If these foreign markets are good, generally speaking Canada is prosperous. If these foreign markets are bad, usually the opposite is true.

In other words, the economic well-being of Canada to-day is dependent to a large degree on conditions over which we have no control. This is particularly true of our agriculture.

The largest proportion of our wheat, hogs, cattle and other products are, I believe, shipped overseas. However, it is also true of our manufacturing industries. During the war our manufacturing capacity, I am told, was increased by thirty to forty per cent. If in the future we are to avoid idle factories and unemployment, if this greater plant capacity is to be fully utilized, we must do one of two things: either we must find a greater export market, or we must increase our home market. Immigration would permit Canada to increase her home market, thus curtailing our dependence on unstable foreign markets.

In the second place, immigration would ease the tax burden of Canadians. It was believed at one time that Canada would have a population several times its present twelve million people. Our provincial government buildings, with their large staffs and very large overhead, were set up with that thought in mind. Our railroad development also has had as its objective the serving of a population several times as large as twelve million. Additional people are needed to carry the heavy financial load which we have taken up. Our taxation burden could be eased by spreading it over a larger number of people.

In the third place, under certain circumstances it is probable that immigration would actually increase employment in Canada. All immigrants need new homes, furniture and other necessities of life. If they are going on a farm they need farm machinery, equipment and tools. Manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers and labourers would all benefit by this new business.

A further direct reaction would be to increase railway freight and railway passenger traffic, and I think it is quite probable that the railroads would have to take on additional employees if we had an immigration policy. Moreover, where the immigrant is one who is likely to invest capital, or who has some special and needed skill, he is likely to enhance the employment of Canadians. For instance, I am particularly mindful of a Czech refugee who moved to Saskatoon around 1938. He left Czechoslovakia just ahead of Hitler's occupation of that country. He had been a butcher in Poland. When he reached Saskatoon he found an empty factory building, where he proceeded to set himself up in the meat-packing business. To-day that refugee employs about 600 men and women. The immigrant, unless he comes to some unproductive employment, creates additional work for the people already in the community and adds to the general wealth of that community.

[Mr. Thatcher.]

In the fourth place, immigrants bring to the nation new aptitudes, new skills and new scientific knowledge. Let us not forget that in centuries past the Flemish weavers, the Huguenots, and others brought new skills and a new outlook to Great Britain and helped to a considerable degree to make the empire industrially what she is to-day. Canada should benefit similarly from the gradual enrichment that comes from fresh streams of newcomers. For example, it is a well known fact that during the latter years of the recent war, immigrant scientists in the United States played a tremendous part in helping to split the atom and in making the atomic bomb. Who can say how the course of history would have been affected had the United States refused to accept those immigrants at that time? I have heard it said—it may be incorrect but I have heard the statement made—that some of these very scientists who went to the United States tried to get into Canada and could not do so because of our immigration laws. I suggest therefore that immigration will bring new skills and new aptitudes to the country which will prove very valuable to us.

Finally, I believe that Canada needs a larger population for purely defensive reasons. In this land-hungry world, twelve million people cannot hold half a continent indefinitely. I believe our poorly filled dominion is a danger to peace. We are asking for trouble if we refuse to take elementary precautions to increase our population in proportion to the nation's absorptive capacity. If we steadily refuse to take steps to populate our country, we may find in the future that some other nation will step in and do it for us.

In the past, most opposition to immigration has come from organized labour. This feeling was based largely on the premise that immigrants would deprive Canadians of work. Conceivably this view might be justified if there were only a limited and defined amount of work in the country, which could be divided among the people. However, most labour leaders have now accepted the belief that immigration by itself produces new wealth, creates demands for manufactured goods and services, and acts generally as an aid to trade, business, and employment.

Many immigrants bring capital and business experience with them, and become employers of labour rather than employees. There are also some immigrants who are willing to take jobs for which enough native applicants cannot be found. These classes certainly do not "take away jobs from Canadians." Moreover, a large number of immigrants are not wage earners and hence are not com-

petitors. Among these are people too old to work, women who remain housewives, and young children.

The economic and social maladjustments to which our attention is drawn by the immigration issue are for the most part problems which are fundamental to our present society, whether or not immigration is involved. For instance, in the United States the problems associated with poverty, illiteracy and so forth are nowhere more apparent than in the south-eastern cotton belt, a region where there has been the least immigration in past years.

It is interesting to note that at its 1944 convention the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada passed the following resolution:

Be it resolved that Canada's Immigration Act be revised to make it possible for Canada to do her share in granting refuge to her full quota of refugees.

Be it further resolved that a policy of accepting immigrants into this country be proceeded with as long as such policy in no way adversely affects living standards or the welfare of our present Canadian population.

The Canadian Congress of Labour passed a similar resolution at its convention in 1944, which reads as follows:

Be it resolved that the C.C.L. in convention assembled request the dominion government to institute a concrete plan of immigration during the post-war period, without any danger of displacement of present labour.

In passing, it is interesting to note the steps that other nations have taken recently with regard to immigration. Crowded England has admitted some two hundred thousand refugees during and since the war. The United States has admitted thousands, and plans to bring in many more. Australia recently announced plans to absorb seventy thousand adults and seventeen thousand children a year. France is actively encouraging immigration. Canada, one of the most lightly populated areas in the world, appears to lag behind.

In conclusion may I say that I am not advocating a policy of wide-open immigration, nor would I support such a proposal. Rather I am asking the government to enunciate a moderate, well-planned immigration policy based on Canada's absorptive capacity and her moral responsibilities to the united nations organization.

It seems to me that the programme should be a flexible one, taking into consideration from year to year the labour needs of the nation. Moreover, I believe that immigrants should be picked not on a basis of race, but for their skills and for their physical backgrounds. Above all else, the policy must in no way be allowed to affect adversely the welfare of our present population. To-day the lives and liberties of millions throughout the world are in danger. Canada, in keeping with her traditions, must bear a share of this great human problem. A great opportunity for our nation is at hand. I do not think that we should delay in taking advantage of it.

Mr. D. A. CROLL (Spadina): May I join with the hon. member who has just spoken on this question and say that he has presented the problem not only fairly but capably. I, too, do not advocate an open-door policy, but I do advocate immigration. I have here a few figures which I think would be interesting to the house. There are few people who know that the area of Canada is three and a half million square miles or fifty per cent larger than continental Europe, which is 2,116,000 square miles in area. While Europe supports four hundred million people we have approximately twelve million people. It might also be interesting to note that the unoccupied agricultural land of Canada amounts to 293,000 square miles, or 80.000 square miles more than the area occupied at the present time. As I have just said, the population of Canada is approximately twelve millions with a distribution of 3·7 inhabitants per square mile as compared with Belgium with 802 inhabitants per square mile.

Most hon. members have read the report recently issued by the dominion bureau of statistics. This report, based on present trends, states that the population of Canada is likely to reach fifteen millions in 1990. The planning and development of Canada from confederation on were based on continually expanding population. Since the first world war it has become evident that the trends have been other than what were expected. There were three reasons for that. The first was the heavy emigration to the United States; the second was the smaller Canadian families, and the third was the sharp decline in immigration from Europe. The first two factors were outside the scope of the government because they were governed by social and economic forces; but the third factor was the result of a positive act carried out by the government. The door was closed. It is more important to-day than it has ever been to examine the problem and survey present conditions on both sides of the door.

I have a few more statistics which I should like to give to the house. At confederation the population of this country was 2,700,000. Then came the Sifton immigration policy from 1896 to 1911, and it brought 3,000,000 immigrants into Canada. In 1906 the number was 211,653; in 1907, 272,409; in 1910, 286,839, and in 1911, 33,288. From 1911 to 1930 we averaged 100,000 annually, but there were two

high years. In 1912 we brought in 375,756, and in 1913, 400,870. In one year we brought in only 41,000. In 1931 we brought in 27,500, and in 1935, 11,000. During other years immigration was negligible.

Canada must take cognizance of its changed economy. We have become a great industrial country, but can we afford to neglect our agricultural classes? To-day the farmers are begging for labour. We cannot constantly rely upon German prisoners of war and conscientious objectors to pull us out of the hole.

An hon. MEMBER: And the Japanese.

Mr. CROLL: An hon. member says, "and the Japanese". We are dependent upon our export trade for a third of our economy, not only upon our exports of wheat and other natural products, but upon our exports of manufactured products. While we are not competing with other countries that have a lower standard of living, we must have more people in this country in order to be more productive. We are the people who are alleged to have the "know how" industrially, but what we lack at the present time is population.

Let us look for a minute at our side of the door. The years since confederation have brought us to the point where we are the third industrial nation of the world. The United States with 140,000,000 people is first; Great Britain with 46,000,000 is second. We have huge railway and communication systems, much more than adequate for our needs at the present time. Our shipping tonnage is the third largest in the world, and in the precambrian shield we have still untapped an incalculable reservoir of wealth. We are a strong creditor nation, and we help feed the world. In addition, next to the United States our standard of living is the highest in all the world.

Then we have to look at the other side of the door. Let us consider only Europe, which has been the traditional source of our immigration. There are four hundred million people over there existing under conditions of unparalleled misery. Europe has been reduced to poverty and famine; her cities are in ruins; her industries are smashed; her transportation is shattered and her communications are disrupted. Even the soil has been injured to some extent by mine fields and shell fire. Her people are anxious to start life anew; they are clamouring to get in, and at the present time we have made-to-order immigrants in orphans and children who are at an age at which we can influence them to become the kind of Canadians we want. Both these adults and children would, in my opinion, make ideal citizens, and we must ask ourselves whether we can afford to miss this opportunity, whether we can afford to let Australia and New Zealand "beat the gun", as my hon. friend has said. Already they are subsidizing, to some extent, immigration from Britain. All we need do is to assure the people of Britain that the doors will be opened within a reasonable time, and they will wait to get into this country.

Canada's immigration policy since 1914 can well be called a dog in the manger policy. Here we are inhabiting a country whose area is the third largest in the world, and we have a population about the size of that of Afghanistan. We have here what is potentially one of the richest countries in all the world; yet we have only scratched the surface of our wealth. Not only have we done nothing about the whole matter, but we have not permitted people to come here and help us give this country a fair opportunity. Paradoxically enough, we have invited foreign capital into this country, upon which capital we are paying tribute. But here are people who ask nothing but an opportunity; yet for the time being the doors are shut. One of the reasons is that over a period of time we have failed to formulate a long-term immigration policy. Always when the question has been raised there have been surface reasons why the matter should be deferred. In the twenties someone found excuses for doing nothing. In the thirties we were quite helpless about doing a great deal, and to-day we find a different set of reasons. Though the reasons may vary a little, the principle always seems to be the same. In effect it is that on this blank day of blank we will deal with the problem of immigration, but since it is an involved problem we will do nothing at all about it for the present. Consequently for almost thirty years we have allowed surface reasons to remain in the path of our own interests and in the interests of common humanity. The truth is that if we are looking for reasons for dodging the problem we can find them, but we must ask if they are fair to ourselves and fair to the rest of the world.

At the present time, for instance, we say to ourselves that immigration is out of the question because of the need to repatriate and rehabilitate Canadian servicemen and their dependents, or because of the world-wide shortage of transportation, or because immigrants are needed to rebuild war-torn Europe, or because we have not in Europe an organization prepared to deal with them. It would be futile if not foolish to argue that these considerations are without merit;

but it would be equally futile and foolish to say that because of these considerations we should do nothing at all about the matter. All of us in this house agree that Canadian soldiers and their wives should be brought home and rehabilitated first; and no one proposes that the thirty thousand persons in Britain and the twenty-five thousand in the Netherlands who have already indicated their desire to come to Canada should be brought here to replace those who are no longer here. The fact that immigration may be impracticable to-day is no reason for dodging the responsibility of making definite plans for to-morrow; and to-morrow is almost here.

What are some of the reasons that are given? One of the fears is that one's job will be in jeopardy if workers are given a stake in Canada. The second fear is that business will be ruined by letting in competitors. How these elements can interfere with an intelligent immigration policy is beyond me! Surely it can be shown that Canada is still in its infancy and that its potentialities are unlimited. How can we convince these people that there is enough here for all of us, yes, even much more than we can possibly anticipate? Canada is in the position the United States was in when it had only twelve million people, and I think most hon. members will agree that it would have been a tragedy for the United States to stop at twelve million people. That country has made a great contribution to the world. We must calculate our absorptive capacity, as the previous speaker said, and in the light of that lay down a policy and stick to it. We might well point out to the man who is afraid of losing his business or his job that it is fallacious to think that the immigrant in any way interferes with either his business or his job, except to do it good. If Canadian industry were exhausted; if the Canadian labour market were exhausted, then something might be said on behalf of those people who fear, but surely it is not necessary to labour the point that Canada has not yet reached the limit of her expansion in industry or agriculture. According to a report issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce, refugees who have been permitted in from Europe have established over one hundred new industries in Canada, ranging from ceramics to diamond cutting. Not only do immigrants create business; they help it. As for the fear of the agriculturist, I need only recall that in the ten years between 1921 and 1931 some 437,000 Canadians moved from rural to urban centres, and have not yet been replaced. To-day we note an ever-growing shortage of labour in the heavy industries: construction, mining, road building, logging, all industries whose workers traditionally have been recruited from the immigrant class. If native-born Canadians are not entering these fields we must look elsewhere for the necessary man-power. If in this house we can formulate a sane yet generous immigration policy we shall be giving the most direct assistance to the victims of this war.

I wish I could adequately tell hon. members exactly how the people of Europe feel. To have observed them was in itself a saddening experience, but what one remembers most about them is not that they are habitually cold, habitually hungry and habitually ill-clad, but that they do not seem to have any hope. Before them they see at the best an existence sustained by endless work and at the worst a repetition of the same bloody pattern of their generation. I have here a cutting from the Montreal *Star* of Thursday, March 14, which reads:

> Vatican City, March 14—Pope Pius told a group of United States citizens in private audience yesterday that immigration could "help solve Europe's saddest problem." The group included Ugo Carusi, United States commissioner of immigration.
>
> "The question of immigration is one in which your countrymen have had large experience and competency," he said. "For centuries the shores of America have offered generous hospitality and haven to peoples of other lands."
>
> The Pope said it was "not surprising, however, that changing circumstances brought about certain restrictions on immigration."

From the point of view of common humanity it seems to me that we should be doing more than we are doing at the present time. We are sending our surplus foodstuffs and our second-hand clothing, but I think that is the easiest thing we can do. The way of humanity would be for Canadians to share their heritage with some of the people of Europe, remembering that it is not ours as of right. Humanity calls upon us to share our good fortune with those people who are not ungrateful, who are not unappreciative. We shall find that they are among our most loyal and zealous citizens, remembering that they came from lands of misery and oppression.

I do not think we can formulate a policy without taking these matters into consideration. If we cannot give them immediate haven we can at least hold out hope. That is the path of humanity. If we are interested in ourselves, then let us examine the situation from the point of view of self-interest. Industry needs more people to-day in order to be more productive. Industry needs also a domestic market. Transportation and communications are available for all the people that we can bring in, in the foreseeable future.

Workers are needed for the heavy industries, the construction industry, the mining industry and the logging industry. We need domestics in this country, and we need them badly. Agriculture is begging for labour. They need these people and they must have them very soon. Economists tell us that we need people not only to provide a domestic market but for our foreign markets. We cannot expect to export without doing some importing as well.

In so far as the man on the street is concerned, he is more than anxious to share the heavy burden of taxation with anybody at all. He knows that we need population. He does not know just how many people we need or where they should be placed; that is a matter for the government. It can give some direction in that regard. There are such people as we need and that we can absorb. They are available in countries with progressive economies and with domestic ideas. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I must ask the government: What are we waiting for? Last session I pointed to the problem. This session I warn of the danger unless we attack the problem. I hope it will not be necessary for me to condemn the government at any time because they have not dealt with the problem.

Mr. A. L. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I begin by reading the resolution, because I think the mere reading of it will convince everyone that it is acceptable in its present form:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should give early consideration to the advisability—

Those are the words.

—of instituting a reasonable immigration programme, planned in accordance with Canada's absorptive capacity, its economic needs and possibilities of development.

I compliment the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Thatcher) upon being able to read so well and to absorb what he reads, because it may be news to some hon. members that in December, 1942, a political party held a convention in the city of Winnipeg. I am quite sure that those papers circulate as far as the benighted place in which my hon. friend lives.

An hon. MEMBER: It is not a benighted place.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): It is not a benighted place? All right; we will let it go at that. I was merely trying to me humorous. This is what they said:

Canada is destined to be one of the world's great nations provided we vigorously develop our vast natural resources.

[Mr. Croll.]

In considering any immigration policy we will first make sure that our own people, including primarily those in our armed forces and war industries have jobs.

We favour a long-term policy of immigration to:

Assure development of our vast natural resources and create employment.

Increase home consumption of our own products and thus make us more self-supporting and less dependent on the hazards of foreign markets.

Immigration must be selective. Preference must be given to those whose background, training and love of freedom best fit them for citizenship in Canada.

I do not read that as covering everything from A to Z in connection with this problem. The difficulty with that resolution of my own party is that it is open to the same criticism as are the remarks of the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) and of the mover of the resolution. It deals in generalities. It expresses hope, and I will be frank and say that I am not in position to improve very much upon what has been said by the hon. member for Moose Jaw, by the hon. member for Spadina, and by this resolution.

Let us be practical about this thing. Consideration, yes; and I have no doubt that when the minister stands up he will tell us that they are giving it active consideration. But let me say this. Those of us who speak of the broad policy of immigration must be completely forgetful of our housing conditions. Anyone who suggests that at this moment we should bring into this country any number of persons is surely forgetful of the fact that at the moment we are unable to house our own people, particularly those who have returned to us from service in the Canadian forces.

But that is not an argument against the real wording of the resolution—"consideration." We have heard to-day from the hon. member for Spadina, whom I regard as the second best speaker in this house. I am not pointing to myself, because I really do not know who takes first place. I remember so well the hon. member discussing this matter last year, but, with respect, he said largely the same thing, although he clothed it in different and more beautiful language.

There is no doubt about the fact that a home market is the best market, but what is a home market that does not earn its living and cannot pay for the things which are produced? I know I am playing right into the hands of my hon. friends over here for a moment, but if they will follow me long enough they will find that the trail has turned and that they are still on the by-road which they have been on for a long, long time.

We have had immigration in days gone by. The hon. member for Spadina has told us of

the many untilled acres that we have. We had a debate in this house the other day about untilled acres in the northern part of Alberta and British Columbia—I see the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Dechene) back there; but why are they not tilled? Because even now, with the world crying for food, we cannot till them effectively, on account of lack of transportation. This thing cannot be regarded all by itself; it must fit itself into the great puzzle—and I use that word advisedly—of our economy. I should get applause for that word from the planners to my left. After all, it is something which has been built up through changing circumstances through the lifetime of everybody in this house.

What happened under our last policy of bringing farmers into this country? They must serve on a farm for six months. How many of them are there to-day? Not five per cent of the people we brought in under that policy. I have no statistics to prove it, but in areas with which I am familiar I am perfectly certain that that percentage is correct. Why will they not stay on the farms? For the reason advanced the other day in another building in which I was: that farming has not been profitable. You men in this House of Commons who come from farms and who have sons coming back from this war are having difficulty in maintaining them there. Why? It is easy to say that the farmer in Canada has been better off in the past five years than he has ever been before. Certainly he has; there is no question about it. But the sons are not staying there because farming is not profitable.

I am going to pose a question for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), who I see has just come into the chamber; and I flatter myself it is because somebody told him I was speaking. If one looks over the history of Canada, and those of us who have been in this country for any length of time know this, it will be realized that the hard work has been done by the immigrant. The mines, the work in the brickyards, the labour on the farm, the bush labour—all that has been done by the immigrant. It is true that he grew up, got himself some cash, and as his intelligence merited or warranted he went on and did many other things. My own grandparents came to this country on the same basis. Now we have the German prisoners of war, to whom the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) referred, and the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank)—if it was not he, it should have been—helped him out by talking about the Japs; and we have also the conscientious objectors. In spite of all that we are going to have some difficulty in finding the men to do the hard work. I think the Minister of Labour, before he is through will be rather badly off to produce the men. We have already heard something in this house about beets—

Mr. MITCHELL: It is the same all over the world—in the United States, Britain and Australia, for example.

Mr. SMITH: (Calgary West): I am sorry the minister told me that, because having listened to him in this House of Commons, and having listened to the Prime Minister flattering him the other day, I thought we would be infinitely better off in that respect than those other countries. But that is the position. Do not think that I am blaming the men who went into the army or into industry and through study and apprenticeship and so on became skilled in certain trades. People do not go back in this world. Those who talk about the standard of living, and there are some foolish enough to do it, say that we have to tighten our belts. I believe in thrift; of course I do, but no body of people and no nation ever achieved a certain standard of living and then went back without a revolution. Let us just think that one over.

And so it is up to us here who ostensibly at least—and I use the word ostensibly advisedly—are supposed to give guidance and direction to business and government, to start with that as a foundation, that people never go back unless there is very serious trouble.

I know the procrastinator. It is easy to abuse him. It is easy to say to him: You are all wrong; open the doors, let the flood come in, and let nature or something else take its course. I for one, and I think I speak on behalf of those who are with me, certainly believe in selective immigration, but while we have any large measure of unemployment, and while our housing situation is as it exists to-day, I think it would be extreme folly to open our doors to immigration. We hear that Australia is going to treble its population of 7,000,000 within ten years, and that New Zealand, by going after this thing, is getting the cream of the crop. But the cream of the crop only shows in the testing. I think there will be plenty of people left who will want to come to this country when we have got over this period of crisis—because it is a period of crisis both in jobs and housing. I have no lack of faith in our future. I do not believe the estimates of our population as given by our leader the other day from some statistical brochure of the government. I think those estimates are low. I think we can develop. It is true to say that we have only

scratched the surface as yet—and it is the precambrian shield, not the Laurentian, Mr. Spadina. I know that there are many things under the ground. We who live in a favoured part of Canada know a little bit about oil. We know that it does not stop at the international boundary, that it does not stop two miles underground. We know that we hav greatness before us. We know that we have splendid transportation systems. Years ago we claimed that we had too many. When I was going to school—perhaps I had better not go back that far—we were building the Grand Trunk Pacific, a great part of which has since been abandoned. But we have the structure—let us not deny it—the skéleton to which we can add the flesh. We have before us the greatest future of any country in the world. But let us not put a cancer in the side of that growing body now by destroying the faith of those who have come back in our determination to fulfil our promises to them.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who moved this resolution (Mr. Thatcher) has presented his case with great ability and with a high sense of humanity. He referred to the distress and poverty among the peoples of Europe, and he was perfectly right in recalling to this house the extreme distress that exists in Europe to-day. Nevertheless I regret to have to oppose this resolution, for reasons which I shall explain to the house shortly, in my mother tongue.

(Translation): Mr. Speaker, the resolution moved by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Thatcher) reads as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should give early consideration to the advisability of instituting a reasonable immigration programme, planned in accordance with Canada's absorptive capacity, its economic needs and possibilities of development.

Experience shows that a reasonable immigration programme cannot possibly be carried out. I do not question the sincerity of the mover of this resolution. But I believe that the time is ill-chosen even for its consideration. It is not when returned men are looking for employment and shelter that any thought should be given to opening the door to immigration, even on a moderate scale. When more than 200,000 people are unemployed, our duty is to solve that distressing problem rather than make it worse through immigration, however moderate it might be. There is no room for immigrants in Canada. Our sole duty is to put our own house in order. It would be inconceivable that we should do otherwise; we would thus disregard our responsibilities. Let us at least show some fairness to those who are in search of a job or a house. When our soldiers are still policing Germany, is it proper that the government should be asked to admit foreigners to this country? The most elementary justice demands that we bring our men back, up to the last one, before even thinking about immigration. Canada has first to ensure security for its own citizens. We are not in a position to absorb even a very small flow of immigrants. We must first restore our economic and social life. All our strength must be devoted to this worthy object. The economic needs of our country forbid all immigration. The reestablishment of social order is of greater import than any kind of immigration. The return to civilian life of our thousands of young men who have served in our armed forces must be undertaken with method, fairness and justice. Those whose careers have been interrupted or jeopardized by the war are entitled to assistance and protection by the government.

I now come to the third part of the resolution moved by the hon. member:

> Canada's possibilities of development.

Our country is rich in natural resources. Part of them have not yet been developed. We do not need immigrants for that task. Our people are more than equal to it. The transition from the state of war to normal peacetime activities is a slow process. We are not short of experts and technicians for developing our resources. The conversion of our war industries into civilian industries would, alone, bring a solution for years to come to the problem of the development of our resources. We have the required manpower. How many heads of families and young men are receiving unemployment insurance benefits rather than the fruit of their labour which would ennoble their lives? Why should we allow immigrants to compete with our own citizens in the quest of jobs? This would be a disastrous policy. At a time when we must suppress subversive ideas and crime, which are frequently the result of idleness, I would not think of supporting any immigration policy. Let us find jobs for our own citizens first of all. That should be our chief consideration when thinking of an immigration policy. I am as much opposed to immigration as I am in favour of Canadian citizenship.

(Text):

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): In rising to support this motion, may I do as my colleague did, so there may be no misunderstanding, and read the resolution:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should give early consideration to the

advisability of instituting a reasonable immigration programme, planned in accordance with Canada's absorptive capacity, its economic needs and possibilities of development.

First of all may I say that to some extent I agree with my colleague who spoke on this subject a few minutes ago. While we should certainly give consideration to this matter it would not be advisable to bring in these people at this time, when we have not housing for those of our own kith and kin, and while we have the unemployment situation which now exists. May I go a step farther than he went, and say that I do not think we should have that condition prevailing to the extent that it prevails to-day. It should have been planned against. I could take some time in setting forth an argument to prove that housing is Canada's number one problem. However, I do not want to take the time at this particular moment. The same might be said of unemployment.

I do want to take some issue with the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) in his argument that we should have more agriculturists from Europe. In my opinion agriculture has suffered more than any other activity in Canada from lopsided development. May I say before going further on that point that at the time of confederation the then prime minister, Sir John A. Macdonald, predicted that Canada would have a population of twenty-five million people during the quarter of a century following confederation. We all know what has happened. Mention has been made of a pamphlet put out quite recently by a government department which indicates that now they are hoping only for a population of some fifteen million at the end of this century, fifty years hence. Certainly these are two very different views, one expressed by the government of the day following confederation; the other by the government of the present day. For the life of me I cannot conceive of a government, with conditions as we now find them throughout the world, putting out a pamphlet of the kind at this time, in view of our present position and prospects. I do not believe there is any other nation whose undeveloped resources and whose developed and potential electrical power compare with those of Canada. Therefore we cannot lightly neglect the matter of immigration. We must give serious thought and planning to it. True, the Sirois commission points out that from the period of 1896 to 1913, under a very vigorous immigration policy by the government of the day, assisted by land companies and railway companies, a tremendous expansion took place in territories of Canada. Settlement took place without discrimination. The territories settled grew from about 10,000,000 acres to some 70,000,000 acres in that period. And the settlement was chiefly along agricultural lines.

I have argued many times that immigration should be on a selective basis. I have said that our development has been lopsided. I think in view of that experience we should be very careful and should encourage people who are tradesmen to come to this country now. I have pointed out the opportunities we have for development here; and in view of what has been said by the hon. member for Spadina may I make a brief reference to another article:

> Statistics prove that for the year 1937 the family of the average industrial employee consumed agricultural products to the extent of $409.35 annually. These figures for to-day would be considerably higher. On this basis, if we had five million heads of families employed in industry there would be an immediate home market in Canada for our present agricultural production.
>
> I am one who thinks that in a country such as Canada, with our vast undeveloped natural resources, our very cheap electrical power and the possibility for further development of cheap electrical power, we must have, during the generation following the end of the war just terminated a much greater development of peace-time industry. This would create employment for all our ex-service men and for every able-bodied Canadian willing to work. It would also necessitate an immigration policy on a selective basis for industrial development.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What is my hon. friend reading from?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): This is part of a speech I made in 1943, and the article from which these figures were taken appears in the *Labour Gazette* of that date. To those who think we should not have immigration, I would point out that it is on this selective basis that industry should be developed. It would enhance the opportunities for employment of those young people whom we are putting through our universities. I have raised this point before in connection with estimates. I have pointed out that our scientists and research workers are not paid salaries commensurate with those paid in other countries. While we had the immigration policy that was in force some years ago, our young people, born, brought up and educated in Canada, were leaving us to go to the country to the south of us because they could receive higher remuneration there.

I am satisfied that we can correct this condition on a proper selective basis, and I think it is our duty to be planning immediately instead of having a haphazard immigration policy which will admit everyone who is willing to come into the country. This country

must be settled more rapidly than we are settling it to-day. It is most inhuman that we should retain these great undeveloped resources without sharing them with other people, especially when, if we did share them, we would be creating a better standard of employment and a better standard of living for our own kith and kin and those who will become citizens with us in the future. The importance of the resolution will become increasingly apparent as time goes on.

Mr. C. C. I. MERRITT (Vancouver-Burrard): I am very much in favour of the resolution. Before going into my reasons for favouring it I wish to say a word about the speech of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith). I do not often disagree with the hon. member. I do not disagree with him now, but it did seem to me that the manner in which he made his remarks certainly left the impression—it left the impression in my mind at any rate—that since we could not have immigration now, it was not of the importance which I for one attach to it, to have now a discussion of the matter with a view to arriving at a satisfactory plan for immigration.

To my way of thinking, now that the war is over and our liberty is secure, now that we can turn our eyes inwards towards the development of this great country, there is not a single thing which is more important to the economy of Canada or to full employment than that we should have a definite policy of mass immigration.

I want to put my remarks in the strongest possible terms, because I read the other day a short pamphlet on immigration which amused me very much. Probably most members received it. It pointed out that the first objectors to immigration into Canada were the Indians, and they objected because they were afraid that one more buck would be killed by the immigrant and there would not be enough meat to go around the few thousand Indians who then inhabited the country. The article goes on to point out that there is no possible opposition to a programme of immigration except from people of the "if" and "but" school. There is no one who will get up and say, "I am opposed to immigration". That would be a ridiculous thing.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): I am opposed to mass immigration.

Mr. MERRITT: I must retract what I said. There are people who are prepared to advocate a ridiculous thing. I make no bones about where I stand. I stand for mass immigration, and I mean by mass, a very great number of people, not less than 200,000 a year over a very long period.

While I entirely agree with the member for Calgary West that it would be impossible to start immigration in the year 1946, in view of the necessity for repatriating the rest of the troops and getting a housing programme going; while I agree that it would be folly to bring people into the country if we are to continue the present type of muddling over housing, instead of getting after the housing problem and providing a housing policy that will take care as well of immigrants who do come into this country, I am perfectly satisfied that the plans must be laid now.

Let me give an illustration. All hon. members will recall the events in 1942 preceding the Battle of El Alamein. There was criticism of the Churchill government over equipment available for the troops in the preceding Gazala defeat. Mr. Churchill, speaking on that subject, pointed out that the troops which had fought at El Alamein and saved Egypt were not troops sent out by the government after the defeat in the desert. They were troops sent out before that action, with the intention of going ahead to Bengazi and Tripolitania, which was eventually done. Churchill pointed out to the house that you cannot start these great movements and bring them to completion in a moment. You must make your plans long in advance. I believe he mentioned that the time taken to transport a division from Great Britain around the cape to the middle east was six months after the executive order to proceed had been received, and the plans which the government had to lay for the campaign in the western desert were taken more than six months and sometimes as long as a year before the event about which we read in the papers. Surely the same thing exactly applies to this great problem of immigration. I shall come back to that.

For a moment I wish to turn to the reason why I say we need immigration in large numbers. The hon. member who moved the resolution was a little faint-hearted. He said that immigration would probably create more employment. I am quite satisfied that it is the one way to full employment, to increasing production which can come only from an increase in the man-power of this nation.

To the north of us we have a great new frontier and, thank goodness, we are becoming conscious of it. It is the last frontier in the world. A few days ago we had a debate on the Peace River railway, the Pacific Great Eastern. From what the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) said on that occasion

it was obvious to me that such a railway cannot be built economically with the present population in that area. There is only one way to have that railway built, and everybody knows that we need it. That is to bring into the area a population which will support the railway. That applies right across the country.

If hon. members would like to know one way to full employment, I believe I can help them. As I came east for this session I stopped off in the mining town of Geraldton in northern Ontario. I found it a pleasant little town of twenty-five hundred people. It contained two-storey buildings and every possible modern facility. It might be of passing interest to remark that very few people in the town were over forty years of age. The town exists because of four producing mines in the immediate vicinity. These people are there because of the discovery and development of these mines. I should like to have the reaction of the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) to the existence of this town. I am quite sure that if these 2,500 people were in Toronto, Winnipeg, or one of the other big centres in Canada, these ministers would be much more worried than they are to-day over employment. When I was in Geraldton I was shown pictures of the town as it existed twelve years ago. All that existed was one building. Now there is a town which compares favourably with the majority of the towns in my own province, and is greater in population than many.

The other day I suggested that it is the existence of such towns as Geraldton and others that makes it possible for the industrial and financial developments which we have in our big cities. I am convinced that no other thing makes this possible.

At the moment there is tremendous activity in the mining area of Red Lake. In the course of years we shall find the same thing happening there as happened in Geraldton. This is an area which has mines in an indefinite state of development. One can get into the area at the moment only by air. I venture to prophesy that in ten years' time there will be in that area many more than 2,500 people earning a good living for themselves and, incidentally, supporting the earnings of many people in our great industrial areas.

I come now to a second reason for an immediate programme of immigration. The reason, of course, is that in the country we should have a stable internal market upon which we may rely. I wish to make two broad generalizations in regard to this matter. I deliberately make them broad and general because this is an important broad policy which is being advocated and we should not get down to questions as to whether or not we can put two men here or three men there. It is customary to say that in Canada three out of every eight people depend on the export trade. That is advanced as an argument to keep up our export trade. I quite agree with it and often use the same figures myself. But at this time I wish to reverse the figures and say that in Canada five out of eight of our people depend for their livelihood on home trade. While we are doing a great deal for the export trade to look after the wants of three of the eight, granting $2 billion in export credits, I believe we should be doing something at the same time to care for the five, the greater number. We are spending $2 billion in export credits in order that people in foreign and empire countries may buy our consumer goods. I am all in favour of that, but we should also be considering the expenditure of considerable sums of money on the development in Canada of the capital goods necessary for a greater production of wealth.

I do not wish to become involved in a discussion on export trade, but at the moment we are worried about bilateralism in trade; we are worried about how we can import from Great Britain the amount of goods to balance the exports we make to her. If we do not reach some sound agreement, or if the Bretton Woods fund does not function in the way we all hope, then we have little chance of getting back any large part of the moneys that we are advancing to France, the Netherlands, the Netherlands Indies, Russia and other countries. We should spend some of our money in the development of our public facilities, which are our capital goods.

It is necessary to bring in people for three main purposes; first, for the full use of our transport system; second, for the full use of our government facilities, and third, and perhaps most important, so that we may spread taxation and thereby reduce the per capita taxation in the country.

No matter how economically we behave—and, goodness knows, this government is not behaving economically—there is no real hope of greatly reducing the per capita taxation unless we increase the number of people who are paying taxes in this country, and increase them substantially indeed. Any hon. member who has travelled across the continent on either of the great railway systems will have a vivid picture of the International Limited

line along the north shore of lake Ontario and the railway line across the continent. In the one case it will be found that there is a sizable city of twenty thousand people or so every fifty miles for several hundred miles on that line. If one leaves Vancouver to come east he will find that he has to travel three hundred miles before he comes to Kamloops. I do not dare to brave the criticism of the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) by trying to say how many people live there, but I know it is less than ten thousand. In all those three hundred miles one finds not towns, hardly villages, just settlements of several hundred people clustered around the railway station. That is no way to get freight costs down and lessen the cost of distribution of our produce in the country. If you want to talk about taxation, look at the civil service here in Ottawa. The civil service of Canada and of the provinces is very much greater in numbers, I understand, than the civil service of Great Britain, a country with four times as many people. We have to bear the cost of that civil service, of course, because of our tremendous distances, but there is no reason in the world—

Mr. CLAXTON: Has the hon. gentleman any figures on which to base that statement? It seems very surprising.

Mr. MERRITT: I have no figures, and I may be wrong, but for the purposes of my argument I will agree that the numbers are equal.

Mr. MITCHELL: You are wrong even in that.

Mr. GRAYDON: Have you the figures over there?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have the figures for the labour department, 55,000.

Mr. GRAYDON: You may be wrong, too.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am right.

Mr. MERRITT: I am perfectly happy to leave it in this way, that whatever may be the comparison between our civil service and that of any other country, we have far too many civil servants in comparison with our total population.

I now want to come to another point, which to me is very important. We want a policy of immigration so that we may remove from the economy of this country the greatest of all tariff barriers, the embargo on human beings. I put it in that way because I think it is a vivid way of putting it. We have now an actual embargo, with very few exceptions, on the import of human beings into this country. I was most amused at the tremendous tempest in a teapot raised last session by some hon. members opposite and by the Winnipeg *Free Press* over the imposition of a twenty per cent duty on diesel engines. Of all the ridiculous things, Mr. Speaker, to raise such a row about, when the same government at the present time maintains practically an embargo on immigration!

Finally, of course, as other hon. members have mentioned, the questions of world peace and national defence also come into the picture. I need not go into these matters at length, because both have ben covered by the hon. member who introduced the resolution and by the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll). But I believe that to enable the people of Europe to have a decent, economic standard of living and so contribute toward world peace we must relieve them of part of their surplus population. The question of national defence speaks for itself. I feel sure that we shall have introduced into the house this session estimates for our armed forces based upon the decision that has been made as to their size. No doubt this will be all we can afford, but I believe every hon. member will be forced to agree they will be entirely inadequate for any kind of defence of the country. The only way we can get the money and the man-power to provide a suitable form of national defence is by increasing our population.

I now want to come to a point which explains the only difference between myself and the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) who, I see, is back in the house. The Australians say they want twenty million people, and their plan calls for seventy thousand the first year and one hundred thousand a year thereafter. For some months now they have had a committee working in the United Kingdom and on the continent—I believe headed by a cabinet minister—laying their plans and indicating their desire to accept large numbers of immigrants. Australia has given the green light to immigration. What have we done? We have done nothing so far. The other day I deliberately placed a question on the order paper to find that out. I asked how many applications had been received for immigration to Canada, and I was told that no record of applicants existed. I wish to refer to a press clipping in that connection, which appeared in January of this year in the Vancouver *Province*. In it a returned soldier who was connected with the *Maple Leaf*, the Canadian army newspaper, is quoted as having said:

Canada has done a great job of promotion over there . . . Among Belgians particularly, and among Dutch and French, there is a great desire to come to Canada. The Canadian consular office in Brussels is besieged by citizens who regard Canada as a sort of "promised land."

All servicemen met many people in Europe whom they would consider suitable to come to this country, but how in the world are we to keep those people from going to Australia or some other country unless we at least tell them now, "You have the green light, and as soon as we can make arrangements for you we will bring you in." That is what Australia did. In the pamphlet dealing with the Australian programme it is clearly stated that Australia proposes to look after the reestablishment of her veterans and her housing problem before she brings her scheme into large-scale operation, but the pamphlet also states, "But, nevertheless, all plans are being laid now." That is what I ask from this government; not that they start flooding the country this month with mass immigration, but rather that they indicate to prospective immigrants that they are going to adopt such a policy and, second, that they lay their plans and announce them as soon as possible in order that these prospective immigrants may have a choice between Australia, New Zealand and Canada and may not be forced to go to the antipodes. The government of Australia is also arranging assisted passages for veterans, and giving preference to families with young children, who they think will be the most suitable type of immigrants. I say that is right, because the greatest wealth an immigrant can bring with him is not cash in his pockets but rather his character, education and occupational skill.

When I come to the question of ccupational skill I wish to point out that all the great movements of immigration into this country in past years have been in periods of great prosperity; and in my view that prosperity has been brought about by this immigration. Why do people want to come to Canada? It is because here they have a greater hope for freedom than in their native countries, and also because they hope to be able to get capital assets in their new home. Our previous mass immigration movements have relied upon homestead lands and railway lands to give the immigrants that capital, and have relied also upon railway construction. In this new era we still have vast acreages of land available for immigrants, provided that we conduct irrigation schemes, and we still have some railways to develop. However, the public capital facilities most needed now are power projects, irrigation schemes and things of that kind, as well as housing; and it is my view that the government should coordinate a mass immigration programme with the provision of these capital requirements, in order to allow the immigrants to catch on in the country. Comparatively speaking, it would not cost the government a very great sum of money to do that. There can be no doubt that private business would respond to the challenge and would respond to the promise that their markets would be continuously extended in the very near future.

We have in this country a great need for the development of communications and for the development of housing. I have seen an estimate that this country needs at the present time 700,000 housing units. Of course, if we brought in more people, more housing units would be required. As I have mentioned, we need irrigation and water and power supply. I have here a pamphlet of the Canadian construction association stating that the post-war projected works will total over three billion dollars.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the motion before the house deals with immigration.

Mr. MERRITT: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, if I am straying from the subject matter of the motion. What possible hope have we of expending vast sums like that, made up partly of public money and partly of private money, if we are not going to share the benefits of those works and the costs of those works among an expanding and quickly expanding population?

I close my remarks by reiterating one important point. The decision as to whether mass immigration into this country is to be permitted cannot be left to the time when we propose to allow immigrants to start coming in. A decision must be made, now, for two reasons. One is so that the people whom we propose to attract here will know they have a chance of coming and will not make other arrangements. Second, this policy should be decided and announced now so that people in this country, not only in the government but in private walks of life may know the kind of economy we may expect in the post-war years and be able to make plans and gear their businesses to the type of economy that has been decided upon by the government. I hope that we shall have no "if" or "but" opposers of immigration and that a plan will be announced with all the necessary safeguards within the next few months.

Mr. L. PHILIPPE PICARD (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, whether mass immigration is a wise policy or opposition to mass immigration is ridiculous cannot be decided as lightly as the hon. member (Mr. Merritt) has just done. Peopling a country is not like packing sardines into a tin. The question of immigration and the possibilities of our country providing a decent standard of living for a much larger population has been a matter of great concern to economists who have failed to be in agreement with one another on the matter and who have not tried to dispose of the matter as lightly as has the hon. gentleman.

I think it was quite appropriate that the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Thatcher) should bring in this resolution. I may not be in agreement with all those on this side, but I think within the life of this parliament, if not during the life of this session, this country should determine its immigration policy. It is highly necessary that we know where we stand on the question. People outside Canada should know what to expect from this country.

The immigration laws have been too elastic and, if I may say so, the administration of those laws has been more or less of a hodge-podge during the last thirty years. Fortunately, the branch has been under able ministers, and under every government there have been conscientious civil servants carrying on this work, to whom I am pleased to pay a compliment, both to those who have retired as well as to those who are still in office. But the fact remains that for the last twenty-five or thirty years Canada has had no definite immigration policy and has had also very unsatisfactory immigration laws.

I do not intend to discuss all the details of the problems of immigration, but I should like to touch upon two questions that have been mentioned by some of the previous speakers. First, it has been said that Canada is empty, that Canada needs a much larger population if we are to dispose of our surpluses or of our production, whether in agricultural fields or in industry. That brings up the argument for mass immigration which has been so ably presented by the hon. member who has just spoken but with whom I cannot agree.

There is another school of thought which contends that we should have an open door for anyone who comes from the British isles and a door kept only partly open for those who do not come from the British isles. I am opposed to that line of thinking and I intend to say a few words about it. There is another school of thought which opposes all immigration, and again I am opposed to that. It seems that I am against everything. But the fact of the matter is, I think a happy medium could be found in the form of functional immigration, and I shall say a few words about this before I close my remarks.

Dealing with the argument of those who say that this country is empty, I think it would be interesting to note what studies have been made in the past by economists and others who have dealt with this problem. I believe statistics were quoted last session to show that Canada could have a population of 100,000,000 people or at least 80,000,000. I have tried to find some information on this matter, and I remembered having been in Hamilton in 1943 when I heard Professor Dawson of McGill university discussing this question. As I could not remember all his argument I got hold of the text of his lecture. I find that people are far from agreeing with one another as to our possible maximum population. Those who have looked into this matter seriously put their estimates much lower than those who estimate between 80,000,000 and 100,000,000. I should like to quote from Professor Dawson's work because I think he is much more eminently versed than I and many other hon. members are in this matter. Speaking on May 24, 1943, as president of the Canadian political science association, Professor Dawson said:

> In recent years we have heard much about the so-called overpopulated and underpopulated countres. The crudest form in which notions of this kind are presented is in terms of number of people per square mile of land surface. By this device Canada's 2½ per square mile seems to demonstrate obvious underpopulation as compared with England's 390, forgetting that this 390 involves resources not only at home but also abroad.

It must be remembered that the population of the British isles does not thrive only upon the exploitation of the land. It exists mainly through trade and commerce. This is one argument that will be brought up in a short time when the question of the British loan is before us, which loan I will approve. I say that now in order to reassure some of my hon. friends. The argument will be advanced that Britain must import from the outside considerable materials which she in turn manufactures into finished products. British shipping thereby profits by hauling these products, and considerable capital is also made by the manufacture or treatment of these goods while in the country before they are exported to other countries as finished products. I might use the following as an example: if my hon. friend the member for Beauce (Mr. Dionne) succeeds in his negotiations, and I am told that they are about completed, we shall be able to manufacture in Canada some

rayon or celanese. Formerly a pulp made out of British Columbia wood was sent to Britain and there converted into rayon or celanese and then brought back to Canada and sold at a considerable profit. It was just a small item in the list of raw materials processed in Great Britain, but from now on, because of the ability and initiative of the hon. member for Beauce, a factory is being organized in the city of Quebec to treat and manufacture the pulp and make the finished product here.

But I am getting away from my first argument, that Britain can support a population much greater than ours because of its highly industrialized areas and by importing goods from all parts of the world and manufacturing them in Britain into finished products, thereby giving work to a very much larger population than its own resources alone would permit.

Those who base Canada's possible population on her area, on the surface of land, fail to take into account the actual conditions within the country. We seem to be on safer ground when we follow Professor Dawson and take the arable land surface as a base for presenting population densities.

I have often said that instead of having a nice red map of Canada in our school books we should show, in white, what parts of this country are covered with ice and snow and are not occupied and cannot be lived in except perhaps by a musk-ox expedition. Then we should show, in a light colour, perhaps in pink, —I did not say rose—the areas which can be inhabited part of the year, and finally show in a stronger shade those parts where there is arable land.

But to come back to Professor Dawson, if we figure out our population according to the arable land surface, we see that Canada is not so vacant because we have 121 people per square mile of arable land, which is vastly different from the figures that are used by some people who say that we could have a population equal to that of the United States, if not larger. Professor Dawson says:

> The arable land index should be supplemented by indices of available minerals, and closely allied items.

And so on. Nevertheless that would not warrant Canada in having such a large population as some people advocate. Professor Dawson says:

> In supporting this point of view—
>
> The point of view that Canada is an empty country.
>
> —the great mass of Canadians believe that Canada is a country of boundless resources, meagrely developed and offering great opportunities for population expansion, not only by way of natural increase at home but by immigration from abroad. Our school books have built this picture into our minds. Publicists keep inflating this conception throughout our adult years.

I might in passing remind the hon. gentleman who just spoke that with sound economic conditions within the country in past years we would not have needed immigration to have a population as large as Canada has to-day. Canada could have reached her present size of population, given sound economic conditions, without immigration, just by the natural increase in population if it had not suffered from emigration. Without the policy of forced immigration which was started forty or fifty years ago, given good economic conditions, and no emigration, Canada would have been able to reach her present population by natural increase alone, and therefore I gather that the main point that we should have under consideration is that of having a government in this country that will give to Canada as good administration as we have had in the last ten years—that is the political note in this, Mr. Speaker. Let us give the people decent standards of living which will prevent them from drifting over the boundary into the United States. By doing that we shall have, through the natural increase in population, as large a population by 1980 as Canada can sustain with a standard of living comparable to that of the United States.

Economically and geographically Canada and the United States are so vastly different that we cannot compare them simply by surface area. But we must take into account also the climate and those innumerable other factors which economists consider before arriving at their conclusions. It is all very well to speak of mass immigration, but we must also consider the productivity of which the country is capable, what parts of the country are climatically habitable, and what parts of the country we can develop with a chance of providing a decent living for our people. We have to consider so much more than is taken into account by those who simply look at the map and our surface area and say that we need a vast population to provide markets for our products. But first of all, people must have productive and remunerative work. They must have land which they can till or industries where they can be employed. Let us agree that Canada needs a larger population than she now has. But we do not need mass immigration, as some hon. gentlemen on the other side are advocating. Far from it.

Professor Dawson in his conclusions is quite conservative. Others are a little more optimistic. Professor Dawson says:

> The shock of disillusionment enters Canadian minds when someone points out that in terms of its population possibilities Canada, like Australia, is a relatively small country and not as big as the United States. The Canadian shield and other non-arable mountainous areas comprise most of Canada. The remaining land surface is roughly 1,000,000 square miles, of which approximately 550,000 square miles is available for potential agricultural settlement, much of it very problematical. Less than one-half of this is now occupied. These latter figures give a clue to Canada's size in terms of potential settlement.

As I said before, one must not simply look at the map, because these other factors have to be taken into consideration. Professor Dawson goes on:

> The pressure of the forces of nature against the settlement process in Canada is further indicated by the fact that we have been able to absorb only a portion of those available.
>
> For the past two decades the prairie region has become an area of emigration rather than immigration. There will be some further expansion in farm acreage, but this will take place more slowly and with greater difficulty.

Now, for my friends of the prairies, Professor Dawson has this advice:

> This expansion will offer a limited opportunity even for those who live on the prairies.

The development is not illimitable. There are limits to the development of the prairies, and those who have made a thorough study of the question have realized it. Professor Waines, in his study called "Prairie Population Possibilities," which has been published under the auspices of the Rowell-Sirois commission, has this to say:

> The material presented in this review affords no basis for the belief that the presently unexploited resources of the prairie provinces are capable of supporting large additions to the present population. Assuming a continuance of present factors it appears that the prairie provinces will not find it easy in the early future to support their own natural increase, and that any attempt to enhance the population by assisted immigration or land settlement schemes will probably merely accentuate to that degree the present emigration.

That is not my statement; it is from a professor who was considered versed enough or enlightened enough on such questions to be called by the Rowell-Sirois commission to prepare a study for their consideration on that matter. To go back to Professor Dawson, I might add this statement of his:

> In terms of our climate, resources and competitive location, the evidence points against any marked expansion of occupational opportunities.

[Mr. Picard.]

Which is another thing to be considered.

> Indeed we may be pushed to the limit to give chances for livelihood to our present population as augmented by natural increase.

I have considered this question objectively, as has been my habit through life, to try to find out the facts. I had no preconceived ideas. I do not get them from any newspaper, whether in my city or province or elsewhere. I just want to try to have an opinion of my own on the question. I have tried to find the arguments on both sides. When I was with the late Mr. Lapointe I was fortunate in that he received a great deal of information on immigration from all kinds of immigration societies, and I retained it for my own use when the files were disposed of. Some expressed very eloquently the belief that we should be the second British empire, the heart of the British empire, and bring all the British isles over here—which might be easy to do geographically but not so practical ethnically. My mind has been much more satisfied on this question by the studies of Professor Dawson, as well as those of Professor Forsey, from which I shall quote in a moment. Frankly, I believe that no hon. member should approach this question with a biased mind. There are some, in my province and elsewhere, who say that we do not want anybody; that we are satisfied to be alone: there are others who say, let us open the doors to our friends on condition they are of our own racial stock. My opinion is different, and I shall give it as I conclude my remarks. But I beg every hon. member, when he considers this question, whether he is now inclined to one side or the other, to open his mind to arguments from the other side, and then to try to find where lies the happy medium for our country. I do not think the solution is to be found in mass immigration; I do not think it is to be found through the closed door. There is bound to be a happy medium.

Professor Dawson is more conservative than anybody else. He has devoted many years, he says, to incidental studies of the question; that is, he has not spent many years in an exclusive study of it but has given quite a lengthy period of time throughout his life to incidental studies of the matter, and he comes to a conclusion which, to me, seems a bit pessimistic, that Canada could give a standard of living comparable to that of the United States to a population of only eighteen million people. As I say, I think that may be pessimistic, although the man is much better versed in economy than I can be. Professor Forsey is inclined to go to a limit of thirty million; yet he himself admits that

that may be stretching the possibilities of the country. He says that it cannot be foreseen, that it depends on the development of economic trends throughout the world, and on many other factors on which the figures cannot be available, and on problems of which he cannot foresee the solution, but he thinks the most optimistic appraisal could reach that figure. That might be put into the possession of those who, when they go back to Britain, and sit on commissions to investigate conditions in Canada, come to conclusions somewhat like that Australian professor who used to say that we could have on our eastern shores about one hundred million people, or, including the eastern shores of the United States and Canada, about 130,000,000 in that part alone. Such fantastic figures cannot be supported by anybody. The most conservative figure is 18,000,000. The most optimistic implies, as Professor Forsey says, the possibility of extending our arable lands farther to the north, climatic changes, and improvements in the possibilities of inhabiting cold climates, as have been attempted in Siberia and certain parts of Russia. But taking all these things into account, and trying to be fair to those who believe that Canada can maintain a huge population, he concludes that we cannot reach a figure higher than I have mentioned. As Professor Forsey says:

> It is not a question of how many human beings can squash into a particular territory, nor even of how much that territory can physically be made to produce, cost what it may, it is a question of costs and markets.

It is not a question of sending people there and saying, we will put them there even if it means a loss; we must have people in that part of the country. If we want to have in Canada a sound economy we must make sure that the people who are located anywhere will produce at a marked advantage to the economy of the country in general. Professor Forsey says:

> We might, for example, divide the nine million acres of unoccupied "agricultural" land in the northwest territories into 56,250 farms of 160 acres each, and we might succeed in growing a crop on them. But how much would it cost? And where could we sell it, and at what price? Of the already occupied farm land in Canada only about 38·5 per cent is actually in use.

That refers to the amount which is occupied. Maybe only half of the potential arable land is occupied, but even where it may be usable from a climatic point of view, much of the land does not lend itself to cultivation with profit, because the geographic conditions are such that the land cannot be profitably operated. It is not worth while to cultivate it because, says Professor Forsey:

> . . . the produce costs too much to grow; because markets are too restricted or too far away, or both; because of European and American tariffs, quotas and embargoes.

It is admitted by everybody that the farmer can no longer live directly off his land except at an exceedingly low standard of living. On the pre-depression standards of western Canada, says Professor Dawson, he had to buy two-thirds of his living necessities. No civilized man could be expected to obtain all his wants out of the products of nature.

These are the aspects of the argument which have convinced me that geographically Canada cannot accept a vast immigration scheme, having regard to its natural growth, as we have seen it in the past. As I said before, had there been no emigration from Canada, and no forced immigration, our population to-day would be exactly what it is. Let us give the country a sound economical administration and we shall retain the people we have without being under the necessity of bringing in 200,000 a year, as someone suggested.

There is another point. Some people say that we should throw our doors open to immigration from the British isles. I have no prejudice at all against anyone from the British isles. I have visited Great Britain quite often and have been well received there, and I have admired the qualities of the British people, not only as empire builders but in many other ways. Although I am of French descent, I do not mind saying that on one occasion a scene I witnessed brought tears to my eyes. I see some of my hon. friends smiling, but that was my reaction to the union jack. I was cruising on the Adriatic and our ship was supposed to enter the Bay of Kotor in Jugoslavia. We were told that we had to be up by 5.30 a.m., and though that was not in keeping with my habits, I did get up. As the sun was dispersing the mists of the morning we saw sombre masses on the water not very far from our cruise ship, and we heard a bugle call. Presently a flag was hoisted and it was the union jack. The whole Mediterranean fleet was at anchor in that vast bay. I was surrounded by Americans, and, though it may sound queer to some hon. gentlemen, I did have a feeling of pride at the thought that I was a British subject.

I take people exactly as I find them for what they are, and when it comes to immigration I consider them from the point of view of what they can give the country. I cannot believe that opening our doors wide to any-

one who is British is necessarily the best thing for Canada, and in the few minutes left to me I shall illustrate my view on this point. In my opinion we should consider immigration in relation to certain groups which I shall enumerate.

The first group, comprising people who are educated and who at the same time have money, will prefer to stay at home. Those who have established businesses and business connections will normally remain in their own country rather than come to Canada. We might have some people from other European countries who, having suffered as they have done, are willing to take whatever capital they have left and come here and buy land, or establish a business in Canada. Anyone in Britain who is well off will not, however, come to Canada merely for the sake of helping us.

The second group will comprise those people who have a little capital and who desire to emigrate. Such people will do as they did before the war. They will go to India, if they are still welcome there, or they will go to Burma, where cheap labour costs have in the past produced substantial profits. Those people, having a little money, will invest it where it will bring them the greatest financial returns and they will not come here simply to increase the population of Canada or to provide more profits here. People in the British isles who have capital and who are willing to come could be the preferred ones; I grant even that to you, but we should not exclude people from other countries who also have capital and who are willing to invest it here. But there should be no hide-and-seek capital as there was at one time to circumvent our immigration laws. At that time someone would deposit $1,000 in a bank in Canada in the name of So-and-so, some prospective immigrant, who would come into the country, and after that capital had remained in the bank for a few months, it was transferred back to the society overseas and deposited again in the name of someone else, another immigrant, to enable that person to come into the country. That applied, of course, to non-British because the same condition was not demanded of people from the British isles. But that practice was carried on extensively.

I would be willing to give priority but not exclusivity to people from the British isles who wish to bring in their capital and settle here, but I do not believe that many would come. I believe that they would rather stay at home. I do not blame them; they have a beautiful country and naturally they prefer to stay there.

[Mr. Picard.]

In the third group there are those people who have had a fairly good education but who are not technicians or specialists. They are not people who have business connections. They prefer England, but they are willing to make sacrifices in order to go to some other country, provided that conditions are acceptable. I met one such person on the train not long ago. He said to me, "You should hold out some inducement to us. We are somebody and we should be sure of having jobs when we come here, instead of being left at the caprice, at the mercy of someone in Canada. We are somebody, and the moment we come in we should be given special treatment."

Well, in my opinion they are no better than the people our universities turn out from Halifax to Vancouver. They are not specialists, but ordinary, well-educated people, and we have many such people in Canada who are quite capable of filling the jobs that are available. We should not throw our doors open to those people. They are no better than our people because they come from the British isles. I have said to such people, "The Canadian Pacific Railway company, the Canadian National and many large corporations, and even the civil service of Canada have given you enough preference in the past, but that should not be extended indefinitely except in the case of experts and technicians."

We have to develop the country, but at the same time we must see that our people have a decent standard of living. The people we need are experts and technicians, not simply clerks. Those we can find in our own schools. This person with whom I had the conversation on the train also said to me, "In order to induce us to face the rigours of your climate and to adapt ourselves to your way of life you should give us some special consideration." I do not agree with this. In Ontario, in Quebec and in the west there are many young men from our schools who are quite capable of managing our companies or of being clerks. We do not need to get such people from outside.

The fourth group comprises skilled labourers of whom there is a scarcity. We have a scarcity of certain technicians. I am in favour of bringing in such people either from the British isles or from the continent, because we need leather chemists, glass experts, textile experts and so on. We should open our doors to them without too many restrictions. It would be for the good of the country.

I would not close the door to anyone who could be useful and help to make Canada a

greater country. Far from it. This group of people, whether from the British isles or from the continent, should be allowed to come in. I do not mind having them come from the British isles if they qualify.

The fifth group is that of unskilled labourers, unemployed persons or persons who were on the dole before they went into the army in England. They are not adaptable to Canada and they are not the people we need—at any rate until our conditions are sufficiently stabilized and we know that we can go through the after-war period without a depression and without any lowering of our productive capacity. We must make sure that we can provide work for our own population and maintain our own standard of living. If this is not assured, we must not extend our facilities to others.

I am opposed to mass immigration of this type of people. Let me illustrate this with an incident that was related to me by a former minister of the crown who is now sitting on a commission. He told me he had a large farm in the west. At the time we had opened our doors to unemployed miners from Wales or elsewhere who had not worked for a long time. They came on his farm and he said to me: "We were asking our people to get up early and work all day, to eat as much as they could. We had wagons on the farm with beans and everything they wanted to eat. They could eat ten times a day, but they had to work from sunup to sundown." He said, "After a day or two these people said, 'What about union hours?'" They did not want to work from sunup to sundown. They were not used to that. They were fed up with the condition and he was fed up with them, and most of these people drifted back to Winnipeg and other cities, and finally clogged the labour market. Some of them were not much of an asset to the country and many of them had to be repatriated overseas. I do not think that type of people can be of much use to Canada at the moment. I am still amazed if that is what is proposed by some people.

We have now come to the point where conclusions should be arrived at. If Canada had functional immigration, that is immigration of people who would become an asset to the country, it would be all to the good. We cannot foresee how future generations may turn out. They may turn out to be bad citizens, but we can at least make sure that the first generation which comes in will be useful.

I would welcome to Canada, as I indicated in my remarks, first the people with capital who wish to buy land or to establish a business in Canada. We need the type of people who can provide capital, and they should be welcomed regardless of the part of the world from which they come. The second class is specialists. We need them. There the advice of experts in economy and in the labour movement could be obtained. We should determine that and have quotas. Specialists, technicians, scientists, physicians, engineers and highly-trained people should be welcomed to Canada. We have need for them in many fields of endeavour. Skilled labourers may be a great asset to the country.

I would limit the people who come in just because they have a relative in the country. At the moment I believe the law is that wives and unmarried children under eighteen years of age joining family heads already established in Canada may be admitted. That is all right, and I agree with it, but I think in the past the policy has been to extend it to the seventh cousin on both sides. That permits a lot of people to come in because one man is already in Canada. Many of these people may not be of the same high standard as the one who has already arrived in Canada. I looked up the regulations as they existed a few years ago and they would appear to be all right. It mentioned wives and unmarried children, father and mother. I would even include brothers and sisters if they can qualify. They should be given preferred treatment, but it should not extend to the seventh cousin as has been done in the past.

Formerly farmers bringing capital sufficient to establish them on the land were admitted, but we should demand guarantees from these people. There should not be a transfer of money from one person to another and the land held nominally in the name of So-and-so to permit them to get in, and then the land sold within three months with the result that Joe ends up in Winnipeg, Montreal or some other city and the land passes to the association and another man enters on that land. We must have some security to make sure that the man who comes to settle on the land intends to settle on the land and does not want to enter another business in Montreal, Vancouver or Winnipeg.

I am against both extremes in this matter, whether they come from my province or my party or elsewhere, or from any particular group which says, "let us not open the door; let us keep it closed; it is dangerous to Canada." We need new people in limited number provided that they can be useful. I am against mass immigration of people without taking into consideration the service that they may render to the country. I am in favour of some immigration, not because

they will eat our food, but because they can produce something without taking the place of some of our workers, because they can occupy land which can be cultivated; not just to bring them in for the sake of packing sardines in a tin. Let us allow these people to come in who may be an asset to Canada, and let us keep the others out whatever their racial origin may be.

I think this was an opportune time for the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Thatcher) to bring this problem to the attention of the government and of the house. We must have the courage to face this matter within the life of this parliament. I am not in a hurry as other hon. members may be and say that it must be done this year. Because of the opinions I have expressed I do not believe there is any hurry about it. Within a reasonable time we must have the courage to face the situation and to formulate an immigration policy so that the population may know where it stands as far as the expansion of the country is concerned and that people in other lands may know what they can expect from us. This problem should be tackled within a reasonable time. Let us do it within the life of this parliament.

Mr. L. W. SKEY (Trinity): I wish to take about two or three minutes of the time of the house to discuss this question. In my six months in the House of Commons I have already spoken three times on this subject. I feel that there has been enough said to-day and on other occasions thoroughly to convince the members of the house that immigration is one of Canada's most pressing problems at the present time. I can see only three possible solutions for the government to take. The first is to do nothing as has been done over the past few years. The second is to announce a quota which will permit people from other countries to come to Canada. I say that because lack of knowledge of what the government intends to do is causing real hardship in the country, read hardship amongst those Canadians who are interested in bringing their relatives and loved ones here. As I see it, the third solution is immediately to set up a committee on this problem, study the various aspects of it and bring down a report this session, if possible.

I was one of those who curtailed his remarks last session because I understood that a committee had been promised and would be set up this session. So far, we have had no announcement from the minister on this subject. In fairness to hon. members, who like me, understood that there would be a committee this session, the government should make some announcement on this subject.

[Mr. Picard.]

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): When we review the history of immigration before, during and after the war as set out in the splendid bluebook of the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen) it will be found that something should be done first of all for Great Britain. What Great Britain suffered in the war and is suffering to-day is something that should be considered, particularly with regard to those who wish to come to this country. I urge on the government that we should have a forward, courageous immigration policy adapted to Canada's circumstances. I do not mean by this that we should interfere with the employment of our own people who have been overseas, and others, but the time has come for a forward policy on immigration to let the empire know what our policy is for the three main problems of empire trade, defence and immigration within the empire, especially the latter.

After all the British people have suffered, surely we should take some steps along the lines taken by New Zealand and Australia on assisted passages for them and come at once to some agreement with them in connection with immigration adapted to our circumstances. I believe some consideration should also be given to some of those French soldiers who were on the side of the allies during the war. However, until such time as conditions improve, I believe immigration from the continent of Europe should be largely restricted for a short period of time, though in my opinion we should have in the first primary class assisted passages and other forms of assisted immigration from the British isles, though not to interfere with absorption in employment for our own soldiers and citizens.

I believe those are the three cardinal principles that should be laid down. I do not want to see the unrestricted emigration we had after the last war and between the two wars, when nearly 1,250,000 unemployed people left Canada for the United States because they could not find employment here. Those figures were given in a return tabled in the house, and they included many thousands of Canadian soldiers who had fought for their country at the hazard of their lives. Where did they go? They went mainly to the United States, owing to conditions here resulting from the trade and other policies of the government.

In conclusion, I urge upon the minister that we should decide something right away. This is a very important question. First comes migration within the empire. What is

to be done to help those who assisted us during the war? I believe British immigration should come first; then migration within the empire; in the next place we have a large number coming from the United States who must be considered. Then the continent of Europe, with priority for our allies there, must be considered. In my opinion we should not bring refugees here from Europe only to become a charge on the municipalities, as happened after the last war. Let us carefully consider this matter and send them aid. I was the head of a municipality at that time, and I can tell you that refugees were brought from all parts of the world, with the result that some of them became a charge on the taxpayers of our cities and towns and on real estate. I have great sympathy for the refugees and their suffering, but I believe there are conditions within our own empire which should receive prior consideration. So that I think the time has come when the government should not be afraid to tell the people of Canada and the people of the empire what their policy is, and adopt a forward policy like those of Australia and New Zealand, for if we do not come to some agreement in connection with immigration all these people will go to Australia and New Zealand. Many people in Britain desiring to come to Canada are key men who are badly needed in various skilled industries in this dominion. I am sure many industries will be very glad to get people of this kind, many of whom they cannot get in this country, and so aid reconversion and production. Therefore I urge upon the minister that some definite action should be taken almost immediately, and a government plan announced at once, so that the house and the country may know what it is.

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this resolution may I say that the discussion to-day has been particularly gratifying to me because I believe I was the first to raise the question of our immigration policy in this parliament. No doubt this matter has been discussed on previous occasions, but I brought it up in the house last September, and again a little later on. The expressions of opinion we have heard from all sides to-day have been very helpful. Whatever may be the ultimate fate of the resolution, I believe the discussion will show that all parties in this house are interested in this most important question, and it will give the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen) an opportunity to place before the house his opinions and whatever plans may be ready.

I believe the question of immigration can be divided into two main categories. First there is the long-range policy, which has been particularly discussed up to the present, and then the immediate policy.

On motion of Mr. Zaplitny the debate was adjourned.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Charles H. Larose, Esquire, Acting Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Administrator desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the deputy of His Excellency the Administrator had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name royal assent to the following bills:

Bill No. 11, an act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1947.

Bill No. 12, an act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1946.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

Thursday, April 4, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STEEL COMPANY OF CANADA EMPLOYEES—CONCILIATION BOARD

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last I promised a reply to the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) as to whether a request had been received from the united steelworkers union to convene a joint conference of the steel manufacturers and representatives of the steelworkers union to discuss the matter of wage increases. I think the best answer would be for me to refer my hon. friend to *Hansard* of September 12, 1945, page 111, where my colleague the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) answered a similar question put by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell).

I feel that I should, however, state that negotiations are going on in respect to em-

ployees of the Steel Company of Canada of Hamilton. At the suggestion of the Minister of Labour for Ontario, Hon. Charles Daley, a conciliation officer was appointed and reported that a conciliation board should be constituted.

The board has been established, the members being His Honour Judge M. A. Millar, Mr. J. S. D. Tory, K.C. and Mr. J. E. McGuire.

I have not as yet received a report from the conciliation board. However, I have every expectancy that a solution will be found.

Of course, the conciliation board will not be dealing with the question of wages. The employees are asking for increases and will, of course, apply through the regional board for Ontario, and, if dissatisfied with the decision, may appeal to the national board.

I am informed the situation is that the application is under consideration by the regional board at Toronto.

I should mention that negotiations are going on in connection with an application for an increase in wages of certain employees of the steel mill at Sydney. In this case a decision of the Nova Scotia regional war labour board has been appealed to the national board and a hearing is scheduled to take place in a few days.

Under the regulations those doing the collective bargaining for the employees in the various steel plants are as far as I am aware conducting their business through the boards established for this purpose in the regular way, and I am very hopeful that a mutually satisfactory settlement of all differences will be reached.

While I am answering the question of the hon. member for Vancouver East on this subject, I deprecate "strike talk". Every once in a while I read in the papers or hear on the radio that someone, and I often wonder who the someone is, is predicting a strike. In my judgment it would be much better if the predictions were all to the effect that a settlement was going to take place. Indeed it might not be out of place, Mr. Speaker, to mention that out of 3,478 cases which have been before the national and regional labour relations boards, strikes have only taken place in eight cases which in my judgment is a very good record, and I compliment both labour and management for this record.

JUDGES ACT

JUDGES NOT TO ACT AS COMMISSIONERS OR ARBITRATORS—TO BE BOUND BY DECISION OF COURT OF FINAL APPEAL

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 13, to amend the Judges Act.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

Hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. CHURCH: The proposed bill amends what is known as the Judges Act, chapter 105 of the revised statutes of 1927. The amendment consists of two sections. Section 1 provides that judges appointed by the parliament of Canada are not to act as commissioners or arbitrators on any commission or inquiry. The frequency of recent years with which judges are drafted for all kinds of such work impairs the efficient administration of justice and sometimes causes congestion in the law courts, and, as they are largely only fact-finding commissions when appointed, they duplicate the efficient powers and functions of parliament, of the committees thereof, and of the many outside boards of recent innnovation in war work. This causes delays; and they are slowly building up a system of judicial commission government in Canada.

The second section deals with judges to be bound by decisions of the courts of final appeal—the privy council or any other court of final appeal; the decisions of such courts are authoritative. The legal maxim or doctrine known as *stare decisis* is adopted in this amendment, and this bill will be law for all Canada, notwithstanding the provisions of any law, statute, usage, custom, or doctrine of law to the contrary. Decided cases which lay down a rule of law are authoritative and must be followed. Decisions of the judicial committee of the privy council, as the court of last resort, will be binding on all Canadian courts.

Motion agreed and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK—APPLICATIONS FOR LOANS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many applications, by provinces (a) have been made; (b) have been granted, for loans under the Industrial Development Bank?
2. What is the total amount, by provinces, of loans so granted?

Mr. MAYHEW: 1 and 2: The Industrial Development Bank is not a branch of the dominion government but a subsidiary of the Bank of Canada.

Section 29 (1) of the Industrial Development Bank Act requires that "The bank shall, within twenty-one days following the end of each calendar month, make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance in such form as he may prescribe, a statement of its assets and liabilities at the close of business on the last day of the preceding month." This statement as at February 28, 1946, appeared

in the *Canada Gazette* of March 23, 1946, and showed loans and investments (excluding dominion government securities) at $1,794,472.07.

In addition, section 29 (2) provides that "The bank shall make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance at least once in its fiscal year or more frequently if so directed by the minister, in such form as he may prescribe, a classification of loans and investments and of the loans guaranteed by it." This return, tabled in the House of Commons on December 6, 1945, showed that on September 30, 1945, there were 80 authorized credits on the books of the bank totalling $3,198,050, of which $871,752 was outstanding as shown by the balance sheet.

The classification of loans and investments by provinces at September 30, 1945, was shown by this return as follows:

	Authorized	Outstanding
Prince Edward Island	$	$ .....
Nova Scotia	115,000	.....
New Brunswick	200,000	66,064
Quebec	1,052,500	459,912
Ontario	1,192,550	212,189
Manitoba	335,000	105,000
Saskatchewan	30,000	17,100
Alberta	135,500	.....
British Columbia and Territories	137,500	11,487
	$ 3,198,050	$ 871,752

WAR ASSETS—COMMODITIES SOLD FOR FOREIGN ACCOUNTS

Mr. PROBE:

1. What surplus commodities have been sold by War Assets Corporation or other agencies to or for foreign accounts since V-E day and what unit amounts of each have been disposed of to each country involved and at what sale price?

2. Where paid for other than by cash, what amounts are now owing to Canada by each country involved?

3. What firms or individuals, if any, have received or will receive commissions on the sales mentioned in question (1) and to what amounts each?

Mr. HOWE: This question comes in the class of those which can be more conveniently and more fully answered in the committee which is dealing with War Assets Corporation. The hon. member who asked the question is a member of that committee, and the officers will be in attendance there who can give first-hand answers to the questions asked. In addition I would point out that we have large contracts being negotiated with two or three countries, and it would be very difficult indeed to bring down a reply at this particular time. I hope the question can be dropped.

Question dropped.

SALES TAX—CALEDONIA FARMS LIMITED

Mr. PROBE:

1. Has the Caledonia Farms Limited made restitution of the $40,000 sales tax deficiencies claimed by the Department of National Revenue following the companies breach of the Special War Revenue Act?

2. If not, what was the settlement arrived at with respect to the unpaid sales tax?

Mr. McCANN:

1. The case tried on February 3, 1944, was not instituted by the excise division of the Department of National Revenue, but apparently by wartime prices and trade board.

An assessment for sales tax amounting to $41,808.76 against Caledonia Farms Limited was made in October, 1944.

The company was adjudged bankrupt on January 26, 1945, and a claim filed with the trustee on February 10, 1945, for the outstanding indebtedness. No dividend has yet been paid by the trustee.

2. No settlement was arrived at with respect to the unpaid sales tax.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD—FILMS WITHHELD FROM DISTRIBUTION IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

Mr. DORION:

1. From November 1, 1929 to August 1, 1944, were any films produced by the National Film Board banned in the province of Quebec for the reason they constituted communist propaganda?

2. If so, how many?

Mr. CLAXTON: 1 and 2. No, but, out of the five or six hundred films in the French and English languages issued by the national film board in Quebec since the board was established in 1939, one film was withheld from distribution in Quebec at the request of Quebec authorities. Neither this nor any film had any communistic propaganda but objection was taken to this film because of the picture presented of the Russian revolution. The film showed the fighting achievements of Russia at a time when Canadians were glad Russia was fighting on the same side we were on, and it was a definite function of the national film board to show what all our allies were doing. As the first function of the board under its act is to produce films "designed to help Canadians in all parts of Canada to understand the ways of living and the problems of Canadians in other parts," a very large number of films has been made about Quebec and its people and these have

been distributed throughout Canada and in many parts of the world. Among many of the finest films produced are "Alexis Tremblay, Habitant," "Pays de Quebec," "Pays de mon Coeur," "Chercheurs de la Mer," "Vallee des Dynamos," and "Sept Peintres de Quebec." Even now films are being prepared to show the beauties and resources of the eastern townships and the Saguenay.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

ALLOWANCE OF SURCHARGE TO MANUFACTURERS' PRICE

Mr. HAZEN:

1. How many manufacturers, if any, have been allowed to add a surcharge to the sale of their products?
2. To what products do these surcharges apply?
3. What was the date on which permission was granted to add each of these surcharges?
4. What was the amount of the surcharge in each case?
5. In what instances were additional surcharges permitted (a) what did they amount to; (b) from when did they date?
6. Are these surcharges absorbed or passed on to the consumer?

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—STAFF

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many (a) investigators; (b) other officials, officers and staff, are now in the employ of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board?
2. What amount has been paid out since the inception of the board to date, in respect of such employees, for (a) salaries; (b) fees; (c) expenses?
3. What is the total expenditure to date since the inception of the board for (a) rentals; (b) other expenditures excepting salaries, fees and expenses?

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—PROSECUTIONS—LEGAL FEES

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many prosecutions, by provinces, have been proceeded with to date for infraction of any of the regulations of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board?
2. What is the total amount of fines and costs that have been recovered?
3. (a) What is the total amount of legal fees and disbursements that have been paid to counsel and solicitors in respect of such prosecutions; (b) what amounts are still due?

CANADIAN PRISONERS OF WAR—RED CROSS

Mr. PROBE:

1. How many Canadian prisoners of war were in enemy hands in each year from 1940 to 1945?
2. How many food parcels were sent from Canada from the Red Cross or other account for distribution to Canadian prisoners of war in each enemy camp in each of these years and what was the cost of awards in each stated year?
3. How many Canadian Red Cross personnel are at present overseas, in what countries are they stationed and what is the nature of their present duties?

RADIO BROADCASTING—PROGRAMMES SPONSORED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. FRASER:

1. What departments, or agencies, of the dominion government sponsor programmes over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, or any other broadcasting stations throughout Canada or the United States?
2. What are these programmes?
3. What is the object in each case of such a broadcast?
4. What is the cost per week for each of these broadcasts?

HOUSING

REFERENCE TO 53 CANADIANS OCCUPYING ONE HOUSE IN TORONTO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. R. JACKMAN (Rosedale): I should like to ask the Minister of Reconstruction if he is prepared to supply housing accommodation to the fifty-three Canadians in Toronto, living in one house equipped with one bath, who are now threatened with eviction if the house is condemned, which matter I brought to his attention in a speech in this house on Monday, March 25.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): The question should more properly be asked of the Minister of Finance, who operates emergency shelter.

Mr. JACKMAN: I address the question, then, to the Minister of Finance. There are fifty-three people living in one house in Toronto, which house is about to be condemned, and there is no place for these people to live. I mentioned this matter on March 25 in the house, and have had no answer.

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the speech made by my hon. friend on March 25, but I will bring the case to the attention of the emergency housing authorities.

Mr. ROWE: Or the Minister of Reconstruction.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE

CLOSING DATE FOR ENTRANCE APPLICATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): Will the Minister of National Defence announce the closing date for applications for entrance

to the Royal Military College? My question is prompted by to-day's press release giving similar information about Royal Roads.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): I did not receive notice of the question. The whole matter of the future of the Royal Military College is now under consideration and I hope to be able to make a statement in that regard in the very near future.

POSTAL SERVICE

PARCELS TO NORWAY AND OTHER OVERSEAS COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): May I ask the postmaster general a question? I am informed that it takes five months to send a parcel from British Columbia to Norway and it costs a small fortune. Is there any likelihood of quicker transit and a cheaper rate in the near future for parcels dispatched to foreign countries?

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Postmaster General): I shall have to look into the question as regards Norway. I know that we are sending parcels there to-day but I do not know exactly what time it takes. I shall give an answer within a few days.

AIR FORCE

BUILDINGS AT FOOT OF YONGE STREET, TORONTO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. R. JACKMAN (Rosedale): May I ask a question of the Minister of National Defence for Air? In a Toronto newspaper there appeared a report that air force buildings at the foot of Yonge street—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The rules forbid the reading of quotations from newspapers in asking questions on the orders of the day.

Mr. JACKMAN: May I ask the minister whether air force buildings at the foot of Yonge street, which have formerly been a storage depot, are to be wrecked, or whether they will be used in helping the housing crisis now facing my own city.

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): When any buildings are no longer required by the air force they are turned over to the war assets allocation committee, and if not required by other government departments they are then turned over to War Assets Corporation, which makes the decision regarding the disposition of such buildings.

Mr. JACKMAN: I would ask the minister to apply that very general principle to the specific case which I have given him? May I have an answer?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member knows that the minister is not obliged to answer.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REPRESENTATION OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): Arising out of a Canadian press dispatch in the Hamilton *Spectator*—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McLURE: May I ask the Secretary of State this question: Is it the intention of the Secretary of State to reduce the representation of Prince Edward Island in the House of Commons from four to two members?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The question is not one that should be asked on the orders of the day.

CANADIAN ARMY

INQUIRY INTO ADMINISTRATION OF FORCES IN THE NETHERLANDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ALAN COCKERAM (York South): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence: Will the minister advise the house if and when the report of the committee of inquiry, headed by Lieutenant General Price Montague, into the administration of Canadian forces in the Netherlands will be tabled?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): These reports are never tabled in the House of Commons and therefore this one will follow the rule.

CANADA DAY

SUBSTITUTION OF WORD "CANADA" FOR WORD "DOMINION"

Mr. A. P. COTE (Matapedia-Matane) moved the second reading of bill No. 8, an act respecting Canada day.

He said: In proposing the second reading of the bill I shall not venture upon any remarks which will give rise to a protracted debate. When Dominion day was established by law as a national holiday our country was, for all practical purposes, and I have reference particularly to the 49th parallel as well as the whole expanse of the ocean, regarded as a possession or as a colony or as a plantation of the British crown, at least according to some constitutional and legal authorities,

among which is a unanimous judgment of the Court of King's Bench delivered by Lord Chief Justice Mansfield in 1774.

But since by the statute of Westminster in 1931, which statute constituted a new charter for the nations comprising the six kingdoms, Canada has achieved a new status, from the constitutional point of view the most important event since confederation. And quoting Dr. Maurice Ollivier in his book entitled "Problems of Canadian Sovereignty":

> The statute of Westminster was therefore the confirmation of the Balfour declaration at the imperial conference of 1926 to the effect that the dominions had now become "autonomous communities within the British empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another, in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the crown and freely associated as members of the British commonwealth of nations."

Therefore the appellation which may have been considered appropriate before 1931 cannot any longer be used to designate properly either our country or the day devoted to its national holiday. Furthermore, "dominion" is surely not an identification which is proper to make Canada known in its true perspective, or in any way at all either to Americans or to other peoples of the world. May I quote here my best authority, our distinguished Prime Minister:

> Incidentally, may I say that the time has come to cease speaking of "the dominions" as if they were some peculiar half-fledged type of community, and all alike in their interests and views. Such a usage leads to confusion at best, and to alibis and misrepresentation at worst. South Africa is South Africa, New Zealand is New Zealand, Australia is Australia and Canada is Canada.

Replacing the word "Dominion" by the word Canada, as far as our national holiday is concerned, will at least provide Canadians travelling outside of our country with an answer when quizzed about our national holiday—that there is a Canada day and it is on July 1, and on no other day; because for so many strangers Dominion day may as well mean New Zealand day.

The time has come, I firmly believe, our valiant men of the three armed forces having put Canada in the limelight all over the world during the conflict which has just ended, when the name of Canada should be kept in the ears and in the eyes of mankind, and at least of Canadians. Because, for a great many loyal new Canadians and perhaps for a greater number of our older citizens and their posterity, Dominion day means no more than an ordinary bank holiday. Surely it is not too early to try to give the idea to all Canadians that on July 1 they commemorate their national holiday in a true Canadian way, and that their citizenship is being given a significance on that day. I believe that Canada day bears out that message better than Dominion day.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Bill No. 8 proposes to amend a general act regarding public holidays which has been in force since confederation. In the first meeting at Charlottetown of the fathers of confederation they were unanimous in agreeing that the proposed confederation be called the "Dominion of Canada". From time immemorial we have been a dominion. We are part and parcel of the British empire. There is no reason why this bill should be introduced at this time. If the bill passes, all the history books will have to be changed. Moreover the bill is ultra vires of this parliament, because the original provinces came into confederation on a definite bargain. Speaking at Kingston in 1844, Sir John A. Macdonald said that it has always been the policy of Canada that as a dominion we are part and parcel of the British empire. Long may it continue. Had it not been for that fact we would have had the awful horror of war on our own soil. As I pointed out the other night, not only in Ontario but in Quebec and the maritime provinces we owe it to confederation that that did not happen.

I see no reason for this bill at this session of parliament. There are many bills being proposed with regard to a change in status, autonomy and sovereignty. A large body of public opinion in this country is very much alarmed at what this parliament is doing in that regard. I believe a large body of public opinion in all the provinces is against this bill. We have good history books in Quebec and in all the provinces. Confederation was brought about with the cooperation of the French people of Canada. Sir John A. Macdonald, Cartier and all the others, Liberals and Conservatives alike, made confederation possible. We have got on very well together. Like Your Honour, I have always believed in confederation and the doctrine of the old Cornish battle cry, "Each for all and all for each". What is good for one province is good for all.

The words "Dominion of Canada" were wisely selected after a great deal of consultation and thought. While we are part and parcel of the British Empire the ties are invisible under our status of autonomy and sovereignty. A million men went from the dominion in the first great war. One hundred and thirty thousand died on the field of battle. We shall always remember France, where several thousand of my own citizens

are buried until the resurrection morning. I plead with hon. members from Quebec to pay tribute where tribute is due—to Britain for saving our shores from invasion. I see no reason why we should bring up such matters as this at the present time. There are more important economic matters to be decided by this parliament so that a lead can be given to the health, peace and prosperity of all our citizens. We are wasting our time on a lot of secondary matters for political purposes that could very properly be left over until the more important matters affecting the poorer classes of citizens in all the provinces, namely, housing, health matters, fuel, clothing, food, employment, and so on, have been dealt with.

I am prepared to move in amendment, seconded by the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Ross), that the bill be not now read a second time but that it be read this day six months hence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Church moves, seconded by Mr. Ross (St. Paul's):

That bill No. 8, respecting Canada day, be not now read a second time but this day six months hence.

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): I wish to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church). At the present time I see no reason why we should repeal the Dominion Day Act. We are the Dominion of Canada, and Dominion day signifies something; it signifies the bringing together of all the provinces of Canada in one great country, the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. IRVINE: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understood Your Honour had put the motion and that it was voted down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The debate is continuing.

Mr. SPEAKER: The house has before it a bill proposed by the hon. member for Matapedia-Matane (Mr. Cote). I read the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church).

Mr. IRVINE: Is the six months' hoist debatable?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): For seventy-five years we have had Dominion day. All our history springs from the joining together of all the provinces of Canada, one by one, and that is the day which we celebrate. We celebrate the bringing together under Macdonald and Cartier of the two great races of this country. I see no reason why this controversy should be injected into our national life. Many people will take sides on this matter. All of our children know Dominion day; they have been brought up to know what it means. Our history books show what it means. To me Dominion day means that we have a great nation. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. J. E. SMITH (York North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Matapedia-Matane (Mr. Cote), who introduced this bill. We in Ontario have known the hon. gentleman for many years as an advocate of real, virile Canadianism and a true friend of Canadian unity. I also appreciate the views of hon. members from the city of Toronto, and give them credit for sincerity in their attitude toward this question. However, I do take issue with them when they state that this is not an important matter.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to rise in support of this bill, because I sincerely believe that by its adoption we can make a real contribution to Canadian national life. To-day we look out on a troubled world, a world bleeding and suffering after six long years of war. Here in our own country we have problems so perplexing and of such magnitude that sometimes I confess to a feeling of discouragement. I submit that in dealing with our national problems and in facing up to the problems of the world we must get down to a consideration of fundamentals. One great need in Canada to-day is for a patriotic siprit of determination to win the peace, comparable to the splendid spirit of patriotic determination shown by the people of Canada in the winning of the war. During the war years the Canadian people met every challenge with which they were faced during the most trying period in Canadian history. It did not matter whether the challenge was in connection with men for our armed services, whether is was in connection with money for victory loans, for the Red Cross, for munitions and supply, for food or for whatever cause it may have been; the challenge was successfully met, no matter what the sacrifice. That was the spirit in which we made our splendid contribution toward the winning of the war, and I submit that is the sort of spirit we need to win the peace.

During the long, trying years of conflict we spoke freely and hopefully of the new era which was to come after the war. The men in our fighting forces on the far-flung battle lines throughout the world were encouraged and buoyed up by the belief that they were

fighting for a new world, a new era which they, their comrades and their loved ones at home would enjoy. They looked forward to that new day which would come when the forces of evil, as represented by our enemies, would be destroyed. Those enemies have been destroyed, and now we must face up to the fact that the post-war era of which we spoke so much is here. Many of the boys who fought our battles have returned; more are returning, and there are still more to come. But as we welcome them back to our communities; as we talk with them about their reconversion problems and the difficulties they face in reestablishing themselves in civilian life, we cannot help being impressed by the sincerity of their concern for our national future. And I think if we are completely honest we must admit that as we talk with them they tell us the truth when they say that so far they see more signs of the old era than of the new.

It is true that our government has made a valiant reconversion effort in the face of most difficult world conditions. It is true that this effort has been successful to such an extent that with pride and truth we can declare that we in Canada are better off than people anywhere else in the world. But this is not enough. We are still far short of the ideal of a better life and that new era which we pictured during the years of war. In attaining that ideal we must not be hampered by an unwillingness on the part of our people to make sacrifices for peace comparable to the sacrifices they were willing to make for war. I regret to have to confess that I can see signs of a tapering off of our national willingness to make sacrifices to overcome the problems of peace. It is indeed sad, if it be true, that we in Canada need the threat of falling bombs to inspire our best national endeavour; but unfortunately there is evidence that this is so. In plain language, what we need is a substitute for falling bombs to inspire the best efforts of our people.

I do not suggest that by the simple adoption of this measure designating our national holiday as Canada day we can perform a national miracle, but in all sincerity I do submit that the taking of this step at this time can be made the basis of a crusade for a revitalized national spirit which can contribute a great deal to the future well-being of Canada. Thanks to the sacrifice of our people, the name "Canada" to-day stands high throughout the world. In this, the greatest conflict of all ages, our fighting men went into battle bearing on their armour the name "Canada". The bill the house is now asked to approve simply provides that our national holiday shall bear that same glorious name, "Canada". It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, most fitting, following the measure passed by this house decreeing that Canada should have its own distinctive national flag, and following the bill so ably and eloquently introduced the other day by the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) providing a new status of Canadian citizenship, that this house should follow through now and adopt this bill designating our national holiday as Canada day.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, it did my heart good to hear a good Presbyterian from the city of Toronto support this bill. When the word "Dominion" came into existence I do not think it had the approval of one of the greatest Canadians to have adorned the history of this country; I refer to Sir John A. Macdonald. I quote from the Encyclopedia of Canada:

> Dominion, the term adopted in 1867 to describe the status of Canada in the British empire, and now used to describe also the status of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Newfoundland. The story is told that the adoption of the term was due to a suggestion of Sir Leonard Tilley (q.v.) When the delegates from Canada, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, were discussing in London, in December, 1866, the details of the British North America Act, some difference of opinion arose as to the proper term to be used to describe the new federation. Sir John Macdonald, the leading Canadian delegate, was in favour of styling it "the Kingdom of Canada"; but Lord Derby, the British foreign minister, was afraid that the word "Kingdom" would wound the tender susceptibilities of the people of the great republic to the south of Canada. The Canadians, on the other hand, were firm in rejecting the term "colony." The night of this debate, Sir Leonard Tilley, who was in the habit of reading a chapter of the bible before retiring to rest, stumbled on the verse in the seventy-second Psalm which runs, "He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." The next morning he suggested that the new federation should be called "the Dominion of Canada."

To me the name Canada has music in it. To me it represents the greatest country on earth. If there are any here who have made Canada their home, but who think that old England, Scotland or Ireland are superior to Canada, then I wonder why they left there. Ireland to me was a tender spot on this earth, but I left it and came to Canada because I thought it gave the greatest possible opportunity to the young man, greater than any other country on earth. We had lots of opportunity.

To me the name of Canada is emblazoned across the world, and stands out as the country that is going to lead in a great many things. We cannot be too careful in changes we make, but some of us are not as conser-

vative as we were forty years ago. I believe we should pass this legislation, and have our children sing of Canada—not only of the Dominion of Canada. Therefore I support the bill.

Mr. CHURCH: There is the British North America Act, first.

Mr. W. GARFIELD CASE (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this does not develop into an issue which will divide the house along party lines. I should like to make some practical observations, and would state first that all the good things which have been said about Canada have come to pass at a time when we have paid tribute and reverence to the name "Dominion of Canada." So it is difficult for me to see where there would be any advantage in a change of this kind.

I listened to the hon. member for York North (Mr. Smith) say that he has noticed a tapering off in our enthusiasm. I have not been able to see that among my people. I know North York pretty well too, because there I cut my political teeth, and I am pretty well satisfied that the people in North York are not lacking in their enthusiasm.

I think the hon. member who introduced the bill did not consider the matter fully. I challenge him or any other member in the house to name any country in the world which calls its national day by its title. I have not heard of any other country—and of course I may be wrong. But at the moment there come to my mind names of such countries as the United States, Mexico, Russia and France. I believe the title we already have, that of the Dominion of Canada, is all right.

Replying to the hon. member who introduced the bill, may I say I am not so much concerned about what strangers may think of us. After all, we have our own lives to live. They will come to know us from our contributions, as they have in the past, and from the contributions we shall make in the future. I am inclined therefore to support the view offered by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) in his amendment, when he points out that there are items far more important to be discussed and determined than the mere changing of a name, and especially a name which has been used and enjoyed since we became the Dominion of Canada.

Dominion day is well known to Canadians generally, and to those who have any regard for us. I hope there will be others who will feel as I do—not in any partisan sense, but in the belief that we are well designated now, and that our national day should remain Dominion day.

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended speaking on this bill, but I do so because I have a sentimental reason for saying a few words. My good friend the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor), mentioned that it was Sir Leonard Tilley who first recommended that our country be called the Dominion of Canada. Sir Leonard Tilley came from my native province of New Brunswick, and was born in the village of Gagetown, which happened to be my own birthplace, and my own home.

Mr. MacNICOL: Two great men from the same town.

Mr. BROOKS: I thank my hon. friend. But I do not see any good reason why the name should be changed. Had there been no Dominion day in 1867, I wonder if there would be a Canada to-day. It was because those great men of that time, men from all parts of Canada, including Macdonald, Cartier, Tilley and others, got together and decided that we would unite our provinces to form a dominion.

Dominion day is a part of our history. Is it good in any country, particularly in a young country, to discard all our relations or connection with the past, and keep grasping at something new? I happened to be a school teacher in my early days, and I recall that Dominion day was always set aside as a holiday. Generations of children have grown up in this country and have been taught that Dominion day is the day on which these men decided upon the confederation of our country.

That is what it means to us to-day. There is nothing belittling about Dominion day, as I see it; is a matter of history. It is linked with the birth of our country. I listened to the eloquent appeal of the hon. member for Fort William, who says that he thinks more of Canada than he does of England, Ireland or Scotland. I cannot see why it is necessary for any hon. member, no matter who he may be, to rise and say that he thinks more of Canada than he does of England, Ireland, Scotland, France or any other country. Is the hon. member implying that there are any others in the house who think more of those countries than they do of Canada? I do not believe there is a member here who does. If anyone rises in the house to say anything about the British empire, then immediately he is branded as an imperialist, and as one who thinks more of other lands than he does of his own.

There is no land dearer to me than my own Canada. But I do not have to stand up in the house and shout it from the rooftop, nor do I have to have it published in the newspapers.

We love Canada: Canada is our country. But we do not want to break our link with the past, or to dim the traditions of other years. And I say we are fast doing it.

One other hon. member said that we have perplexing problems. True, we have. And I would ask that hon. member how many jobs it will give returned soldiers if the name of Dominion day is changed to Canada day. How many houses is it going to build for the thousands of men who are coming back to this country to change the name of Dominion day to Canada day? It is absolute nonsense to suggest that it will do anything of the kind.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The motion before the house is for the second reading of bill No. 8, an act respecting Canada day.

Mr. BROOKS: Mr. Speaker, I claim the same right as the hon. member who spoke a moment ago and who suggested that our great perplexing problems could be solved by changing the name of Dominion day to Canada day. I shall say no more. Canada is steeped in the traditions of the past, and if we are to sever all the links with our past history, Canada will never be the great nation we all hope she will become.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, this bill seems to be engendering a good deal of heat. I cannot understand why it should, or why there should apparently be conflict between one side and the other.

What I have been asking myself is whether the bill is in order. When confederation was established, four provinces entered into it; the British North America Act records their names and states that they became united into one dominion forming the Dominion of Canada. Those provinces were Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario. Would it not be necessary to have the consent, first, of the province of Ontario and of these other provinces before we could pass a bill such as this? I know you would not easily get the consent of Ontario; it may come some time, but I do not think Ontario would jump hastily and accept this change holus-bolus without careful consideration. I do not know that the province of Quebec would. The province of Quebec played an important part in forming confederation; in fact, confederation could not have been formed if Quebec had not consented to it. Has the province of Nova Scotia consented to this bill? Has the province of New Brunswick consented to it? I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the bill is in order and whether it would have any effect if we did pass it without the consent of the provinces having first been obtained. I should think that one of the ministers, perhaps the Secretary of State, under whose department this matter comes, would be able to tell us whether the provinces have been consulted and whether they approve this change in the name of the country of which they agreed to form a part. If they have not been consulted, perhaps the hon. member should withdraw his bill.

I want to say a word about the hon. member. I compliment him on his ability. I have been greatly pleased since this present parliament assembled to note how many splendid bright and capable young men we have in it representing the province of Quebec. I know of no other parliament since I came here in 1930 in which there have been so many able young men from the province of Quebec, and that is all to the good. They are doing well for their province, and will continue to do well. And so I do not want my hon. friend to think that in opposing his bill I am in any way finding fault with his proposal, but I still ask myself how can we pass this bill if the provinces have not first been consulted. If the bill moved be given its second and third reading to-day, the legislature of Ontario is now in sesion, and would it not be reasonable to expect that some member of the Ontario legislature would ask the govern- of this province if they had consented to changing the name from the Dominion of Canada to Canada—because the British North America Act, Mr. Speaker, all the way through, refers to the Dominion of Canada.

When Manitoba came into confederation it was as a province of the Dominion of Canada, and the same is true of British Columbia. Those two provinces, and later Saskatchewan and Alberta, but particularly Manitoba and British Columbia, which entered confederation quite early, all entered the Dominion of Canada. Have they been consulted? Have their legislatures approved the changing of the name of the country of which they became a part?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: This does not change the name of the country.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes. We are going to change the name "Dominion day" to "Canada day". The Dominion of Canada is the name that I have known every since my childhood. When the first of July was celebrated in the small town in which I was raised it was always celebrated as Dominion day, and so Dominion day has become a part of me. I would have to change my whole fifty odd years—I am not going to say how many, Mr. Speaker, but

will say fifty or fifty odd years, of my life's thinking to celebrate Canada day instead of Dominion Day.

I yield to no one in my love for Canada. I am of the fourth generation here. My hon. friend the member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) is perhaps of the seventh or eighth or tenth generation. I cannot go back that far, but I am of the fourth generation, and I love Canada.

I really cannot understand why my hon. friend the member for Matapedia-Matane brought in this bill, and further I cannot understand how it comes before this house if the Secretary of State or whoever draws up these bills did not first consult the provinces which originally entered confederation, to find out whether they wished to make this change from Dominion day to Canada day. It is a matter of importance, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, although I have a very warm regard for the capable young man who introduced this bill, I must say that I cannot vote for it.

Mr. J. S. SINNOTT (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I have a very friendly feeling for the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol), who has always been most cooperative in this house, but coming from Manitoba as I do I must say I feel that we are a part of Canada. We are no longer in the days of 1867, when confederation was formed. I think we should be progressive. A year or so ago the Conservative party in this country progressed by adding the word "Progressive" to its name. I think we should progress, too, by making this change from Dominion day to Canada day and letting the outside world know that we have something. There is no harm in letting the outside world know that there is such a place as Canada, and there is no harm in letting the western part of the dominion know that we are a part of Canada. Coming from the western part of this dominion I shall give whole-hearted support to this bill.

Mr. G. RUSSELL BOUCHER (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I would not have risen to speak on this bill had not the hon. member for York North (Mr. Smith) said that it was a great bill, and the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Sinnott) said that there was no harm in letting the world know that there is such a place as Canada. If the idea of a great bill is to change the name Dominion day to Canada day, and if by that change we are going to let the whole world know that there is such a place as Canada, one must think very little of Canada; for ever since confederation we have been known as the Dominion of Canada. Dominion day to me represents the accomplishments of a great people, in a great country under great leadership, who formed this dominion in the year 1867, and the word "unity" has always been the keynote in the celebration of Dominion day. Dominion day has been taught, to me at least, to represent the day on which the people of Canada celebrate the union which made Canada, the accomplishment of the great men who achieved its unity. For an hon. member to stand up and say it is a great bill which does away with the word "dominion", a word which appears in every one of our statutes, marking the significance of Canada as a dominion—because the word "dominion" means unity, cooperation, amity and friendship on the part of us all—makes me wonder what is in the minds of those who want to change the name. What is wrong with the word "dominion"? Certainly "Canada" is a great name. Certainly Canadians are proud of Canada. But surely before we become proud of Canada we must be proud of the union which made Canada, of the idea of a dominion in and of Canada.

I do not like to hear hon. members say that those who do not wish to abolish the word "dominion" are not progressive. I do not like to hear them say that those who do not wish to supersede "Dominion day" by "Canada day" think any less of their country than others do. I do not believe there is anybody in the country who does not feel that "Canada" and "dominion" are two different thoughts, both to be held with reverence, with esteem, with love, and with pride. But I do not think we should be "little" about it, either. When I see the hon. member for York North (Mr. Smith), that old historic riding, that community which has done so much for Canadian history, which has been so loyal to the Canadian union and to the Dominion of Canada, get up and suggest, at least by inference, that the word "dominion" implies something inferior, something sinister, something undesirable, something unprogressive, I believe other hon. members should rise with pride and insist that we stick to the word "dominion", show our pride in the word, show our reverence for Dominion day as a day symbolizing unity, confederation and friendship. If you want a Canada day, surely you can pick another day. If you want to tell the world that Canada is a great nation, do so, but without changing the thought which commemorates reverence, friendship, and the historic things which Dominion day represents.

I heartily support the amendment and would oppose changing the word "dominion", because it means much to the people of Canada; it has a significance which we would lose if we changed the name.

Mr. EUGENE MARQUIS (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) I would refer him to the British North America Act, section 3:

> It shall be lawful for the Queen ,by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, to declare by proclamation that, on and after a day therein appointed, not being more than six months after the passing of this act, the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall form and be one dominion under the name of Canada; and on and after that day those three provinces shall form and be one dominion under that name accordingly.

Also section 5:

> Canada shall be divided into four provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick.

Those four provinces were Canada. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Boucher) asked, what is wrong with the word "dominion"? When we refer to the dominion we refer to a member of the British commonwealth of nations, but not particularly to one country; the idea implies a plural; it includes such dominions as Australia and South Africa as well as Canada. But if we have the name "Canada" it will refer to our own country, our beloved country, and will not be a name which applies to other countries. I support the motion.

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): Before the question is put I desire to say just a few words, and in the course of my remarks it is my desire to ask permission to move the adjournment of the debate, but not at this precise moment. That motion is one that I am sure, when I do put it, I shall not need to write out and present to you, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty which occurred in the case of another lawyer's handwriting when he wrote "second" and it looked like "third." Probably if I were to write it you would have as much difficulty in reading my writing as you do in reading that of the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church). But it will not be necessary.

A few remarks have been made to which I will advert for a moment. The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) remarked that this debate seemed to be engendering a great deal of heat. I agree. And he said it did not seem to be necessary that that should be so; and with this, too, I agree. For my part I believe I have had and have now as much pride in this country as has any person in the house. I do not suppose I am pre-eminent in that respect; I think all of us look upon ourselves first, last and all the time as Canadians. I have not found it difficult to develop that pride in my country because it was called the "Dominion" of Canada. I do not think there is quite as much importance in this name as some have said. Nevertheless I agree with the bill; I agree that it would be better to make the change, as the bill sets forth. I think the word "Canada" is a more appropriate one for our national holiday than the word "Dominion."

Some people have spoken as if the word "dominion" suggested that some person else had dominion over us. It never had that meaning for me. I have never felt that "Dominion of Canada" carried the idea of some people remote from here exercising dominance over us. I do not know whether it is because of the story of how the word came to be chosen that I have been free from that idea. My recollection of the story as it was told to me is that one of the founders of confederation, in considering what would be a suitable name for our country, either was praying or was thinking of God, and the words came into his mind. "He shall have dominion from sea to sea"; and thereupon he took that as an inspiration and brought the word into the conclave, and so "Dominion" came to be adopted. As I recollect it, some such story as that is the basis of the choice of the word "Dominion". I do not know whether that is the particular kind of dominion which some would like to escape by discarding the word. I do not fancy that it is.

The truth of the matter is that we should not confuse the word "dominion" with dominance, and there is no dominance of any person or any power to be considered as a concept in connection with that word. At the same time, I do not think that some of the expressions that have been used this afternoon are apt. The member for Broadview spoke of our having been a dominion from time immemorial. That, it is self-evident, is not so. We have not been a dominion from time immemorial, nor have we been a dominion during most of the existence of organized society on this northern half of the continent. We have been a dominion because that was the name decided upon in 1867. That is all there is to it. It looked like a suitable name at the time, and it served well enough over the years. We have developed much pride in our country in the use of that name, but it does not carry the idea of autonomy which is the fact respecting Canada at the present time. It would be better, I submit, that we should try to keep our terms in accord with the facts of our situation. We are an autonomous country, all our partners in the British empire agree with that, and it would be well in the use of all expressions to convey the

idea which does express the truth of the matter. For that reason I submit that we would be wise to change the name. There is no thought, nor need there be any thought, that in making the change there is any attack upon the British connections or any disrespect for the crown, or any flying in the face of tradition or anything of that sort. It simply appears to me that we would be nearer to the truth if we used the expression "Canada" in naming the day which is our birthday.

I revert to what I said at the beginning about there being some heat in the debate. I submit that we would probably be well advised to wait a few days and come back to the question rather than settle it now, and for that reason I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion negatived.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Church) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aylesworth
Barrett
Blackmore
Blair
Boucher
Bracken
Bradshaw
Brooks
Cardiff
Case
Casselman
Charlton
Church
Cockeram
Cruickshank
Daniel
Desmond
Diefenbaker
Drope
Fraser
Fulton
Gladstone
Graydon
Green
Harkness
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Hazen
Hlynka
Hodgson
Jackman
Kidd
Kuhl
Lennard
McGregor
McLure
McMaster
MacNicol
Marshall
Menary
Merritt
Murphy
Pearkes
Quelch
Robinson (Bruce)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Souris)
Rowe
Senn
Skey
Smith (Calgary West)
Stanfield
Stephenson
Stirling
Stokes
Tustin
Webb
White (Hastings-Peterboro)
White (Middlesex East)
Wylie—60.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott
Archibald
Argue
Arsenault
Baker
Beaudoin
Belzile
Bentley
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Bourget
Bowerman
Bradette
Breithaupt
Bridges
Brunelle
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Cardin
Castleden
Chevrier
Claxton
Cloutier
Coldwell
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Dechene
Denis
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Douglas
Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gagnon
Gardiner
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gillis
Gingues
Glen
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Grant
Hamel
Herridge
Howe
Ilsley
Irvine
Isnor
Jaenicke
Jean
Jutras
Knight
Knowles
Lacombe
LaCroix
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Langlois
Lapalme
Laurendeau
Leger
Little
McCann
McCuaig
McCubbin
McCulloch (Pictou)
Macdonald (Brantford City)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McGarry
McIlraith
MacInnis
McIvor
McKay
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
MacLean
MacNaught
Maloney
Marier
Marquis
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Maybank
Mayhew
Michaud
Mitchell
Moore
Mullins
Mutch
Parent
Picard
Pinard
Power
Probe
Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie)
Raymond (Wright)
Reid
Richard (Ottawa East)
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Smith (York North)
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Stuart (Charlotte)
Strum, Mrs.
Thatcher
Townley-Smith
Tremblay
Tucker
Viau
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winters
Wright
Zaplitny—131.

Mr. RINFRET: I was paired with the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MacDONALD (Halifax): I was paired with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BROWN: I was paired with the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Henderson). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I was paired with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ASHBY: I was paired with the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. R. W. GLADSTONE (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, my inclination is to support the motion, but I do not think there is any occasion for undue haste at this time. We have before us a bill respecting Canadian citizenship, and we have established a committee for the purpose of recommending a distinctive national flag for Canada. I think we can well afford to give time, through the press and on the radio, to consideration of this matter. Therefore I respectfully move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I should like to say a word before the motion is put.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: May I second it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no seconder for the motion.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I think I am entitled to speak before the question is put.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. member is seconding the motion to adjourn the debate?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I was told I was out of order in doing it. If I am in order in doing it, I am.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is in order in seconding the motion.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And I am entitled to speak on it, then, am I?

Mr. CASSELMAN: Speak now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) is not entitled to speak to the motion. He may second it if he sees fit.

Mr. CASSELMAN: There is no seconder for the motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Question.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I don't know what I can do and what I can't do.

Mr. COLDWELL: The hon. member may second it, but not speak to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is moved by Mr. Gladstone, seconded by Mr. Cruickshank, that this debate be now adjourned.

[Mr. Brown.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Gladstone), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Abbott
Breithaupt
Brown
Claxton
Cleaver
Cruickshank
Emmerson
Farquhar
Gardiner
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gladstone
Golding
Howe
Ilsley
Isnor
McCann
McCubbin
McIlraith
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Mitchell
Reid
Tucker
Warren
Weir
Winters—28.

NAYS

Messrs:

Archibald
Argue
Arsenault
Aylesworth
Baker
Barrett
Beaudoin
Belzile
Bentley
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blackmore
Blair
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Boucher
Bourget
Bowerman
Bracken
Bradette
Bradshaw
Bridges
Brooks
Brunelle
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Cardiff
Cardin
Case
Casselman
Castleden
Charlton
Chevrier
Church
Cloutier
Cockeram
Coldwell
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Daniel
Dechene
Denis
Desmond
Diefenbaker
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Douglas
Drope
Dubois
Eudes
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser
Fulton
Gagnon
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gillis
Gingues
Glen
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Grant
Graydon
Green
Hamel
Harkness
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Hazen
Herridge
Hlynka
Hodgson
Irvine
Jackman
Jaenicke
Jean
Johnston
Jutras
Kidd
Knight

Knowles	Quelch
Kuhl	Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie)
Lacombe	Raymond (Wright)
LaCroix	Richard (Ottawa East)
Lafontaine	Robinson (Bruce)
Lalonde	Robinson (Simcoe East)
Langlois	Ross (St. Paul's)
Lapalme	Ross (Souris)
Laurendeau	Rowe
Leger	Senn
Lennard	Sinclair (Ontario)
Little	Sinclair (Vancouver North)
McCuaig	Sinnott
McCulloch (Pictou)	Skey
McDonald (Parry Sound)	Smith (Calgary West)
McGarry	Smith (York North)
MacInnis	Stanfield
McIvor	Stephenson
McKay	Stewart (Winnipeg North)
McLure	Stuart (Charlotte)
McMaster	Stirling
MacNaught	Stokes
MacNicol	Strum, Mrs.
Maloney	Thatcher
Marier	Townley-Smith
Marquis	Tremblay
Marshall	Tustin
Matthews (Kootenay East)	Viau
Menary	Webb
Merritt	White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Michaud	White (Middlesex East)
Moore	Whitman
Mullins	Wright
Murphy	Wylie
Mutch	Zaplitny—161.
Parent	
Pearkes	
Picard	
Pinard	
Power	
Probe	

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for London (Mr. Manross). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. RINFRET: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

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

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): It should like to say a word now. Apparently I have lost some of my new-found friends from Ontario, or from Toronto, but at least I had the satisfaction of uniting those hon. members from Toronto with my good friends from Quebec. My batting average was not bad; I maintained four and a half of the cabinet with me although I lost my roommate.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): You might have had them all with you if you had an order in council.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: When I need any help from Souris I will let the hon. member know. I had thought of making a sub-amendment to declare April 1st Souris day.

I wish to make myself clear on this question. I was not born in Canada, but I am particularly proud of being a Canadian, and I have no objection to the name being changed to "Canada".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Just a minute. But I do think there is a little too much haste. For that reason I was prepared to support the motion for a six month's adjournment, so that we could give the matter a little further thought. In particular, whether some hon. members realize it or not, in any legislation affecting my riding I am interested in the reactions of my riding. I make no bones about it; I should like to have a little more time for thought. The only recruit I really picked up from the Conservative party—and I wish to make this point perfectly clear for the record so that there will be no suggestion of bribery or otherwise—is the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), with whom my wife and I are having dinner to-night, but that was arranged long ago.

As I say, I should have liked to have time to give this matter more consideration, and I think we should have been supported in our move for an adjournment. May I point out to my hon. friends who are sponsoring this measure that I cannot see how they would have lost by an adjournment which would have given us further time for discussion. Particularly I cannot see that the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), which constituency I understand is in the suburbs of Toronto, would have lost anything.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I am not out of order. A man tells me that I am out of order; let me tell him that I do not need any assistance and he does not need to tell me that I am out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order. We are not now considering the adjournment of the debate; that question has been settled.

The house divided on the motion Mr. Cote (Matapedia-Matane) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Abbott
Archibald
Argue
Arsenault
Baker
Beaudoin
Belzile
Bentley
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Bourget
Bowerman
Bradette
Breithaupt
Bridges
Brunelle
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Cardin
Castleden
Chevrier
Claxton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Coldwell
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Douglas
Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve Rosemont)
Gagnon
Gardiner
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gillis
Gingues
Gladstone
Glen
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Grant
Hamel
Herridge
Ilsley
Irvine
Isnor
Jaenicke
Jean
Jutras
Kirk
Knight
Knowles
Lacombe
LaCroix
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Langlois
Lapalme
Laurendeau
Leger
Little
McCann
McCuaig
McCulloch (Pictou)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McGarry
McIlraith
MacInnis
McIvor
McKay
Mackenzie
MacKinnon
MacLean
Maloney
Marier
Marquis
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Maybank
Michaud
Moore
Mullins
Mutch
Parent
Picard
Pinard
Power
Probe
Raymond (Beauharnois Laprairie)
Raymond (Wright)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Sinclair (Ontario)
Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Sinnott
Smith (York North)
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Stuart (Charlotte)
Strum, Mrs.
Thatcher
Townley-Smith
Tremblay
Tucker
Viau
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winters
Wright
Zaplitny—129.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aylesworth
Barrett
Blackmore
Blair
Bracken
Bradshaw
Brooks
Cardiff
Case
Casselman
Church
Cockeram
Daniel
Diefenbaker
Drope
Fraser
Fulton
Graydon
Green
Harkness
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Hazen
Hlynka
Hodgson
Jackman
Johnston
Kidd
Kuhl
Lennard
McCubbin
McLure
McMaster
MacNicol
Marshall
Mayhew
Menary
Merritt
Mitchell
Murphy
Pearkes
Quelch
Reid
Robinson (Bruce)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Souris)
Rowe
Senn
Skey
Smith (Calgary West)
Stanfield
Stephenson
Stirling
Stokes
Tustin
Webb
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
White (Middlesex East)
Wylie—59.

Mr. BOUCHER: I was paired with the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Bertrand), who is away welcoming the former Prime Minister of France. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. CHARLTON: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Ann (Mr. Healy). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): I was paired with the hon. member for London (Mr. Manross). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): I was paired with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. RINFRET: I was paired with the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BROWN: I was paired with the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Henderson). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MacNAUGHT: I was paired with the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Coyle). Had I not been paired, I would have voted for the motion.

Bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On the short title.

Mr. CHURCH: I doubt whether this bill is within the power of this parliament because it is contrary to the British North America Act, and the terms and principles on which the four provinces came into confederation, and if the word "Dominion" is changed, the change must have the approval of the provinces. There is no power to change it. The history books prove that, and we have the confederation debates and records. It was unanimous at confederation to name the country the Dominion of Canada.

We had a scene this afternoon unparalleled since I have been a member of this house. The members of the cabinet were divided. If the government followed the practice in the old country it would resign, because a government in the old country resigned at one time when it was defeated on a private member's bill or a motion at one stage of it.

Where is this going to land us? Where does Canada stand when one considers the motions we have had on the order paper in the past few months and the debates that have gone on? What was said regarding the future of this dominion by members of the government from the province of Quebec who are absent from the house to-day? Either we are a dominion or we are not. If not, we are outside the British empire. We were a dominion at confederation when the four provinces came together. There was none of this bickering during the two wars. I referred to that earlier in the afternoon, and I shall not repeat what I said. I do not think the people of any of the provinces believe in altering the terms and conditions which were agreed to by the four original provinces at confederation. Those terms cannot be changed without the consent of the legislatures of the various provinces. This is a political bill, first, last and always. Either we are in the British empire or we are not. We do not wish to be like Eire. We are a dominion within the four corners of the British North America Act. If we do not wish to be a dominion we should say so. I am surprised at my hon. friends of the C.C.F. and the attitude they took on this bill this afternoon. There is a large body of public opinion which is alarmed and surprised that this parliament finds time to devote to all these matters which are frivolous and secondary. I voiced their opinion this afternoon. We have not time to attend to the primary matters which are facing this country to-day. There are some people without houses, employment, coal, food and clothing. These matters should be primary and not secondary. That relates to all the provinces.

I have always been one of those who believe in the principles of confederation, of equality and each for all and all for each. I do not know who drafted this bill. Whoever drafted it has forgotten the act of confederation which constituted this country and the intention of the four provinces. The change cannot be made without a vote of the provinces. Hon. members can talk all they like about this, but we are still part and parcel of the British empire. We ought to be thankful for that, especially those who come from the eastern provinces. Britain, save for the dominions, stood alone for two and a half years. The people of Quebec have always been loyal and faithful to the British crown. They showed it in the revolutionary war of 1783 and have always shown it. I have a great deal of respect for Quebec and for France, where so many of the old soldiers of the city from which I come lie buried. They were quite ready to fight for that great country. France will always be a glorious nation. Mr. Churchill said that and I have said it in this house on many occasions. It is the hope of the world that France should be restored as a great nation which she has always been in the past. At a time when economic and social conditions are so critical in this country I object to debates of this kind, more especially when our people are suffering from the after effects of the war. It is inconceivable that we should waste time on bills of this description.

I think the afternoon was well spent, however, because the people in the mother country are wondering where Canada stands at the present time. Is she willing to help the mother country, where so many thousands of churches and public buildings, destroyed during the war, need to be restored? Are we to sit here as a parliament and not observe the handwriting on the wall? Are we not going to listen to those who are clamouring for us to deal with the great economic problems, to start production, to bring about adequate reconversion of industry, instead of wasting our time on things like this?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I should like to say a word to account for the manner in which I have voted up to the present. I quite agree with the previous speaker that this procedure is unconstitutional. In spite of the fact that we have taken all afternoon to debate this matter, I do not believe the proposed change will be made. I think when we come to deal with the proper authorities the holiday will still be observed as Dominion

day. Those who feel we have to change the name in order to advertise Canada to the world certainly cannot know what has been going on during the past few years. I can assure them that anyone who has been in the midst of what has been going on since the fall of 1939 will readily realize that the young men and women of our three armed services have certainly advertised this dominion in no uncertain terms in all parts of the world.

I repeat that in my opinion this procedure is quite unconstitutional; therefore I do not believe this parliament should take time to debate a matter of this kind when, if we are really concerned about changing the name, we might easily adopt the proper procedure.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Which is what?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): First of all, I think the British North America Act probably will have to be changed.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am not a legal man, and I am not going into that question; but, as an hon. member said a few moments ago, at least we want time to consult our constituents. I am satisfied that if the people of this nation take the performance this afternoon seriously their reaction will come as a rude shock to many people here.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am just as entitled to my opinion as any other member of this house. It may be that I am not able to judge properly the feelings of my constituents back home, but I am prepared to endeavour to do so, and am prepared to stand by their decision with no regrets whatever. I am one of those who believe this has been quite a political gesture this afternoon. I do not believe the name will be changed, but I wanted to make these remarks in order to explain the stand I have taken to-day.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am very much in accord with what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. For some reason or another an attempt has been made to rush this bill through, and I think the people of this country as a whole should be given an opportunity to decide, by their reaction, whether or not it should become law. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary West, that the Chairman do now leave the chair and that the committee do now rise.

Motion negatived: yeas, 31; nays, 75.

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

Mr. GREEN: I am certain that this bill is of a great deal of importance in the life of Canada, perhaps more so than some hon. members realize.

Some hon. MEMBERS: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. GREEN: I have the right to be heard, and I do not propose to be heckled.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. GREEN: This bill is important because it shows a trend which I think must be faced by the Canadian people and which I am sure will be faced. Taken by itself it may not mean a great deal whether our national holiday is known as Dominion day or Canada day, but we must take into consideration the circumstances under which this bill comes before the house. Here we have it brought in with many signs of a desire for haste, a great urge to put it through.

Mr. LALONDE: No; you cannot say that.

Mr. GREEN: You can make your own speech. There were clear evidences this afternoon that the cabinet did not know what to do about the matter, that the cabinet were divided. No opportunity has been given to Canadians, certainly none to the people of my province of British Columbia, to consider this bill, and no request for this change has come from that province. I doubt whether any request for a change has come from any province in Canada. It must be taken, too, with the different statements that have been made in this house. To those of us who sit here it is only too obvious that an attempt is being made at this time to take actions which, while I know those sponsoring them believe they are in the best interests of Canada, at the same time may have a serious effect on Canada if we look at the broader picture. We have just gone through a terrible war. At one stage of that war civilization was only saved by the British empire, and—

An hon. MEMBER: "Only"?

An hon. MEMBER: What about the Canadians?

An hon. MEMBER: What about the Americans?

Mr. GREEN: —because the empire stood together for a whole year, when nobody else was fighting the Germans and Italians but the British people of the world, and gallant little Greece.

An hon. MEMBER: What about France?

Mr. GREEN: We have won this war, and it was a close shave; everyone in the house

admits that. Since that time we have been faced with attempts only too obvious to break up the British empire from without—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. GREEN: I said, "from without." It is just as plain as can be that there is an attempt by certain other nations to squeeze the empire out. If the empire should be squeezed out, if it should be broken up, then indeed that would be a tragic day for Canada as well as for other nations of the empire.

This is no time to be doing things that will weaken the empire, because the future of Canada depends upon the empire's being strong. I doubt very much whether my good friends who are cheering and shouting, and who are so keen to have this bill rushed through have ever had in mind the possibility that action of this type of necessity weakens the empire.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. GREEN: Oh, you may not agree with me, but—

An hon. MEMBER: We don't.

Mr. GREEN: —surely in a British parliament a member who has been duly elected has a right to be heard, and not to be heckled.

An hon. MEMBER: We have been elected too.

An hon. MEMBER: We are listening.

Mr. GREEN: You are not listening with any measure of comfort. You are interrupting, which you have no right to do.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. May I remind all hon. members that an hon. member who is speaking must not be interrupted or questioned without his consent. May I also remind hon. members that when speaking they must address the Chair.

Mr. GREEN: For these reasons I suggest that we be very careful before we rush into a thing of this type.

I have listened to a great deal of talk in this and in the last session about colonially-minded Canadians. The challenge has been hurled across this floor on different occasions that those of us who believe in a strong empire are colonially-minded, that we are colonials. Let me suggest this to the house, that the shoe might be on the other foot, and that it might be those Canadians who refuse to recognize the value of the empire to Canada who are colonially-minded, and who have not got over the old colonial days which passed away many years ago.

It does not do for members who talk in that way to get the idea that they are the only Canadians in the world. Let them remember that there are many of the rest of us who are just as good Canadians as they are, and who come from a long line of Canadian settlers. Let them remember that we are just as good Canadians as any others in the country, just as much interested in the welfare of Canada, just as much determined that no other nation shall come first in our minds, whether that nation happens to be within the empire or outside it.

We are just as much in earnest about this question as any other people in Canada. I think it should be recognized by all Canadians, no matter of what origin, that those who sit in the House of Commons, no matter what side they may be on or what their beliefs may be, are all good Canadians, and are all working for the benefit of Canada.

Therefore I suggest that some hon. members be just a little careful in throwing out those charges, when they say, "Oh, you are only colonials; you are not good Canadians; you are Englishmen first"—or Australian—"and Canadians second." Those charges are not correct.

Since I have been a member in the house there has been much talk about unity. It seems the suggestion is always made that the English-speaking people in the country must be very careful or they will upset unity, that they will bring about disunity in Canada. Charges are always coming in that direction. Well, if this sort of thing is carried on much further, the shoe will be on the other foot. English-speaking people in Canada are going to think they are being attacked.

An hon. MEMBER: Who made those charges?

Mr. GREEN: My hon. friend can read *Hansard*. I say they are going to think they are being attacked. If that should come about—and, fortunately, it has not yet—but if it should come about, and if it should develop that one great group is set up against the other great group, then there never will be unity in Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: Imagination!

Mr. GREEN: There never will be unity in Canada, I say, if that should happen, and our troubles will become greater and greater; we shall never build a nation in this country if that should come to pass.

For that reason I make my appeal to all hon. members in the house—and I have friends in all the parties, friends of many years

standing. I would appeal to them not to keep pressing through measures of this type which can only make trouble. Yes, they can only make trouble, and especially when the attempt is made, as it was made to-day, to rush this thing through.

Mr. CLEAVER: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. GREEN: No.

Mr. CLEAVER: Why didn't you vote against it, then?

Mr. GREEN: An attempt is being made to rush this thing through. I wish the people I represent could have sat in the galleries here to-day to see just what has happened, because it is impossible to convey it in words. That sort of thing is bad for Canada. It will make all kinds of trouble in Canada, and I would—

An hon. MEMBER: You are making it.

Mr. GREEN: —appeal to hon. members not to rush to put a measure of this type through the house.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CASE: Mr. Chairman, during the dinner recess I have had an opportunity of considering this bill further and I feel that there are some observations still to be made.

Throughout our whole history our thoughts and sentiments have been associated with Dominion day, and not with anything of any semblance to Canada day. I made a challenge to this house this afternoon when the Speaker was in the chair to name any country which calls its national day after the name of the country. In the United States, for instance, their national day is called "Independence day," and the same holds good with respect to every other country which celebrates a national day. Dominion day has been associated with the birth of this nation ever since 1867, to designate that we were a dominion within the great commonwealth of British nations.

The word "dominion" means something to a Britisher. After all, you cannot have your cake and eat it. Either we are a part of a great empire or we are just an individual nation. I prefer to associate myself, as I believe the majority of the members of this house do who think seriously on this matter, with the broadest application of the word "dominion."

A few days ago I had a commander in the navy visit me and he made this remark. I mention this in relation to what was said this afternoon by the hon. member for Vancouver South. This navy commander said, "If I lived a thousand years and spoke or lectured every night I could not begin to tell of the great contribution made by the British people in those trying days of the war when Britain stood alone."

During my limited experience in public life, confined largely to municipal affairs where government had its beginning, I have never imputed improper motives to my fellow man. I have nothing but the highest regard for the hon. member who introduced this bill and for those who are supporting it, because I believe that they are imbued with a sense of loyalty to Canada and that they, too, have in their breasts deep affection for and a sense of loyalty to that one great nation in the world which stood between us and tyranny in the darkest days of the war. I do not believe that they would want to see any weakening of the ties which bind the empire together as a great world power, although I regret to say that there is a tendency in this critical hour to weaken those ties. But in unity there is strength, and the greatest strength we enjoy to-day is our association with the British commonwealth of nations. This great empire stands for something which Britishers and freedom-loving people throughout the world cherish. I could not find words to express adequately what the British empire has stood for and what it has meant in human relations throughout the world, but I am thinking of one thing in particular at the moment, and that is freedom. Unfortunately, never having been denied our freedom, we sometimes do not value our freedom highly enough; but if we were to travel throughout central Europe and talk with the thousands there who were deprived of their freedom and became a subjugated race, it would readily be appreciated what a great heritage of freedom is ours to enjoy. When the Prime Minister of this country, quite properly in my opinion, took a definite and determined stand with respect to espionage in this country, I wonder just what our position might have been had we been a small individual nation unprotected by our position in the empire. What answer might we have received from a great power at that time if we had been just a small nation standing alone? But because we knew that we enjoyed the protection and the support of one of the

greatest empires the world has ever known we were able to make our voice heard, and even though criticism was heaped upon the Prime Minister of this country, Canadians generally I think gloried in the courageous stand he took. By that I am not implying any approval of the methods adopted. I am not a legal man and I am not going to argue legal points, but I say that in the main public opinion admired the Prime Minister for championing the nation's cause because the security of individual Canadians was at stake.

The other night the Minister of Mines and Resources, in reply to the hon. member for Davenport, who had a bill before the house to introduce a Jack Miner day, said in effect that it was a matter which involved the provinces because it touched upon education. He thought there should be a reference made to the provinces before the house should give its assent to that bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should not go farther into a debate which is completed.

Mr. CASE: But it has a direct reference to what I wish to say.

The CHAIRMAN: That debate has been concluded and the hon. member should not refer to it now.

Mr. CHURCH: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is talking about a principle by which we should be guided in this debate.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member who is speaking must not refer to a previous debate on the same subject during the present session.

Mr. CASE: Mr. Chairman, you handicap me in what I intended to say, because, if that was important then, this is far more important now. When the provinces of Canada joined in confederation there was designated a day termed "Dominion day", "Dominion of Canada day", or any other like expression you wish to apply to it. Surely the provinces have now the right to determine whether this house should write upon the statute books of this country the substitution for "Dominion day" of the term "Canada day".

Mr. MARTIN: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? It is not correct to say that in 1867 Dominion day was designated as such. In 1867 the reference was to "Canada", but in 1879 a resolution was introduced in the upper house urging that July 1 be made "Dominion day". That resolution was subsequently dealt with in this house on motion of a private member.

I thank the hon. gentleman for giving me the chance to make the observation that in 1867, July 1 was not designated as "Dominion day", but simply referred to in sections 3 and 5 of the British North America Act as "Canada".

Mr. CASE: I accept my hon. friend's explanation. I believe that it lends strength to my argument, for it indicates that in 1867 they were not in a position to determine a suitable day or a suitable designation for a day; but after some years had elapsed, they in their wisdom—and after all they were the makers of Canada and of confederation—determined that it should be called "Dominion day". I am glad to have the hon. member's explanation, but as far as I am concerned any sentiments I have with respect to Canada's national day are directly associated with Dominion day. I consider that the mover of this resolution would have had a great deal more support in this house if he had sought to have the day termed "Confederation day" rather than "Canada day". If we adopt and pass this bill we shall be the only country in the world which uses our national name to designate our national day. I leave that thought with the committee. The world is in a formative, unstable state. What we may do now in this direction may tend to weaken the strength we need in these trying times. I do not want to be misunderstood. I believe my Canadian friends of French descent from Quebec will give me credit for speaking from my heart, just as I believe they have spoken from theirs. Canada as part of the empire has played a great part; I cannot agree in in any way with the hon. member for York North that an act of this kind would make it any greater. Canada's history is written in the contribution she has made to world affairs. Her sacrifices have been made under the terms of an act and are commemorated by a day which we are now seeking to change. I hope someone will see fit to amend this proposal so as to change "Canada day" to "Confederation day", as being something which better describes the purpose we have in view. I do not want to be bigoted in my views. I believe we have in this house a sense of common loyalty; we have all sworn allegiance to the same crown; we believe in British institutions, British laws and British justice. We are therefore not very far apart. I suggest that the title proposed in a wrong one and will be misunderstood, and this thought I leave with the Chairman and members of the committee.

Mr. PINARD: I did not intend to participate in this debate, but I think it is my privilege to try to correct an impression which was made by the remarks of some hon. mem-

bers this afternoon. I do not for a moment question their sincerity. I do not for a moment doubt their good faith in their argument. But it seems to me that these remarks follow the same policy which has been adopted by members of the Progressive Conservative party, who always claim, whenever we try to enact legislation which has for its purpose to develop or better emancipate Canada, that we are trying to destroy our British connection. They have always followed that policy. Whenever any change was suggested or contemplated in the relations of Canada to Great Britain, those who are interested in having things remain as they are insist that we are trying to put an end to confederation. This has been said about practically every constitutional change since the conquest of Canada. In 1927, when the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, then leader of the Conservative opposition, opposed the appointment of a Canadian minister to Washington, he did so on this very ground. His actual words were:

It is the last great adventure in our relation to the British empire. It is but the determining of separation; it is but the end of our connection with the British empire.

And, Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Bennett came into office in 1931 he appointed his own brother-in-law, Mr. Herridge, as minister at Washington. Mr. Herridge served his term, and I do not believe it is the opinion of my hon. friends that any material change was made in our relations with Great Britain.

It was also suggested this afternoon that before the adoption of the British North America Act there was an agreement by which this country was to be called the "Dominion of Canada". I do not believe that this assertion is true. In order to substantiate my opinion I wish to refer first to a book entitled "The Constitution of Canada", by Kennedy, on page 314 of which the author states:

When the conference resumed after the holidays Lord Monck, the governor general, and Lord Carnarvon, the colonial secretary, attended its meetings accompanied by Sir Frederic Rogers, afterwards Lord Blachford, the permanent under-secretary. Attempts were at once begun to draft a bill. With the final resolutione before them, at least six drafts were drawn up. The seventh and last printed in imperial form was dated for revision February 9, 1867, and was the outcome of consultation between the imperial representatives and the members of the conference. Perhaps the most interesting fact about these drafts is that at first the name of the new federation was left to the decision of the queen. Later it appeared as "the kingdom of Canada," and in the final draft as "one dominion under the name of Canada." Macdonald was "the ruling genius" with power in "management and adroitness." There can be little doubt with his strong bias in favour of a legislative union that he desired to form an auxiliary kingdom out of the colonies, and he deplored in later life the lack of insight which rejected the title. He fought hard for its retention, but it was withdrawn at the instance of Lord Stanley, the minister for foreign affairs, who feared that "it would wound the sensibilities of the Yankees." It was appropriate that the name of Canada should be chosen in preference to the fantastic titles suggested by the press, but history does not relate from what source or for what reasons the word "dominion" was added.

May I now quote from one who, together with Sir George Etienne Cartier, may well be considered the founder of confederation. I refer to none other than Sir John A. Macdonald. I wish to quote from a book entitled "Correspondence of Sir John Macdonald," by Sir Joseph Pope. At page 450 there appears the following:

The declaration of all the B.N.A. provinces that they desired as one dominion to remain a portion of the empire, showed what wise government and generous treatment would do, and should have been marked as an epoch in the history of England. This would probably have been the case, had Lord Carnarvon, who, as colonial minister, had sat at the cradle of the new dominion, remained in office. His ill-omened resignation was followed by the appointment of the late Duke of Buckingham, who had as his adviser the then governor general, Lord Monck—both good men certainly, but quite unable, from the constitution of their minds, to rise to the occasion. The union was treated by them much as if the B.N.A. Act were a private bill uniting two or three English parishes. Had a different course been pursued—for instance had united Canada been declared to be an auxiliary kingdom, as it was in the Canadian draft of the bill, I feel sure (almost) that the Australian colonies would, ere this, have been applying to be placed in the same rank as the kingdom of Canada.

I should like to quote the postscript:

On reading the above over I see that it will convey the impression that the change of title from kingdom to dominion was caused by the Duke of Buckingham. This is not so. It was made at the instance of Lord Derby, then foreign minister, who feared the first name would wound the sensibilities of the Yankees. I mentioned this incident in our history to Lord Beaconsfield at Hughenden in 1879, who said, "I was not aware of the circumstance, but it is so like Derby—a very good fellow, but who lives in a region of perpetual funk."

Mr. COLDWELL: Who wrote that?

Mr. PINARD: That was written by Sir John A. Macdonald and addressed to Lord Knutsford on July 18, 1889, and it is reported in Sir Joseph Pope's "Correspondence of Sir John Macdonald."

I submit, therefore, that it is not right, in fact it is definitely wrong, to assume that the title "Dominion of Canada" came into being as a matter of agreement. That is not the fact. The name "Dominion of Canada" came into existence as the circumstances which I have stated indicate.

There is another aspect to this matter, and I mention this in answer to the argument which was advanced this afternoon and which has been repeated to-night by the same hon. member, namely, that no other nation has adopted as its holiday a day bearing its name. I do not think that is the purpose of the bill. The purpose of the bill is to attempt to clarify an ambiguity which has existed for a considerable time. When Dominion day is celebrated and the first of July is taken as the day of celebration it is apt to lead any one to think that the first of July might as well be the holiday of any other dominion forming a part of the British commonwealth of nations. When in the future any other country may become a dominion and form part as an associate of the British family, this argument will again, I suggest, be advanced and we shall again be caught with the same ambiguity. It will then be considered that "dominion day" may be the holiday of any other dominion forming a part of the British commonwealth of nations.

Personally, it was with pride that I voted in favour of the second reading of the bill. It is with joy that I wish this country of mine, Canada, to have as its national day a day which, like the fourth of July in the United States or the fourteenth of July in France, will be known the world over as the holiday of our own country.

It is with confidence in the future of Canada that everyone in this country, all of us who in the near future will, I hope, become Canadian citizens by virtue of the new citizenship bill which has been introduced, should approve this all-Canadian and most progressive legislation.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not intend to take part in this debate because I have been here only one session before and, in my short experience of bills introduced by private members, any such measure has been talked out. I did not know at the time that the government would rally so vigorously and enthusiastically to the support of this particular bill and therefore I did not take part in the debate prior to the time the vote was taken. Since the dinner recess I have made some investigation to find out when Dominion day was originally instituted, and I find that it was on May 15, 1879. On that date an act of parliament was passed which first introduced Dominion day. I should like to quote from the preamble:

> Whereas it was on the first day of July that the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick became one dominion under the name of Canada; and
>
> Whereas Rupert's land and the northwestern territory and the province of British Columbia became part of the dominion in the month of July, and Prince Edward Island became part of the dominion on the first day of July; and
>
> Whereas it is expedient that such important events should be commemorated:
>
> Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows.

Then appears what we find in the present bill. I find that in the old debates there was not one dissenting voice. The matter was brought forward in the house, and Mr. David Mills, a resident of western Ontario, made this remark:

> Dominion day was, he believed, universally kept as a holiday, at least, it was in western Canada, but it was not kept under the authority of any act of parliament.

I suggest that this act, which has been in force for sixty-seven years and under which Canada has made great advances, should not be changed and that no change should be made in the name of this particular holiday.

Mr. COLDWELL: I find it very difficult indeed to understand why so much heat is generated over a proposal of this description. Surely we have come to the day when, setting aside all prejudices, we ought to be prepared to recognize this country as Canada. I look back over the years and I find that in 1867 the proclamation which proclaimed the union of the various provinces of this dominion into one great confederation referred to our country as Canada. I find that when Sir Robert Borden, the erstwhile leader of my friends to the right, signed the treaty of Versailles in 1919, he did not sign it in the name of the Dominion of Canada but in the name of Canada. The various agreements that we have made over the last number of years have been made in the name of Canada. Surely the men and women who went overseas in this war did not carry on their arms any insignia of colonialism; they carried on their arms the name of Canada. For the life of me I cannot understand why there are hon. gentlemen who rise in this house and still desire to cling to the name "Dominion", when dominion has a connotation altogether different from that which is the connotation of the word "Canada" to-day. Canada is a nation. Canada has grown to nationhood in the last seventy or eighty years. Canada has earned a place in the comity of nations and deserves to be recognized as such. It seems strange to me that nearly every other country in the world, including the United Kingdom, recognizes this country as a nation as Canada. Yet we have people in our own country who refuse to recognize it. I cannot understand it.

I came to this country as an immigrant from Great Britain thirty-six years ago. No one can say that I have no love for the country which gave me birth; but this is the country in which I have found my life, in which my children were born. I want to see Canada assume that spirit and place of nationhood which is rightly hers. I cannot understand my hon. friends who continually cling to the outmoded connotations of colonialism.

A few moments ago a quotation was given from the writings of Sir John A. Macdonald. May I requote it? Sir John A. Macdonald was writing to Lord Knutsford on July 18, 1889. He went on to explain why it was the name of the kingdom of Canada was not accepted, as my hon. friend has placed on the record already. In the postscript which I should like to place on the record anew we find these words:

> On reading the above over I see that it will convey the impression that the change of title from "kingdom" to "dominion" was caused by the Duke of Buckingham. This is not so. It was made at the instance of Lord Derby, then foreign minister, who feared the first name would wound the sensibilities of the Yankees.

My hon. friends who are objecting to the use of the name "Canada" are apparently still carrying on the tradition that we must not wound the sensibilities of the Yankees. As far as I am concerned, I do not mind wounding the sensibilities of the Yankees or of anybody as long as this country may assume its proper place among the nations of the world.

I continue with the quotation:

> I mentioned this incident in our history to Lord Beaconsfield at Hughenden in 1879, who said, "I was not aware of the circumstance, but it is so like Derby—a very good fellow, but who lives in a region of perpetual funk."

I rather suspect that there are politicians in this house who live in a region of perpetual funk because they are afraid to assume the name of Canada.

As far as I and those who are associated with me in this party are concerned, while we want to retain the very closest friendship with the people of the United Kingdom and the people of the British commonwealth of nations, we nevertheless want to see to it that this country of ours, Canada, shall be known throughout the world as Canada and not as the Dominion of Canada with a colonial connotation. Therefore I support this bill; I want to se it go through.

There is no incompatibility between assuming a stature that one ought to assume on account of the long history of this country, not the history of recent days in connection with the war but the history of this country ever since confederation. In this country we have been trying to build a nation. Persons from all over the civilized world have come to this country from time to time. Our boys who fought overseas were proud to bear the name of Canada. I hope that at this session this parliament will see to it that we place Canada among the nations of the world. This is not an unhealthy form of nationalism. We are proud of our families. Our families are a part of the community, and we are proud of the community. Our communities are a part of our nation; we are proud of our nation, and our nation can be proud of being part of the great world in which we live.

The men and women who served Canada in this war ought, in my opinion, to have had the opportunity of carrying the name of Canada and her flag across the world. I hope that this house will adopt this bill in order that the boys and girls now attending our schools, the men and women now celebrating the first of July, may celebrate it not as emerging from colonial status but as an indication that Canada has become a nation among the nations of the world. Let us pass this bill and teach our boys and girls, the men and women who have come or who are coming into this country from all over the world, that the first of July is the day on which we are proud to call our country "Canada."

Mr. HARKNESS: I am one of those of whom the hon. gentleman spoke a few moments ago. I was proud to carry the name of Canada on my shoulder overseas, but I do not think that enters into this discussion in the slightest. Not one of us is afraid to assume the name of Canada; as a matter of fact overseas we were all proud to do so, but in my opinion that is not the question before us. I measure this bill by only one yardstick: will it increase the feeling and spirit of unity in our country? In my opinion it will not, and as a result I am opposed to it. As a matter of fact I think it will have exactly the opposite effect; it will tend to destroy some of the unity which exists at the present time. I should like to urge all hon. members to use that same yardstick in considering this bill and in coming to their decision upon it.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3—When 1st of July is a Sunday.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I rise to speak for only two or three minutes in the very fervent hope that I may be able to debunk something which has just been said by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party. No one denies; no one will ever deny—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): The hon. member for Waterloo South is not here, but I see that the quackers down in the far corner opposite are still with us. No one among us, I am sure, will ever say anything against pride of country as we have it in this Dominion of Canada. It is very easy to build up a straw man and then knock him down. The leader of the C.C.F. party is adept at many things, but in that he achieves the absolute tops among us all; I will give him first prize in that sort of business. But what does this amount to? We have used the words "Dominion day" since 1879, as someone told me a moment ago. I give my word of honour that it was news to me, because I was not born then. But this is the position. We have used it and we have never heard a suggestion anywhere, until now, that it should be changed. Now in this House of Commons for the first time, as far as any public discussion, or discussion in newspapers, magazine articles or anything of that kind goes, we hear this suggestion.

Mr. POULIOT: There must always be a beginning.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): The hon. member says there must be a beginning. There is an end of the beginning and a beginning of the end; that also is worth while contemplating. So that I put it in this simple way. As far as I am concerned I do not see any great difference in the use of the word "Canada" and the use of the word "Dominion."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, yes.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): With respect, Mr. Chairman, through you may I say that I am going to take care of the problem of hon. gentlemen opposite right now. My answer is this. We have got along pretty well with this day and this name for a great many years. What is the reason for changing it now? Somebody says, because we have reached the stature of nationhood. The Statute of Westminister did nothing more and nothing less than declare an existing state of facts. That has been the growth of this empire, this commonwealth.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is that not what the bill is doing, declaring a state of fact?

Mr. GRAYDON: Just twisting the government's tail; that is all it is doing.

Mr. SINNOTT: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Yes, indeed.

Mr. SINNOTT: What was the reason for the Conservative party of that time changing its name at the last convention?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I am glad I have aroused at least this much enthusiasm and amusement, but may I answer the hon. member in this way. Our changes of name have not been any more than his changes of affiliation.

Mr. SINNOTT: May I ask the hon. member another question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member for Calgary West has the floor.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): With respect to the hon. member's further question I am going to adopt the attitude of the government and suggest that he put it on the order paper so that I may get along with what I have to say.

I am going to make this very, very plain. The first time I said anything in this house I said something I meant and felt very deeply. I then said that, aside from economic problems and that sort of thing, I thought the greatest problem we had and the mission we had was to do something about unity in this country; that is, unity between the two major races. I have not changed one bit since then. I am now going to make this suggestion, which has already been made, and then I am going to make an admission for myself. I am seeking time in this matter. Someone may say, "Then why did you vote against the motion to adjourn the debate?" I did. I think I was wrong. I think this country should have more time to consider this measure. I am now going to help out the government. They are now in this position. A number of ministers, perhaps the ablest—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And private members.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I will admit that the ablest private member is the one who spoke just now.

I have come clean; I have admitted I was wrong in a vote I cast, and I conclude my remarks by saying this. We have had some heat displayed here. I think the house will agree that I am not exhibiting anything of that kind. When I get mad at somebody it is going to be over something quite worth while. An hon. member over there from Quebec sent me a note this afternoon which might have generated heat had I not known

the great sense of humour he possesses. My position can be put in a sentence. Would it not be better to wait a minute? I told the house I was going to help out the government. Their position is this. They will have to kill this bill in the senate; that is the spot they are in. There is no other place they can go, and I am trying to help them. I am merely suggesting that we cool off a little bit, and let reason rather than emotion govern.

Mr. MAYHEW: Mr. Chairman, I did vote against the first amendment which asked for a six months hoist of the bill, because in my opinion that was one means not only of killing it but of smothering it to death, and of preventing any discussion of this important matter. I thought it was not becoming of anyone to make a motion of that kind which would mean that we would not have a chance at least to consider the bill before us.

Then, when we came to the amendment to adjourn the debate, I voted for it. I did so for the very reason that that would give us time to discuss the bill, but not kill it. It could be referred back to the house later in the session, and we could then either kill the bill or adopt it, as we saw fit.

When it came, then, to voting for the motion itself, I voted against it, because it was doing the very thing that the first amendment did; that is, it was crowding something upon us which we had not had time to consider. Because it was crowding, and because I felt that they were pushing it on us, I for one put out my neck and said that I would not support it. I am not at all sorry that I took that position.

But I do resent it when the leader of the C.C.F. tries to maintain that anyone who voted against that bill was voting against Canada itself. I take second place to no one when it comes to a matter of loyalty for Canada, or pride in this country. But I did think it was too important a question to be settled in an afternoon in this house.

To my mind Dominion day has meant to me the birth of Canada, the birth of our nation. For that reason I have always taken it seriously. But this debate is going to do one thing, because in my opinion it is good for Canada. That day, Dominion day, was nothing more to us than another holiday. It was a civic holiday, but one which Canadians did not use. They did not emphasize that we were celebrating the union of two great nations into one country called "Canada". We just went off on picnics here and there. Nothing was organized, and there was no effort to bring it to the attention of young Canadians that that is Canada's day. Whether it should be called "Canada day", or whether it should be called "Confederation day", or whether it should remain "Dominion day", I am not certain. Because of that uncertainty I should have liked to have a little more time to consider the matter. I suggest that those who have pressed the bill upon us at this time have made a mistake in doing so.

I do not think for one moment that it will make one particle of difference in the loyalty of Canada, one part against the other. It is not going to affect us at all. Those who talk along that line are talking foolishly. We shall still remain Canadians—and if as small a thing as that will send them away saying something or doing something that is not Canadian or is not in favour of the British commonwealth of nations, then I think they have gone altogether too far.

I have said even more than I intended to say, but I hope I have put myself on record.

Mr. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, I will not take up much time of the house. However, I wish to say this to my good friends in all parties in the house that the British people—and I speak, of course, in the broadest sense, because we have taken all the finest people from the world into the family of this dominion—are fully represented in Canada. The British people hold an umbrella of freedom. Yes, always remember that they hold that umbrella of freedom.

Before we pass a measure of this kind, basic principle of democracy is to go and talk the matter over with your own people. I am for Canadian citizenship. I talked it over with my people, and they elected me. I am for a Canadian flag. I talked it over with my people, and they elected me.

I have no objection to this bill, but I think we must go back and talk it over with our people. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar this evening spoke about this Canada. I think Canada is what it is to-day because men were prepared to sacrifice their lives, if necessary, so that freedom, the British commonwealth and Canada might live. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar is an Englishman, like myself.

An hon. MEMBER: I hope not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just a minute; let us be fair about this. My mind goes back to 1939, when his party, there, said to his own flesh and blood, "Cash on the barrel".

Mr. COLDWELL: Nothing of the kind. I invite the minister to prove that statement. It is absolutely false.

Mr. MITCHELL: I will put it in this way, if I may put it in the language of the street, so that they may understand it. I have a vivid recollection of the statement that we should send goods and munitions of war to the people of Great Britain—

Mr. COLDWELL: Absolutely false.

Mr. MITCHELL: —and not any men.

Mr. COLDWELL: Absolutely false. That is not correct. Never cash on the barrel head. The minister knows he is falsifying the record.

Mr. MITCHELL: Well, that is what I call cash on the barrel. Let me say to my hon. friend that I came in late. He made an impassioned speech this evening, and I did not hear all of it. But let me say this to him, that nations and civilization are not built by people who sit on the fence.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is what you have been doing for years, so far as labour conditions are concerned—no bigger fence-sitter in Canada. What about Ford?

An hon. MEMBER: What about steel?

Mr. MITCHELL: Don't get down in the gutter.

Mr. COLDWELL: You asked for it, and you will get it.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind hon. members that they cannot make a row. The speaker has the floor, unless the hon. member who is speaking gives consent.

Mr. GILLIS: On a point of order, is the minister discussing the present bill, or is he discussing the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar.

An hon. MEMBER: Both.

Mr. COLDWELL: I don't mind which he does.

Mr. GILLIS: If you are going to allow that kind of latitude, you will get plenty of it. And that is giving you a tip.

Mr. ROWE: You have often contributed to it yourself.

Mr. MITCHELL: I will say—and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar is a personal friend of mine—that when we have been discussing this particular question he brings in the Ford strike. May I say to my hon. friend that I received a unanimous resolution from the workers at Ford for the contribution I made to the settlement of that strike.

I want now to get back to my previous point, and say that the British commonwealth of nations was built or developed, and evolved the greatest science of government in history, as we understand it, upon a basis of free institutions and the right to express one's opinion, notwithstanding the fact that ninety-nine per cent of the people may disagree with you. I believe that we should take time on this thing, that we should go back to our people and—

Mr. PROBE: But don't ride the fence.

Mr. MITCHELL: If my prairie chicken will keep quiet for a moment—

Mr. PROBE: I am not an overstuffed bantam rooster anyway.

Mr. MITCHELL: I should have said "prairie statesman." I am quite prepared to go back to my people and discuss with them whether they are in favour of making this change, just the same as I did on the flag question and other legislation that has come before the house. I just wanted to say these few words to put myself on record.

Mr. CHURCH: The dominions should hang together or they will hang separately.

Section agreed to.

Section 4 agreed to.

Bill reported, on division.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Other hon. MEMBERS: Next sitting.

Mr. MACKENZIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I refer your Honour to standing order 77, which reads:

> All amendments made in committee are reported by the chairman to the house, which shall receive the same forthwith. After report the bill is open to debate and amendment, before it is ordered for a third reading. But when a bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Next sitting.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Speaker, the rules clearly make it possible to have the third reading of this bill now, but after what has been said by the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Mayhew) and others here to-night I wonder whether the government wishes to press for third reading now or whether it would not be better left over for a later day to give hon. members time to cool off. I respectfully make that suggestion to the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE: In reply to the hon. leader of the opposition, may I point out that this is not a government measure. I was merely pointing out to His Honour that under standing order 77 it is quite competent for the house to take third reading of this bill forthwith.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house that the bill shall now be read a third time? Those in favour will please say, yea; those against will please say, nay. In my opinion the yeas have it. Call in the members.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet.

Mr. GRAYDON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, may I not be heard on a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have put the question to the house. It was not for the Speaker to decide whether the bill should be read a third time now or not. I put the question to the house and I asked those who were in favour of the bill being read a third time to say yea, and those who were against to say nay, and I gave my opinion that the yeas had it. That having been said by me, more than five members rose, and according to the rules of the house I had only one thing to do, namely, to ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to call in the members. The hon. member knows perfectly well that that is established practice in this house.

Mr. GRAYDON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: Am I to be denied the right to speak even on a point of order?

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not going to sit down for any one over there, but I will sit down for the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. members on both sides to be quiet and preserve the dignity and decorum we should have in this house. The hon. member will recall that last session, after the members had been called in, a member rose on a point of order and I gave the ruling that when the members had been called in no member should rise on a point of order. I have already asked the Sergeant-at-Arms to call in the members so that we may proceed to take the vote.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Mr. FRASER: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Members having been called in, no point of order could be raised now.

Mr. FRASER: This is a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Cote, Matapedia-Matane) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Archibald
Argue
Arsenault
Baker
Beaudoin
Belzile
Bentley
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blanchette
Boivin
Bonnier
Bourget
Bowerman
Bradette
Breithaupt
Bridges
Brunelle
Bryce
Burton
Campbell
Cardin
Castleden
Chevrier
Claxton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Coldwell
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)
Coté (Verdun)
Denis
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Douglas
Dubois
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gagnon
Gardiner
Gariépy
Gauthier (Nipissing)
Gauthier (Portneuf)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Gibson (Hamilton West)
Gillis
Gingues
Glen
Golding
Gour (Russell)
Gourd (Chapleau)
Grant
Hamel
Herridge
Ilsley
Irvine
Isnor
Jaenicke
Jean
Jutras
Kirk
Knight
Lacombe
LaCroix
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Langlois
Lapalme
Laurendeau
Leger
Little
McCann
McCuaig
McCulloch (Pictou)
McDonald (Parry Sound)
McGarry
McIlraith
MacInnis
McIvor
McKay
Mackenzie
MacLean
Marier
Marquis
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Matthews (Kootenay East)
Maybank
Michaud
Moore
Mullins
Mutch
Parent
Picard
Pinard
Pouliot
Power
Probe
Raymond (Wright)
Richard (Ottawa East)
Robinson (Simcoe East)
Sinclair (Ontario)

Sinclair (Vancouver North)	Tremblay
Sinnott	Tucker
Smith (York North)	Viau
Stewart (Winnipeg North)	Warren
Stuart (Charlotte)	Weir
Strum, Mrs.	Whitman
Thatcher	Winters
Townley-Smith	Wright
	Zaplitny—123.

NAYS

Messrs:

Ashby	Kuhl
Barrett	Lennard
Blackmore	McCubbin
Blair	McGregor
Boucher	McLure
Bracken	McMaster
Bradshaw	MacNicol
Brooks	Marshall
Cardiff	Mayhew
Case	Menary
Casselman	Mitchell
Charlton	Murphy
Church	Pearkes
Cockeram	Quelch
Cruickshank	Reid
Daniel	Robinson (Bruce)
Diefenbaker	Ross (St. Paul's)
Drope	Ross (Souris)
Fleming	Rowe
Fraser	Senn
Fulton	Skey
Graydon	Stanfield
Green	Stephenson
Harkness	Stirling
Harris (Danforth)	Stokes
Hazen	Tustin
Hlynka	Webb
Hodgson	White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Homuth	White (Middlesex East)
Jackman	Wylie—62.
Johnston	
Kidd	

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): I was paired with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BROWN: I was paired with the hon. member for Lambton Kent (Mr. Henderson). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. RINFRET: I was paired with the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MacNAUGHT: I was paired with the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Coyle). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): I was paired with the hon. member for London (Mr. Manross). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I was paired with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been moved by Mr. Cote (Matapedia-Matane), seconded by Mr. Smith (North York), that the bill do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have in my hand a large book. I am not familiar with every page of it, but I find on page 239 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition, the following:

> 715. It is occasionally the custom to pass bills through their different stages at one and the same sitting. That course, however, is never taken except in cases of extreme urgency, and with the general assent of the house. (Speaker Brand, 1880). It is for the house to declare whether there is such urgency as to require the rapid passage of a measure; and whenever the sense of the house is to take more than one stage on the same day, the Speaker has permitted it to be done.

I am suggesting, sir, that you follow that and defer the third reading of the bill.

Mr. POULIOT: On the point of order raised by my hon. friend—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. If the hon. member will permit me, no hon. member may raise a point of order now that the bill has already been read the third time. The question was put to the house for the second reading of the bill and the motion carried, and for the third reading, which motion also was carried, and the house had many opportunities to act in accordance with the hon. gentleman's suggestion. The house has already determined, however, that the bill be read a third time. The hon. member for Matapedia-Matane now moves, seconded by Mr. Smith of North York, that the bill be now passed and that the title be as on the order paper. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: On division.

Motion agreed to on division.

SOCIAL SECURITY

ALLOWANCES TO PERSONS SUFFERING INJURY, ACCIDENT OR CONGENITAL INFIRMITY.

The house resumed from Monday, April 1, consideration of the motion of Mr. Bertrand (Terrebonne):

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into consideration the advisability of including in their social security programme a system of allowances to every person, without any income or means of support, who, by reason of any injury, accident or congenital

infirmity, is at a disadvantage in seeking or obtaining employment, or incapable of providing for his subsistence, and whose age prevents him from benefiting by the social security legislation now in force.

Mrs. GLADYS STRUM (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, in the face of the exhibition of ultra-patriotism which we have had to-day, I feel almost impelled to declare my ancestry. While that has nothing to do with the present motion, we have had such a marvellous display of ninety-nine and forty-four one-hundredths per cent pure Canadianism that I think I should let you know that my father was born on the first of July and my grandfather was a United Empire Loyalist.

The members of this house have now an opportunity to prove whether or not they are really good Canadians. Perhaps it is well to refer to the motion in order to establish the terms of reference, because I do not wish to explore the entire field of Canadian history or the entire territory included in the British empire. I wish to stick to the resolution, which declares:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into consideration the advisability of including in their social security programme a system of allowances to every person, without any income or means of support, who, by reason of any injury, accident or congenital infirmity, is at a disadvantage in seeking or obtaining employment, or incapable of providing for his subsistence, and whose age prevents him from benefiting by the social security legislation now in force.

I submit that the test of a good citizen is not being able to brag about the number of square miles which happen to comprise our boundaries, or in the figures we establish in the field of trade, or on the goals that we have set in the fields of production. In Canada we have great natural beauty, great resources of power, great resources for the production of food; but I must insist that the test of Canada is in the field of her humanity. If in Canada we have people who are crippled and have no means of livelihood, people who must spend lives of pain, desperation and frustration, people who must depend on chance and charity, it is the greater shame in the face of our great wealth, and we have every reason to blush that we have delayed so long the passage of a bill of this kind.

If, through accident, through injury, if as a result of illness, or because of birth we have people who are handicapped they will need at least four things. They will need an allowance to pay for rent, clothing and food. In addition to that, perhaps they will need drugs and appliances. They should have medical care and a chance to take advantage of the kind of education which might be to their benefit. We should generously endow research institutes—and that is where we fall down—that would try to discover the reasons for their infirmities and alleviate their sufferings. I hope that we shall deal with this bill; I hope that all hon. members will prove that they are really good Canadians by voting for it.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): I rise to support this resolution and to compliment the hon. member who introduced it. He has touched on a matter that has been too long overlooked. I hope that the government will accept the resolution and bring in legislation to implement it.

In my riding in Toronto I have come across many cases that are outside the pale of receiving assistance from any organization or source of which I know to-day. I have in mind a man who worked in a foundry in Toronto. Above him were large glass windows. In the course of time he caught a cold which settled in his lungs. In a foundry there is much heat —not the kind we had here this afternoon— and a good deal of draught. As I say, it settled on his lungs and he became quite ill. He went to the hospital. He applied to the workmen's compensation board for compensation and received compensation for some time. In my experience I have had a good deal to do with many men of that type. Many of them may work in factories. I myself was engaged in the foundry business for some time.

The workmen's compensation board was organized to take care of men injured in plants. I am happy to say that I was one of those, together with organizations and industries with which I was associated, who supported the Ontario government when they introduced the workmen's compensation act. But it does not cover everything. After the man to whom I referred was released from the hospital he received compensation for some time, but ultimately the board's doctors declared him perfectly fit to go back to his work. In the course of time he became incapable of working because his lungs were affected. I did my best to have the compensation board take up his case again, but was unsuccessful. This is the type of case that this resolution would cover. Here was a man who was unable to work at anything to give him a livelihood. His wife took in sewing and after the greatest of effort was apparently able to eke out an existence. This resolution would cover a case of that kind, because among other things it says:

. . . without any income or means of support, who, by reason of any injury, accident or congenital infirmity . . .

I have another case in mind where a man riding to work on a motorcycle had the misfortune to be struck by a street-car and was very seriously injured with the result that he became badly crippled. Of course, a workman cannot fight a street-car company for long. In this particular case the workman was not awarded any compensation by the street-car company or by any other body. He became a charge on his friends, and while still a young man was outside any possible support from any source that I could find out for him. If a bill were founded on this resolution such a man, being unable to work or to take care of himself, would be looked after.

The resolution also refers to congenital infirmity. I know of one or two cases which are only examples of a multitude that would come under a bill founded on this resolution. I know of a young woman who had a pronounced curvature of the spine. She went through a business college and graduated as a stenographer. She applied for a position and could not get one. The fact that she had a pronounced curvature of the spine prevented her from obtaining a position. After a considerable effort and writing many letters to friends of mine who were employers, and appealing to their humanity, I obtained a position for her. But there are multitudes like her who cannot obtain positions because of deformities that are no fault of theirs. This young lady was penalized by being apparently unemployable or being in such a condition that employers would not take her on, perhaps because other members of the staff did not want to have her among them. I know a good deal about offices and there are some offices like that. A class of people like that who could not get employment would be taken care of by a bill founded on this resolution.

I know of another young woman who is about eighteen years of age. She was born a pronounced cripple. She was so crippled that her legs were thrown under her and her arms were also deformed to a certain extent. She got along by throwing herself forward on the floor in a sitting position, one leg after the other. I endeavoured to persuade everyone I knew who might be able to do so to give her something to do, because she had a very happy disposition and wanted to do anything she was capable of doing, but I could get no work for her. Finally a society in Toronto, I believe it was the crippled children's society, took up her case and got her something to do at home; I do not know what kind of work it was. But for that society, which is doing splendid work among crippled children, that girl would have no means whatever of taking care of herself. I presume any bill founded upon this resolution would take care of a case of that kind.

Certainly crippled children, children born that way, had nothing whatever to do with their condition, and in my judgment it is the duty of the state to base upon this resolution a bill which will give these people something on which they may live. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) may have something in mind along that line; perhaps he has been working on something. If so, no doubt when he speaks he will tell us what are his plans and what is the programme. Many others are not old enough to qualify for old age pensions; there must be quite a large number of people in that age group who have no income whatever, and perhaps the bill would help take care of them.

I rose merely for the purpose of placing myself solidly behind any programme of social security for those who are referred to in the resolution. If the government will bring in a bill under which these people will be given at least an opportunity to live, not on their friends but on the state, I will support it.

Mr. W. G. BLAIR (Lanark): I should like to support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, but as it is now worded I cannot do so. I would not want any hon. member to think I am complaining about the resolution on a mere technicality; I have no doubt as to what the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand) had in mind, but as it is now worded the resolution does not carry out that meaning. You will notice that it says, "without any income". In other words, a man in receipt of only $5 a month, far too little to provide him with the necessities of life, would not be eligible under this measure. Then it goes on to speak of "congenital infirmity". That means a disease or disability existing from birth. If this resolution is adopted in its present form we shall exclude people with heart disease, people with arthritis, people with tuberculosis, people who have suffered strokes and are paralysed, and many other persons who are incapable of earning a livelihood.

As I say, I should like to support this resolution, and I would suggest to the hon. member that he redraft or amend it. Instead of the word "any" as to income, I would suggest the word "sufficient"; instead of the word "congenital" I would substitute the word "physical". That would do away with those two objections. It would not exclude the man in receipt of a very small income. It would not exclude all those other people in

the welfare group this resolution is intended to help. If the hon. member for Terrebonne will make those substitutions, by amendment or otherwise, I shall be glad to support the resolution because I think it fulfils a need that has existed for a long time.

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): I rise to support this resolution because I believe that the degree of civilization reached by society may be measured by the extent to which each citizen regards himself as his brother's keeper. I believe that this resolution takes a step in that direction; therefore I am in favour of it. Whatever technical difficulties may arise in interpreting who shall come under its provisions, can I think, be easily straightened out when the bill is brought down. This resolution suggests a general policy; as and when the bill comes down it will contain the details.

I wish to support the resolution also because some provinces, including Manitoba, are not as fortunate as the province referred to the other evening by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), when he said that in British Columbia there was some limited form of assistance to crippled or disabled people. I should like to place on record a sentence or two from a letter I received from the director of public welfare of Manitoba, to indicate that unfortunately in our province we have no legislation whatever to cover disability cases from the time the family allowance ceases until the old age pension begins. In reply to an inquiry of mine dated February 6, 1946, I received this reply, from which I shall read just a sentence:

> In Manitoba there is no provincial programme to provide financial aid for children just because of their crippled condition.

Further in the same letter I find this:

> In the second place because of existing legislation the care of crippled adults is a municipal responsibility . . .

In other words, there is no legislation whatever in Manitoba to look after either crippled children or adults. As an example of some of the unfortunate people that we run across all too often, I should like to quote a few words from a letter which was written to me by a person in Ste. Rose du Lac, which commences with these words:

> Being completely disabled through sickness, and sixty-six years old, would you kindly give me a hand toward getting my old age pension?

We all get letters of this kind, and it is not easy to sit down and explain to these people that because they are only sixty odd years of age they are not eligible for pension, regardless of the fact that they are crippled or disabled.

For the reasons I have mentioned I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Terrebonne on having brought forward this resolution. I hope that not only will the house pass the resolution but that a bill will be brought down under which provision will be made for looking after this class of people.

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I rise to say that I am absolutely with the hon. member who brought in this resolution. I believe it has merit, but I agree with the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Blair) that the wording should be changed. I know of a family in my own riding that has not had one cent from any municipality; yet the entire family is absolutely crippled. The father has been a cripple since birth. The mother is crippled; her mother is the same way, and their child is also crippled. The only way they can get any money, except by working in their back kitchen, is through relief and they are too proud to ask for that. The father has to be carried around, because he cannot walk. The mother is able to hobble around on crutches, and the grandmother is the same way. They have a small income, through their own efforts, by working on woodwork in their own home. If this bill were changed so that it would increase their small income, one which is not sufficient—they make only a few hundred dollars a year—it would help a great deal.

In many instances parents who have children crippled from birth are ashamed of them, and of their infirmity. By accident about five years ago I stumbled on a case of a girl twenty-three years of age who had never been away from her own home, and who was unable even to feed herself. The family would not let her be seen by outsiders, because they were ashamed of her. Even her next-door neighbour did not know she was in the home.

To-day, thanks to the Hon. Percy Vivian, who was minister of health of Ontario, that girl is in an institution. But the family kept her and looked after her for years.

Only a few weeks ago I received a letter from a woman sixty-two years of age who has been crippled all her life, and who has been kept by her sister ever since the father died some twenty-six or twenty-seven years ago. This woman is too young to receive an ald age pension, and the relief she might get from the municipality is so small that it could not possibly keep her.

I hope sincerely that hon. members on the government side of the house will see to it that this bill carries.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I wish in a few words to express my support of the resolution now before us. I would draw to the attention of hon. members the fact that this is not a bill, that it is

a resolution which had to be phrased in general terms so that it could be brought before the house.

Anyone reading the resolution will understand, I am sure, what the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand) had in mind. He had in mind that Canada should have a social security programme. A social security programme is a programme for the social welfare or security of people who, for any reason, are not able to provide for themselves. I believe we have come to a stage in our civilization when the representatives of the people, and the people who elected those representatives, should be ashamed of seeing any member of the community who, because of any condition whatsoever, mental, physical, or otherwise, is not able to provide for himself, being allowed to suffer for lack of the good things of life which we can provide in such abundance.

I too hope, as the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser) has said, that hon. members on the government side of the house, and the ministers in particular, will accept this resolution. In doing so, there is something that those of us on this side of the house should keep in mind. A social security programme cannot be put into operation unless we are prepared to spend part of the revenue of the country on that programme. If we do that, then we must add to the taxes paid by our people. That will mean increasing expenditures. So that if we are going to ask, as we do, that the government accept this suggestion, we must not criticize it for making the necessary expenditures required.

Mr. FRASER: But they could cut out some of their extravagances. They spend over $660 a day on the broadcast "Soldier's Wife".

Mr. MacINNIS: I am not saying that they cannot. However, I have noticed in my years of public life that everyone is in favour of instituting economies, provided that the operation does not begin with him or her, as the case may be.

The matter of looking after the unfortunate among us is not a matter of money. It is a matter of organizing the man-power of the country, our material resources and our machinery of production in order that we may produce the things those people need: food, clothing, shelter, education, medical attention and those other things which we all need. That may be expressed in terms of money, it may be measured in that way, but it must be provided in real goods and services.

The question is not: Can we afford the money? Rather it is: Can we produce the goods and services required? I am convinced we can, and in any event we should not say we cannot until we have put every unemployed man and woman to work producing wealth.

I, too add my congratulations to the many which have been tendered the hon. member for Terrebonne for introducing the resolution. I hope the government will accept its broad general principle, and use every endeavour to put it into legislative form.

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this discussion has followed the introduction of a motion by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand) which, like a good many other motions, may be the first step in a measure of social reform. I should like to add my word of congratulation to him for bringing this forward, and speaking to it in the eloquent and moderate way in which he spoke.

It is within the experience of all hon. members that if we look back over the years we shall find that practically every measure of social reform has been introduced, in the first instance, in consequence of a private member's resolution. This has led to its being ventilated, developed, explored, considered and ultimately introduced in the form of legislation. In that connection I think of the motion of the then hon. member for Compton, Mr. Letellier de St. Just who, back in 1929, offered a motion in favour of family allowances. That was considered very forward-looking at the time, and it was some years before family allowances were introduced.

It is one of the means whereby, as I say, these matters receive attention and ultimately incorporation into the legislative structure of the country. The subject of the motion, namely, assistance for people who are incapacitated by injury, accident, or congenital infirmity from earning their livings, is one which I think has the sympathy of every hon. member. All of us would like to see something more done for these people. All of us have at heart the interests which the hon. member for Terrebonne has so eloquently advanced.

There is a tendency nowadays, as we all know, for all of us to look to the state to meet conditions which people have previously met from their own savings or with the assistance of their families or through private agencies and municipalities. There are many reasons for that development which I do not need to go into now, but it is a manifestation of modern civilization which is seen not only in our country but in all highly industrialized countries.

This debate has shown how strong that feeling is in this field. Every speaker has pleaded the causes of the class of people intended to be covered by this motion, but the debate has been singularly free from detailed suggestions as to what kind of measure should be brought down, exactly who should be covered, how the cost should be met and every kind of encumbering detail. It is a motion designed, and properly so, to bring the matter before the attention of the house and, through the house, of the country.

From my examination of this subject, there would appear to be two distinct classes of people whom this motion might seek to cover. First, there are those who, being gainfully employed, are in consequence of accident or disease prevented from carrying on with their usual occupation. That class is covered in some countries by what are called "sickness benefits." Those benefits are usually payable on a contributory basis, as in the United Kingdom, where since 1911 they have had sickness benefits as part of their system of health insurance. Those benefits are similar to the benefits payable under our system of unemployment insurance. They are payable in consideration of a contribution by the beneficiary, and they are payable in consequence of his being unemployed through sickness, just as unemployment insurance benefits are payable through his being unemployed through there not being work.

There is a second class of people who may be covered by this motion, namely, those who are unable to work at all, those who are totally and permanently incapacitated. They rather approximate to a class to whom we now pay benefits, namely, the blind.

These two sets of benefits might be combined under the same measure, but ordinarily in measures for social security in other countries they are not; they are dealt with in separate categories; the first category of sickness benefits being assimilated to unemployment insurance, and the second class of invalidity benefits being assimilated to benefits payable to the blind.

There are a good many other questions which this motion raises. Would the protection offered by the kind of measure proposed extend only to the gainfully employed or to those insured under a system of unemployment insurance? Would it cover the self-employed? Would it cover the unemployables, the people who ordinarily cannot secure work at all? Would it extend to those partly as well as to those totally disabled and to those temporarily as well as to those permanently disabled? All these are questions which have to be considered when dealing with a matter of this kind, and the provisions of the laws in force in the countries which have these measures, notably the United Kingdom since 1911, Australia since 1945, and New Zealand since 1938, as well as Sweden, differ materially from each other.

Then, too, looking at the motion itself, we see that the idea of a means test is introduced in the words "without any income or means of support", qualifying the class of people who might be beneficiaries. It is added that these people would be "at a disadvantage in seeking or attaining employment, or incapable of providing for his subsistence." So that the motion as it stands seems to contemplate a system of benefits which would be payable on a means test basis, probably without contribution, and primarily intended to benefit those who are unemployable.

In considering this kind of measure, as we have done in the department and as the government has done for a good many years, we have to consider the order of priority in which we introduce social security measures. It is not possible in any country to introduce a complete system of social security measures all at once. No country has ever done that, and from my own experience in the Department of National Health and Welfare I can say that it would be exceedingly difficult to create the administrative machinery to deal with a dozen different measures of social security all at once. Further, a good deal of development of public opinion is required to secure the necessary support for any such measure and also to secure the willingness to pay the cost of that measure.

The order of priority of social security measures is put by different experts in different terms. The report of Doctor L. C. Marsh on "Social Security for Canada" which was prepared for the advisory committee on reconstruction deals at page 115 with the order of priorities of social legislation, and there Doctor Marsh gives this as the desirable order:

1. Unemployment insurance
2. Health insurance
3. The disability-old-age-survivors group of insurances
4. Children's allowances
5. Sickness cash benefit
6. Funeral benefits

President Truman of the United States, in his great message to congress of November 19, 1945, put forward proposals for various measures: first, construction of hospitals and related facilities; second, expansion of public health, maternal and child health services; third, medical education and research; fourth, prepayment of medical costs; and fifth, pro-

tection against loss of wages from sickness and disability. In this last connection President Truman says:

> Therefore, as a fifth element of a comprehensive health programme, the workers of the nation and their families should be protected against loss of earnings because of illness. A comprehensive health programme must include the payment of benefits to replace at least part of the earnings that are lost during the period of sickness and long-term disability. This protection can be readily and conveniently provided through expansion of our present social insurance system with appropriate adjustment of premiums.
>
> Insurance against loss of wages from sickness and disability deals with cash benefits rather than with services. It has to be coordinated with the other cash benefits under existing social insurance systems. Such coordination should be effected when other social security measures are reexamined. I shall bring this subject again to the attention of the congress in a separate message on social security.

There the President puts provision for protection against loss of wages from sickness and disability in the fifth and last group of measures, one in respect of which he is going to put forward some proposal at some subsequent date. Consequently his allotment of priorities on social security legislation is not out of line with that of Doctor Marsh; that is, sickness benefits and invalidity benefits are to be well down the scale, in fact at the end of the scale in so far as health measures are concerned. There is a very good reason for that, and that is that in our attack on the problem of ill health—and there is an attack going on all over the front, with a fine combination of agencies, federal, provincial, municipal and private—we make our first aim the prevention of illness and the cause of disability through disease and accident. In accordance with that, the federal government in its proposals to the provinces has put before them suggestions for a very wide measure of grants to the provinces on various terms which will be found in the green book containing the proposals of the federal government.

Second comes the question of treatment. If we cannot prevent disease and incapacity due to disease or accident, let us try to cure it; let us try to treat it. So that we put forward in our proposals a comprehensive suggestion for a nation-wide system of health insurance which, if adopted, would provide for complete hospital, medical and nursing services for every man, woman and child in every part of Canada in which the plan was adopted.

The third step should be that of rehabilitation. There is a large group of people who have been incapacitated by accident or disease, but who could be rehabilitated by vocational training, by special efforts on the part of employers and national selective service to see that they secure jobs which give them opportunities to use the capacities they have. In that field great work has been done in Canada by the Department of Veterans Affairs with regard to our returned men of both wars and also by the Department of Labour through national selective service. That work has been and is being extended in local communities by provinces, by municipalities and by private agencies.

It is only in the fourth place on this single item of health measures that we come to the desirable measures which the hon. member for Terrebonne has suggested, namely, sickness benefits or invalidity benefits.

So that this comes some way down the list, and that is for another reason that it has been generally found that these are administratively about the most difficult to introduce. There are various reasons for that. One is, of course, and I do not think it is making any unfair comment on human nature to suggest, that during a time of high employment there is a much greater tendency for everyone to use his capacities in a useful fashion than during a time of relatively low employment, when there is a great tendency for people to discover reasons which prevent them from working. It has been found in the United States, in Canada, in every country which has had to administer various measures like workmen's compensation acts administered by the provinces, that there is a clear relationship between the economic status of the country at any moment and the claims in respect of disability or incapacity. In a report "Issues in Social Security—a report to the committee of ways and means of the house of representatives by the committee's social security technical staff", which was transmitted on January 17, 1946, and which has just been published, it was said:

> There is no royal road to a scheme of disability benefits that is not beset with substantial obstacles.

That is, I think, the experience of every country which has tried to introduce it. One of the reasons why it has generally been considered desirable that health insurance should precede sickness benefits is that only when you have a nation-wide system of health services providing the whole population with an opportunity to secure medical treatment and, if necessary, hospitalization for any condition they may be suffering from, can you properly deal with the class of people who do not respond to treatment and who remain incapacitated through sickness or other cause.

Therefore I suggest that in the introduction of social measures there is a definite order of priorities which has been recognized by other

countries and which we ourselves are recognizing in the measures that we have introduced in Canada.

In that connection I might remind the house that in recent years we have made a good deal of progress with regard to social security measures on the part of the federal government. In 1927 old age pensions were introduced on a fifty-fifty basis at rates which have been subsequently increased and which now are contributed to the extent of 75 per cent by the federal government. Further, we pay pensions to the blind at the same rates from the age of forty, and the dominions proposals to the dominion-provincial conference again include a measure for a substantial increase in the benefits to the blind. We would hope, if the provinces concur, to cooperate with them in extending the age down to twenty-one and also in further defining the means test; also making provisions for the treatment of blind people at government expense so as to enable them to restore themselves to gainful livelihood and also relieve the state from the burden of making payments to them.

Mr. MacNICOL: Do I understand the minister to say that the age would be lowered to twenty-one?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes, that is the proposal. As hon. members know, in 1941 we introduced unemployment insurance, despite a good deal of objection to that at the time. It was thought that we should not take that step during the war. We obtained the consent of the provinces to an amendment to the constitution and introduced unemployment insurance, and in consequence of doing that at the time we have not only succeded in getting the system to work, and covering a great proportion of our population; but also built up a fund of $350,000,000 available to meet the demands on that fund.

In 1944 we introduced family allowances and they became effective from July 1, 1945. As hon. members know, allowances are now paid under the act regularly each month by cheques to the 1,386,000 parents having 3,300,000 children under sixteen years of age on whose behalf the payments are made.

These are very substantial, even amazing advances for a country to make, and to make during the war.

I should now like to call the attention of hon. members to another element that must be considered; the cost of any social security measure. We have no estimate of what the cost of any kind of sickness benefits, such as might be provided under the hon. member's motion, would be in Canada. We have tried to make estimates, but as far as I can make out there is no basis for arriving at reliable estimates except to see what the cost has been in countries which have already introduced such measures, and to make some rough and ready calculations. A guess might be that a measure such as this, which would provide for benefits of something like $5 a week to those entitled to claim, by reason of inability to work, because of sickness or some continuing incapacity, might total as much as $100,000,000 a year. That is an estimate made by trying to adapt to Canadian conditions figures which seem to have been the experience in other countries.

One could change that figure up and down materially by very slight changes in the law which would increase the class of people covered, and we could also increase it by an easy administration, or we could easily reduce the figure by changes in the opposite direction.

I do not know whether hon. members realize how much we are spending on social welfare at the present time. In February, 1946, if I may quote figures given by the Minister of Labour to-day at a meeting with the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada—they are for February, 1946—the benefits paid those who are out of work were $5,903,000, and under family allowances, $19,690,000. The dominion's share of old age pensions, plus benefits for veterans of world war I and benefits for veterans of world war II, adds another $42,382,000. Then we have amounts paid under the War Services Grants Act as gratuity allowances, and post-discharge re-establishment and rehabilitation benefits totalling $6,222,000. There was also paid during February to dependents of men in the armed forces a total of $8,000,000.

These measures alone in February, 1946, provide a grand total of approximately $89,000,000, nearly all of which went into homes of those who constitute in the main the wage-earners of Canada. That is a payment at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a year. If we add to that the payments which would be required under the proposed health insurance grants, health insurance and old age pensions as put before the provinces, and add in what the provinces pay for their social security legislation, I think we shall be paying more per capita to the Canadian people than is paid in any other country in the world under any system of social security. In other words, we have a big programme under way, and while that does not represent the end of the road, it does represent a substantial instalment in social security for the Canadian people.

I should also say this. If these measures are to be added to the budgetary burden of the dominion the cost can be met, according to the view of this government, only by taxation

or by borrowing. We believe that the Canadian economy can be used by the Canadian people to keep virtually everyone in Canada gainfully employed. We also believe that on the basis of that full employment we can have a gross national production approximating that which we have had during the last year, and on the basis of that we can carry the load we have set ourselves. But if we add substantially to this load and keep taxes at a very high level, then there will be a steady decrease in initiative, in the willingness of people to take risks and to work, which cannot avoid having a disastrous effect on the value of our money and on our ability to maintain the kind of economy we want.

Therefore, while all these measures are desirable and we should all like to see them enacted, we must also see, if we are to remain a responsible people and keep the value of our money what it is; if we are to retain the confidence of our own people and that of other peoples, that we do not make promises we cannot keep or assume a load we cannot carry. That requires a high degree of responsibility on the part of every member of this house.

So far I have discussed the question without reference to the constitutional position because I am one of those who believe that if a thing is desirable, then there should be some means whereby the dominion and the provinces can work out an arrangement to enable its being carried out. Nevertheless we must recognize that we are working under a federal constitution, under which certain responsibilities are placed upon the federal government and certain responsibilities upon the provincial governments. Clearly the responsibility for health and welfare matters, for the relief of unemployables and for the kind of thing about which we are now talking, rests primarily with the provinces.

If an arrangement is to be worked out whereby some part of that responsibility is to be carried by the dominion, then it requires alterations in the financial arrangements between the two which may be far-reaching. I do not wish to say anything more about that except to say that these matters of health and welfare, the health proposals of the dominion, the proposals for old age pensions and for assistance to the unemployed are before the provinces in the proposals put forward by the dominion government. The dominion and the provinces are going to meet again on April 25, and we hope that a satisfactory arrangement will be worked out for the welfare of all the Canadian people. But we must recognize that these are matters of great concern to the provinces and that we could not proceed with a system of sickness and invalidity benefits such as might be envisaged within the terms of this motion except through the cooperation of, and after arrangement with, the provinces. It is one field in which it would not be possible for the federal government to work out any satisfactory disposition by itself. It must be done by cooperation. My own belief is that in these matters of dominion-provincial relations we should always work through cooperation as far as we can.

Therefore there is also the constitutional question to be considered. However, when I have said that I do not wish to suggest for a second that because we have a federal constitution we should stop working toward the steady improvement of the welfare of all the people of Canada. It just means that we have to take the federal constitution into account, and by cooperation with the provinces, by seeking their collaboration, try to work out arrangements whereby we can do the things that the people of Canada want done. Consequently I cannot hold out any hope to my hon. friend that the government will accept his suggestion in the sense that we shall bring in legislation this year to implement it. But I should like to tell him and the house that the Department of National Health and Welfare is watching with keen interest social security developments in every part of the world. We have our own correspondents in other countries. We take every opportunity of exchanging views with people when they are travelling from one country to another. I should like to announce in this connection, for the first time I believe, that we have asked the director of social security of Australia, Mr. F. H. Rowe, to pay a visit to Canada so that we can discuss common problems together. We hope that it will be possible for him to come. I have also asked Sir Wilson Jameson, director of health services of the United Kingdom, to visit Canada in May. At that time I hope it may be possible for hon. members to have an opportunity of hearing him discuss such questions. When Mr. Attlee was here I took the opportunity of discussing similar problems with him. I have just been on a visit to the United States where I discussed common problems with United States public health service officials and with officers of various government agencies as well as officers of the Rockefeller foundation. Our officials are constantly in touch with the people who have to deal with these matters in other countries. There are a great number of conferences, including the international labour organizations, in which such matters are under consideration.

Therefore I can assure hon. members that this, amongst other social security measures, is receiving constant consideration. Consequently it is without the least difficulty that I accept the resolution and say that we shall continue the consideration it urges, not with the thought of any immediate action this year, but with the thought that some such measure as this must in time be worked out for the welfare of the Canadian people.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): I gave my place to the minister who made a most interesting speech, but I rise now to congratulate very warmly the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand) upon having put this resolution on the order paper. It was time that it should come. There is something most unusual and most incredible, namely, that the only people who suffer from any infirmity and who are too poor to pay for their care and their cure are precisely those whose intelligence is normal, who are not lunatics. A lunatic is sent to an asylum whether he has the means to pay for his board or not. When he has not it is the municipality or the province that pays for him, or both. But when a person who suffers from any infirmity, has some trouble with an arm or a leg, but has a sane and sound mind, then he or she becomes a derelict. He cannot get help.

We hear about security programmes. In our age it is accepted; it is a good thing, and I congratulate the minister on his good speech. But in this very matter that the hon. member for Terrebonne has brought to light there is a gap. There is a gap into which fall those who are precisely the neediest. Around Christmas everybody sees the big advertisements that are published in the New York *Times*, especially in the Sunday edition: "The Neediest Cases". All the cases that I have in mind, the poor people, young children without hands and other cases like that, pitiful cases, would be helped precisely if the suggestion of my hon. friend were accepted. The question is not to bring in an expert from Australia and another expert from Great Britain, Sir So-and-so. I do not care for these people. The question is to look after the boy who has no hands, to come to his help. It is not a matter that can wait until the end of the world. What is the use of bringing in these soft brains from all over the world when the boys are suffering here? It is the story of the good Samaritan. Everyone was passing by; no one was paying attention to the poor man lying in the street. They were saying very nice things, but they were passing by. The thing to do is give help to all these children.

Of course, some things are done by the province; some things are done by Ottawa, but if there is a chaotic condition in the relations between Ottawa and the provinces it is on account of the Rowell-Sirois commission that has caused so much trouble in connection with dominion-provincial finances. It is a complete mess. It is precisely on account of that mess that these children and older people suffer, because it is impossible to come to their help. Apparently no one should speak of that chaotic condition which was brought about by that commission and all the experts who were there. We have to put order into things; and if Ottawa cannot do it, Ottawa has only to transfer some of the taxation to the provinces and they will do it. What is the duty of Ottawa, and what is the duty of the provinces? Is there anyone in this chamber who can answer that question? We may be told that it will come about by agreement. Some years ago, before the Sirois report, everything went well; but since that report was presented it has become the reason for postponing the assistance which is due at once to these needy cases.

I do not say that in any spirit of acrimony. I have no feeling of that kind; but when I think of the procession of poor people who come to my office, as they come to the office and the house of the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand), of our lady colleague the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mrs. Strum), of the good doctor the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Blair), of my good friend the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol), of the minister himself and all those who have spoken, I believe it is time to do something, and not wait. Do the firemen wait until the house is burned before coming with their pump, their hose and all the rest of it? Some of these crippled children have the care they require because their parents can pay for it, but orphans or the children of poor families, settlers and so on, need some help. Let us give it to them. It will not require such an enormous amount of money; and this is not a new proposition. It is a case of adjusting matters so that there will be no gap in the security system.

Naturally I have no objection to the dominion and provincial governments discussing the matter at the earliest possible moment, but they should not wait too long before deciding it. It should be decided this spring, so that people may not suffer longer than is necessary. In the province of Quebec we have allowances for needy mothers who have young children, and it is paid in spite of the fact that they also receive the family allowance.

In Quebec, as elsewhere, the blind receive a pension at an earlier age. There are old age pensions. Those who suffer from mental disability are sent to places where they are cared for properly. But I cannot say how much I have been touched by my hon. friend who has done something that so many of us would have done had he not been the first. It is because we see that the operation of the social security programme is not working as it should that we cannot do otherwise than approve and support this resolution.

There may be some flaws in it, of course, though I find none, but such flaws are of no importance in the drafting of the resolution. It is not this resolution that will be the law. This is an expression of opinion which will be the will of the House of Commons as soon as it is adopted; and I am sure no one in this house will discuss one word or another if, as a result, those who suffer will be deprived of help. Hon. members have had enough experience with what goes on in families which have been afflicted in this way to consider the spirit of the resolution and not argue about matters of detail. I also warmly congratulate all hon. members, including the minister, who have spoken so well.

Mr. J. H. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): I wish to raise my voice, for the first time this session, in support of this resolution. During the earlier hours this evening we were dealing with matters which were characterized as of great importance; but when a good many people across Canada read their newspapers, or read copies of *Hansard,* they will come to the conclusion that a good deal of it has been the making of a mountain out of a molehill, the creation of a tempest in a teapot. I noticed that while the question of changing the name of our national birthday was being discussed, practically all the seats on both sides of the house were filled; that was supposed to be a very important piece of business. Now, however, when we are dealing with something having to do with the happiness and well-being of thousands of our people, where are the members of parliament?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Where is all the excitement?

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): Yes; where is all the excitement? I suppose they will say, well, we could not vote for this thing until we had measured public opinion. I am not a bit afraid of what public opinion will say to those of us who are sitting in the house now, endeavouring to support this motion.

There is only a very little time left this evening, but I should like to refer to the remarks of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton), who said he doubted very much whether the government would do anything in this matter this session, and who introduced the question of cost, speaking of comparable costs in Canada and in other countries for measures of social security along this particular line. Surely we are not going to raise again in this house that old bogey, where is the money to come from? In this copy of the order paper which I hold in my hand I see we are to make a loan to the United Kingdom of $1,250 million. Then on the last page I see where we are to cancel entirely the sum of $425,000,000 which was owing in connection with the commonwealth air training scheme. Not one word would I say against either of these measures. But if we can be so generous with Canada's money in giving it and lending it in the millions of dollars, it ill-becomes us to speak about cost when it comes to alleviating the misery, pain and suffering of thousands of people in this dominion.

Therefore I hope we may introduce a little more humanity into this house, as the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mrs. Strum) said a while ago. The measure of our Canadianism is not just how much we wave the flag or how excited we get over changing the name of a day, but how we stand behind a measure of this kind which means so much in the way of human happiness and human well-being. I wish most heartily to support the resolution.

Mr. L. PHILLIPE PICARD (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise after listening to the able presentation made by the minister. I think, however, that I will reflect the sentiments of the house when I say that the country at large owes him a debt for what he has done up to now to build in Canada a social security system. His argument as to the load which this bill would place upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of the country must be seriously considered. But the people concerned by this resolution are in such special circumstances that I believe I might perhaps be permitted to say a few words on their behalf.

We do not ask for these people a relief measure, because we want them to be treated in a way different from the treatment received by normal persons. We want them to live like normal beings, but they cannot earn their own living. It is not a question of their not having the initiative. It is not a question of their not being willing to work or wanting to

retire from work too early in life. It is a question of their not being able to work because of their disability. For that reason I suggest there is an element of urgency. There is the same element in connection with the old age pensioners. Whatever I might wish to say generally on the question of social security I shall reserve for the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis).

But, just the same, I suggest that something should be done for those people who suffer from permanent disability. The burden of disability, in general, is heavier than that created by old age. Yet by a Liberal government, we have had placed on the statutes of Canada an act which permits our giving to the aged people the relief to which they are entitled after a life of work. But I think people who are disabled are under a worse handicap than are old people. The aged people have lost their ability to earn, but if they are not sick they are not necessarily a burden in many other ways. However, disabled people, in addition to their inability to earn, require nursing care. They need medical assistance—and all that costs money.

It is the duty of the state to look after those people, even ahead of the old people. In this connection I should like to quote just one sentence from an article by Oswald Stein, chief of the social insurance section of the international labour office. This is what he says:

> Permanent or prolonged invalidity occurring before the pensionable age is equivalent to premature old age, and most of the arguments for security in old age apply here too.

I suggest they more than apply because, as I said before, they are under a worse handicap than are the aged people. Social insurance is applicable to the disabled as well as to the aged, and it is feasible under the same scheme.

Relief can be given through social insurance, or through non-contributory social security schemes giving insurance benefits for disabled people. At the moment we have disability policies, but they are available only to those who can pay for them. Those who work in professions or trades, and who are in a position to pay for insurance against disability, permanent or otherwise, can have it. The insurance companies provide such policies in the course of their business. They are available for those who have steady employment, those who are in trade unions or in some fields of endeavour where such schemes are provided. It is included in most retirement schemes of large corporations, and large companies which provide benefits in case of disability.

In the United States a study has been made by the social security board, and I hold in my hand an article by the chairman of the board, Mr. A. J. Altmeyer, which is published in the *Social Security Bulletin* for March, 1941. In this Mr. Altmeyer tells about the benefits derived in the United States by people who are working for one or another of the large corporations.

Mr. BURTON: May I remind the hon. member that the time is nearly up, and we should like to have a vote upon it.

Mr. PICARD: If I reach eleven o'clock can I not adjourn the debate so that I may carry on at some other time? Surely it is my privilege to adjourn the debate and carry on some other time.

Mr. BURTON: I just wanted to remind the hon. member that the time is slipping by.

Mr. PICARD: Does the hon. member mean that he would like to have a vote on the motion to-night? He might have a vote to-morrow. I must say to him that I have not usually abused the right to speak in the House of Commons. Last session I was most silent—and have reproached myself for that. Here is something that is of interest to the people in my constituency. I am in agreement with the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mrs. Strum), whom I congratulate upon her able speech. I am in agreement with most people who have spoken in the debate, and I thought I might be permitted to give my views with respect to it.

If to-morrow we do not go ahead with this we shall go on with the next order; it might be the railway bill or something. I believe there is as much urgency that we give our views with respect to disabled people as there is that we give them respecting other matters.

The time of the house has not been wasted on this side, most of the time. I do not blame hon. members for doing what they do, but I wish they would extend to me the same privilege, the privilege of speaking, even if we reach one minute to eleven o'clock.

I could not understand my hon. friend's remarks. If by the debate stopping at eleven o'clock it would prevent anyone from talking on this, or would have the effect of killing the bill, it might be different. But if I adjourn the debate, and speak some other day, then other hon. members on the other side of the house will have the same privilege.

Mr. KNOWLES: But it goes to the bottom of the list.

Mr. PICARD: It being 20 seconds to 11 o'clock, I shall move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Mr. Picard the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, April 5, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE

REFERENCE TO EDITORIAL IN "OTTAWA MORNING JOURNAL"

Mr. BENOIT MICHAUD (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I rise to what I believe is a question of privilege, and I hope that my point is well taken.

In the Ottawa *Journal* of this morning there appears an editorial headed as follows:

Mr. Speaker misunderstands the House of Commons.

In this ill-advised and ill-mannered editorial the anonymous writer—and incidentally I have no more respect than I should for those who have not the courage to sign the gems of wisdom which come out of their pens—criticizes your conduct, Mr. Speaker, in the following terms:

It seemed to show also that Mr. Speaker Fauteux either doesn't understand the spirit of the House of Commons rules or imagines that his duty as Speaker is to protect the government.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. MICHAUD: He concludes his editorial with these words:

It is worse than pitiful when the Speaker tries to make it even worse than it is—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I will ask the hon. member to state his question of privilege.

Mr. MICHAUD: I say that these words are a reflection on the Speaker of this house—an unwarranted attack, Mr. Speaker, on yourself. I feel that they should be withdrawn, and I would ask the writer of this article, if he is a gentleman, to withdraw his remarks.

PRESS REPORT AS TO DIVORCE PROCEDURE—P.E.I. DIVORCE COURTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. CHESTER S. McLURE (Queens): I rise to a question of privilege affecting at the same time this house and the province of Prince Edward Island. I have under my hand a clipping of an editorial which appears in the Ottawa *Journal* of Wednesday, April 3, entitled "Degradation of Parliament" and discussing divorce actions before this house. I would read one sentence. The editorial states:

Most of these (divorce) applications come from Quebec and Prince Edward Island—provinces without divorce courts.

I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that since last year, 1945, Prince Edward Island has had its own divorce courts, and that my province is not encumbering either the House of Commons or the Senate of Canada with divorce cases.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Second, third and fourth reports of special committee on veterans affairs.—Mr. Tucker.

WAR EXPENDITURES

Mr. G. B. ISNOR (Halifax) moved that the second report of the special committee on war expenditures and economies, presented on April 3, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL AVIATION

ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION IN MONTREAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question to direct to the Minister of Reconstruction, or perhaps the Minister of Transport. I gave notice of it to the Minister of Reconstruction. It has to do with the establishment in Montreal of the international civil aviation organization. The question is prompted by some criticism of Canada and of the government because of the delay in securing suitable accommodation for that organization. Will the minister advise what steps if any the government has taken to aid in the establishment of this organization in that city?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I would point out to my hon. friend that the difficulty in obtaining office space in any city is always with us in times like these. PICAO was housed originally in Dominion Square building in quarters that were adequate at the time, but since then the requirements have expanded. Their expanded requirements were met in the first stage by making available one half floor in the Sun Life building, and recently further steps were taken to make available eleven thousand feet of floor space on another floor of the Sun Life building, which will be in possession of PICAO by

April 10. My advice therefore is that the requirement for office space is fully met at the present time.

Mr. BRACKEN: The minister is not concerned about the possibility of losing the organization's headquarters in Montreal?

Mr. HOWE: I am very much concerned about it, but I believe that in the circumstances the members of PICAO recognize that the government of Canada is doing its best. I do not believe there is any complaint from the members at the moment regarding the arrangements that will obtain after April 10.

BUTTER

QUESTION AS TO APPLICATION OF PRICE INCREASE TO DAIRY BUTTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN T. HACKETT (Stanstead): I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Finance, and if he is not here, possibly the Minister of Agriculture can answer it. Did the recent increase in the ceiling price of butter apply to dairy butter as well as to creamery butter, and if not, why?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): My understanding is that it does not, but that decision was made by the prices and trade board and I would not care to give the reasons.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

ALLOTMENT OF BUILDING MATERIALS—HOSPITALS—SUNNYBROOK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. W. SKEY (Trinity): Can the Minister of Reconstruction advise the house whether building materials allotted to projects such as veterans hospitals will be considered as a part of the total allotment to a municipality, or whether such allotments of materials will be separate from the municipal allotment?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Projects such as veterans hospitals, which have the highest priority in the obtaining of materials, are not considered a part of the allotment to the municipalities. Supplies for projects of that type are furnished *ex quota*.

Mr. SKEY: Arising out of my question to the Minister of Reconstruction I would ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs whether he can say when Sunnybrook hospital will be completed, equipped and staffed.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I cannot make a statement with any definiteness, but I can assure my hon. friend that, in conjunction with various other departments of government, we are doing everything we can to expedite the completion of the hospital in question.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUESTION AS TO USE OF GERMAN PRISONERS OF WAR AT WHITECOURT, ALTA.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. F. KUHL (Jasper-Edson): I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Labour, notice of which I have already sent him. Does the government contemplate permitting the use of German prisoners of war in the sawmills at Whitecourt, Alberta?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Prisoners of war will not be used at Whitecourt, Alberta. At present there are thirty prisoners of war there, and they will be transferred on April 30 to another place.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

The house resumed from Tuesday, April 2, consideration of the motion of Mr. Martin for the second reading of bill No. 7, respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens.

Mr. F. E. JAENICKE (Kindersley): When the house rose on Tuesday night I had discussed the phases of the bill which deal with British citizenship and upon which I maintain this parliament has no power to legislate, because we have repealed the applicability of the British Naturalization Act which previously gave us the power to make British subjects in this country.

I now have a few words of praise for the minister in connection with the section which deals with the qualifications of an applicant for naturalization. I am pleased that he has inserted paragraph (f) in section 10, which requires an applicant to have an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship. I commend the minister particularly for the insertion of sections 37 and 38. Section 37 provides that:

> The minister, with the approval of the governor in council, shall take such measures as to him may appear fitting to provide facilities to enable applicants for certificates of citizenship to receive instruction in the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship.

Section 38 gives the judge who hears the application authority to impress upon the applicants, by appropriate ceremonies, the respon-

sibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship. I warmly approve these provisions of the bill, which will make for better citizenship and will impress the candidate for citizenship at the time he is received into the great family of the Canadian nation.

For a few moments I should like to deal with the sections of the bill which deal with the loss of Canadian citizenship. In that connection I have some criticisms to offer. If we take all this care which we now intend to take—and it is a far cry from the time that we made citizens prior to 1914 in western Canada at least—we should get a better citizenship. We should accept our citizens for better or for worse. There should be no discrimination so far as the loss of citizenship is concerned. Section 20 of the bill provides that if a naturalized Canadian citizen has left this country and resided outside of Canada for a period of at least six years he shall, with certain qualifications and exceptions, lose his certificate of naturalization in Canada. This refers only to a naturalized Canadian citizen. I am somewhat in favour of that. If a person leaves this country and has no connection with it at all, it should be presumed that he does not care to belong to this family any longer; but I suggest that we make this absence from Canada without reasonable and proper cause to be a presumption that he never intended to reside permanently in Canada, which would mean that he did not make a bona fide application at the time he filed his application, and that it could be revoked for fraud. I mentioned a moment ago that I thought we should take our citizens for better or for worse. There is only one ground upon which the naturalization certificate should be revoked, namely, fraud. I consider a certificate of naturalization to be in the nature of a contract. The applicant for naturalization makes an offer to the government, and when the government issues the certificate of naturalization, it accepts that offer. These are the essential ingredients of a contract. If the contract has been induced by fraud or misrepresentation, it can be vitiated and repudiated. For the same reason a certificate of naturalization should be repudiated or cancelled. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these are the only grounds upon which we should revoke a naturalization certificate.

As I have already said, the absence from Canada without proper cause should be a presumption that the individual did not mean what he said when he made the application and said that he wanted to reside permanently in Canada. It will give the applicant a chance, under the provisions of section 21, to have a hearing and to state his case before the tribunal prescribed in that section, and still preserve his nationality or his Canadian citizenship if he has good grounds to offer.

Section 21 also deals with revocation. Paragraph (a) states—

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I regret having to do this, because the hon. gentleman is making a helpful and constructive speech, but if I do not take this attitude now I shall be accused, when other members proceed to discuss particular sections, of not having objected to the course now being pursued by the hon. gentleman. I am following the hon. gentleman's speech with close interest, but he is now discussing particular sections and that is certainly contrary to the rules of the house. We are now debating the principle of the bill. There will be ample opportunity when we are in committee for the hon. gentleman to make what I know are suggestions which he has carefully considered and which may help the house materially in considering the provisions of the bill as they now stand.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I say a word on the point of order? It is true that the hon. gentleman, in discussing the principle of the bill, has referred to certain sections. In all probability that is questionable under our rules; nevertheless I feel that in making these references he is really dealing with the principle underlying the bill itself; hence, in the circumstances the references should be excused. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman can do exactly what he is doing by simply refraining from mentioning the particular section he is discussing, and saying that the bill provides so-and-so.

Mr. JAENICKE: I am sorry if I have offended against the rules, and I shall govern myself accordingly.

Mr. GREEN: On the point of order, as I said the other day, it will be impossible for us to debate this bill in a proper way on second reading if we are not allowed to refer to some of the sections. The minister himself did that throughout his speech the other day. He told us what one part meant and what another part meant. This is a complicated and important bill. Last year it was the intention to send it to a committee of the house where it could be carefully studied. That course is not to be followed this year. I suggest to the minister that it would be to his own interests, and certainly in the best interests of the house, if in our speeches we were allowed to say what we thought was wrong with some of these sections or indicate ways in which they could be improved.

If that is done, then there will be an opportunity to give consideration to the suggestions before the bill is passed through the committee stages. It will then be too late to make the necessary amendments.

Mr. MacINNIS: Before you give your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read from the report of the speech of the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) which he made on the evening of April 2, to show that he was guilty of the very offence that he now charges against the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Jaenicke). At page 508 of *Hansard* he is reported as having said:

> I come now to part IV of the bill which deals with the rights and obligations of naturalized Canadian citizens, and represents no change from the present situation. Sections 26 and 28 are complementary and provide for the continuation of the common status of British subjects that has always prevailed through the commonwealth.

The minister's whole speech is along the same line, and that is nothing more or less than what the hon. member for Kindersley is now doing.

Mr. BRACKEN: Before you give your ruling, sir, may I add just one word? With the principle of what the minister has said I personally am in entire agreement, but I am not in agreement with its strict application in this instance. What is the principle of this bill? If there is just one principle I think every hon. member in this parliament is in favour of it; and if we follow that logic through to its conclusion there is no purpose at all in this debate. With all deference I suggest to Your Honour that the hon. member who has the floor should not be held too strictly to the rules which have been mentioned.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that some hon. gentlemen have suggested that, since this bill is very important, it should be discussed clause by clause. Hon. members will understand that even if the bill is an important one, we have standing orders in this house which must be followed. As my hon. friend knows, in Beauchesne's third edition at page 228 it is stated that on the motion for second reading it is out of order to discuss the clauses of the bill. I understand that the hon. member who has the floor may refer to the various clauses, but I do not think he has the right on the motion for second reading to discuss the bill clause by clause. He should not forget that after second reading is given the house will go into committee of the whole, when he and all other hon. members will have the right to discuss every clause in the bill.

[Mr. Green.]

Mr. JAENICKE: I shall try not to offend against the rules. However, I think I can say that I disagree with the portion of the bill which proposes to take away the certificate of naturalization of a citizen who is guilty of communicating with the enemy, as stated in the bill, or of committing similar acts; in other words, who is a traitor. Why should not a natural-born Canadian lose his citizenship for the same reason, I should like to know? That is one point I wish to raise. In addition, we have adequate provisions in the criminal code for dealing with traitors. I am in favour of the inclusion of this or a similar section in the bill, but I maintain that it should cover all Canadian citizens, whether naturalized or native-born.

The same remark would apply to another section which deals with disloyalty and disaffection toward His Majesty. I would make the same argument in that respect. Then a naturalized citizen is liable to loss of his Canadian citizenship if within a period of five years after he becomes a citizen he is convicted of an offence and sentenced to imprisonment for more than one year. As I said before, I object to that because I think we are now providing for good citizens by making the qualifications higher, and we should take them for better or for worse. In addition I maintain that this will not make for the good administration of justice. A prisoner, a naturalized Canadian citizen, is before the court accused of a crime, and is found guilty. He has been naturalized for less than five years. The facts relating to this man's personal circumstances, his family and so on, are brought before the judge, who because of this provision might be inclined to give him a lesser penalty than otherwise he would receive. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not think this section is good for the administration of justice in this country.

I should like to make just one other point, and it is this. The act provides that if a certificate is issued the naturalized Canadian shall be entitled to all the rights, powers and privileges and subject to the same obligations and responsibilities as a native-born Canadian. It is singular that the word "political" has been left out. If you look at the old act prior to 1914 you will find that the certificate of a naturalized Canadian provided that he was entitled to all the political and other rights, powers and privileges. The act at present in force also provides that a naturalized citizen is entitled to all the political and other rights, powers and privileges. If you look at the British act you find that naturalization confers all the political and other rights, powers and

privileges, and it is rather ominous to me to see that the word "political" has been left out here. Remembering the days of 1917 I urge that we restore the word "political" and leave the law in that respect as it is now.

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the discussion on this bill respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and the status of aliens I should like first of all to congratulate the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) on the masterful address he delivered on this subject last Tuesday. I should like also to commend the Minister for bringing this important measure before the house. May I also express a word of appreciation to the under secretary of state, the chief of the naturalization branch, and the other officials who assisted in the preparation of the proposed legislation.

Before proceeding with a discussion of the bill may I say in behalf of the Social Credit members in this house that we are in favour of the bill and intend to support it. In spite of the fact that in our opinion, two or three sections of the bill could be improved, Social Credit members consider the bill to be good. Moreover, they feel that this bill is long overdue, and therefore we welcome its introduction at this time.

Speaking now for myself, I should like to take advantage of this opportunity not only to comment on the principle of the bill but also to express my views on several other aspects of the proposed measure.

As its long title indicates bill No. 7 covers a wide field. It has, as the minister pointed out, two main objectives: first, to achieve a clear and simple definition of Canadian citizenship by removing the complexities which are found in the old legislation, and, second, to provide a common status or, better still, a common denominator for all our people, the purpose of which is to draw our citizens closer together and thus bring about true unity in Canada.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members will agree that those two objectives are highly desirable. When this measure becomes law, Canadian citizens, natural-born or naturalized, will have the right to call themselves Canadians. This does not mean, however, that until the introduction of this bill, we were not regarded as Canadians. The fact is that we were called Canadians. But for official purposes we had to declare that we were British subjects, and also designate our "nationality" by stating the country in which we were born. Quite often some of our citizens had to change from time to time what was regarded as their nationality in order to comply with the change in control of the country in which they were born. The status of our citizens therefore was confusing and lacked permanency. The proposed bill aims to correct this.

Another important improvement in the act is in regard to loss by naturalized Canadians of citizenship through absence from the country for more than one year. It was possible of course to extend this leave by appearing at the British embassy at the end of each year, but such leave could not be extended beyond the limit of five years. To students, for example, whose funds are usually limited, and who had to travel long distances to the nearest British embassy, the old procedure was a financial burden. Under the new act, a naturalized Canadian will not lose his citizenship unless his absence exceeds at least six years.

A further change in the proposed act has to do with the procedure of acquiring Canadian citizenship. With this change in the procedure to make the ceremony more impressive and instructive, new Canadian citizens will feel a greater consciousness of and pride in becoming citizens of this great country.

Further, provision is made for the first time that an applicant for citizenship who has not an adequate knowledge of one of the official languages may be granted Canadian citizenship, provided that he has resided continuously in Canada for more than twenty years. I might point out that according to the 1941 census ninety-nine per cent of Canadians do speak one or both of the official languages. This particular provision, however, to which I have referred, applies mainly to a small section of population in the northern parts of the three prairie provinces. In this section of our country there settled some of our pioneers. In the early pioneer days there were no schools in these districts, and therefore no facilities for learning the English language. Their first task was to build houses, roads, schools, churches, and community halls, as well as to clear the land for productive purposes. To this section of our population we owe much for their generous contribution to the development of the vast sections of the Canadian west. Virtually with bare hands they cleared the land, and out of the wilderness they made the land blossom with wheat, barley, and rye. Despite their not having acquired an adequate knowledge of the English language, they have earned their place in this country by their industry and devo-

tion to Canada, and by their sons' sacrifices in world war II. I am personally very happy that at long last the Secretary of State has recognized the contribution made to Canada by these people, and by this act will give them an opportunity to apply for and be granted the status of Canadian citizen.

I should now like to deal with one or two criticisms of the bill. My chief criticism is that the bill carries over from the old legislation the distinction between Canadian-born citizens and naturalized Canadians. The section on revocation makes certain reservations regarding naturalized Canadians. In his speech the minister did point out that certain safeguards are necessary. In my opinion, however, this section should be limited to one clause, namely, the one covering treason and betrayal of the country. All other distinctions, in my opinion, should be removed.

I maintain that nothing positive can be accomplished by having two sets of laws in Canada, one for Canadian-born citizens and the other for naturalized Canadians. It is my view that when a person is granted Canadians citizenship, he should have not only equal responsibilities but also equal privileges. Our laws should be the same for both Canadian-born and naturalized citizens. Should a person be guilty of an offence, he should be brought before our courts of justice and dealt with as an individual. Therefore the revocation section in this bill and our immigration laws do make a distinction and are not applied equally to all our citizens. A naturalized Canadian, even under this bill, will lose his citizenship if he stays away for more than six years, but the same does not apply to Canadian-born citizens.

I should like to cite, Mr. Speaker, another instance of this undesirable distinction. May I refer to the defence of Canada regulations and point to the distinction which was drawn in our statute books between Canadian-born citizens and naturalized Canadians. At the beginning of the war the regulations known as the defence of Canada regulations were passed under the War Measures Act. Section 26 of this act as originally framed provided for the registration of enemy aliens. Later section 26(b) was enacted by an order in council which brought under this clause persons who were naturalized after September 1, 1922, who were born in territories which were under the sovereignty or control of enemy countries on the dates on which Canada declared war on these countries.

Order in council P.C. 6150 of November 2, 1940, contains this paragraph:

> That in view of the fact that certain persons who were not required to register under the original regulations were under the impression that they were not affected by the subsequent regulations due to the fact that they were naturalized, some of them have been guilty of the offence of failing to register.

Such discriminatory measures, Mr. Speaker, are undesirable and harmful. We should not hold a Canadian responsible for the acts or the attitude of the country from which he originally came.

If we are to achieve the objectives which the minister outlined, we must eliminate distrust and suspicion from our midst. Moreover, legislation should not be placed in our statute books which perpetuates distinction and discrimination. We must do our utmost to make our naturalized Canadians feel that they are a part of our nation, if we are to have a truly strong and united country.

The task of building and strengthening our nation is a great one. I should like to quote a passage from a book entitled "Emily Murphy, Crusader", by Byrne Hope Sanders. It would be well for us to listen to what Emily Murphy, a great Canadian woman, had to say on Canadian nationhood:

> This task of making real Canadians out of all who live in Canada cannot be accomplished by coercive measures, nor by approaching these people in a superior, patronizing attitude, but by persuading them that Canada is their friend; —that we are willing to guide and counsel them in their perplexity relating to laws, language, and customs.
>
> Many of these people come to this dominion with a rich and varied handicraft, with a wealth of literary and artistic knowledge, a reverence for sacred things, for established order; with well-formed habits of thrift, and with a fine old world courtesy. We would be well advised to benefit by their gifts and acquirements even as we would expect they would benefit by ours. What we have to teach them in citizenship, language and laws, can only be done by a sympathetic respect for their pride, and a wise patience.

In its farewell address to the governor general and Princess Alice, this house unanimously endorsed an expression of gratitude to their excellencies for their services to Canada during the past six years. The address contained the following passage:

> It must be a source of profound gratitude to you, on your retirement as governor general to realize that your years in Canada have witnessed victory over the enemies of freedom, and the emergence of Canada as a world power, with a foremost place among the united nations.

I am sure that it is a source of deep satisfaction to all Canadians to know that Canada has reached the position of a "foremost power among the united nations." The granting of the new status of Canadian citizenship will be in keeping with this stature and will be a source of pride to Canadians. When bill No. 7 becomes law and is placed on our

statute books, all Canadians, regardless of origin, will be able to meet on common ground. There will then be a real unity in all matters that challenge our common interests.

While it must be admitted that certain changes and adjustments of a constitutional or legal nature must still be made, the chief obstacle in the way of the realization of our full nationhood lies, in the main, in the cultural and economic spheres. Although we have drawn upon Great Britain for most of what we possess in the way of culture, traditions, history, institutions, our way of life, and centuries of experience in practical statecraft, we nevertheless have now arrived at the stage where we must begin to develop our own distinctive character.

Let me say this, however, that while Canadian nationhood is being crystallized, it will in no way lessen our ties with the British commonwealth; rather it will strengthen our position, as an equal member nation, within the British family of nations.

Mr. EDOUARD RINFRET (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, in introducing bill No. 20 last session, the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) indicated that it was in reality a comprehensive amendment of the Naturalization Act, no more than a definition, a clarification of what existing statutes indicate Canadian nationality or citizenship to be.

Bill No. 7, which is essentially identical, is a substitute for the Naturalization Act. It replaces the Canadian Nationals Act; it improves the Immigration Act, without altering it to any great extent. It was away back in 1914 that the words "British subject" were defined by chapter 44. In 1921 the words "Canadian national" were defined by chapter 4, and in 1910 the words "Canadian citizen" were defined by chapter 27. These definitions, we are told, were unrelated, sometimes contradictory, and created difficulties of all kinds which it is sought to eliminate by the passing of the present bill.

I have no quarrel with the bill, inasmuch as its declared sole purpose is merely to group together in a composite consolidation and to prune down and sort out articles which were previously scattered in three different laws, and for that reason I shall vote in favour of the bill.

I shall also support the bill because, although it does not go as far as, in my opinion, it might have gone, it is nevertheless a step in the right direction and will, I hope, be followed in the very near future by a further clarification and recognition. It has the merit of introducing, although incompletely and inadequately, a new significance, a meaning hitherto non-existent, to the words "Canadian citizen" and of providing a medium whereby residents of the same country will be able to designate themselves legally. It will dispel the confusion which actually exists in the naturalization law, and will give to the inhabitants of this our country a necessary and long-awaited identity. However, this common appellation cannot alone and by itself promote true Canadianism or a real national status. In any event, I do not wish my vote to be interpreted as a reaffirmation of the principles enunciated in article 26, because I believe that this theory is antiquated, and, if I may so express myself, progressively conservative.

I do regret that the opportunity has not been seized of completely doing away with the definitions of old and dusty statutes and of incorporating in the Canadian citizenship act the present-day concept of the majority of Canadians from ocean to ocean, that of Canadian subjects. Tags of 1910, 1914 or 1921 do not befit Canadians of 1946. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that I have mentioned "Canadian subject" and not "Canadian citizen". We are told by specialists that a citizen is the inhabitant of a republic, whereas a subject is the inhabitant of a kingdom. Gladstone Murray wrote that Canadians were incurably royalists, and that "loyalty to the old country" had been replaced here in Canada by "loyalty to the crown." That is so, and may be more so amongst my Quebec compatriots than amongst others. One has only to recall the enthusiastic welcome of the French-speaking element of our population to Their Majesties in 1939 to admit with Mr. Murray that it was more rapturous than, and certainly as sincere as, that of their English-speaking fellow citizens. If these affirmations are true, as they are, would it not be preferable to use the term "subject" instead of the term "citizen", and would not this appellation better suit and express the aspirations of Canadians?

Here I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am incapable of understanding how the citizen of one country may at the same time be the subject of the king of another country. Is it not true that by the adoption of the statute of Westminster in 1931, Canada has become an independent kingdom, in personal union with the United Kingdom? As Maurice Ollivier has so delicately expressed it in his remarkable book. "Problems of Canadian Sovereignty":

> The United Kingdom and Canada are to be considered as "separate kingdoms in personal union under the same king."

Is it not true, further, that a British subject is a subject of the king of Great Britain? How then, can a Canadian citizen—to wit, a citizen

of an independent sovereign state, Canada—be a British subject and owe allegiance to the king of a distinct sovereign state, Great Britain? The situation in 1946 is not the same as that of 1921. The aspirations have changed. What we need is the mentality of a common ideal, not merely a name. Should not attention have been given to the fact that the three statutes which the present bill seeks to replace were enacted at a time when internationally Canada was still in its infancy, long before the statute of Westminster established unequivocally the sovereignty of our country, at a time when Canada was represented in other countries principally by English diplomats, and when we did not have our own ambassadors and ministers?

Canada has grown since 1910, 1914 and 1921. Canada is now a nation and has been recognized as such for at least twenty years by our co-members of the British commonwealth of nations, including Great Britain. The imperial conference of 1923 declared each dominion "free to negotiate and ratify its own treaties". That of 1926 agreed that each and all constituent members of the commonwealth were autonomous communities, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to the other in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the crown, and freely associated. If Great Britain agreed that Canada was autonomous, equal, not subordinate, and united by the crown, why should some Canadians of English descent insist that it is not? If Great Britain has agreed that the crown is as much Canadian, Australian, Irish, as it is British, why should some so-called Canadians insist that it is not? Why should some so-called Canadians be more British than the king of Britain? The other nations of the world have long since recognized Canada's sovereignty. The few remaining restrictions on Canada's complete independence are, citing Clokie in his "Canadian Government and Politics", "relating to her connection with Great Britain and are relics of the time when Canada was a subordinate portion of the British empire." It is no longer a subordinate portion, and the relics should disappear.

There was a time also when Canada was a French colony: that was 185 years ago. In this short period Canada has progressed rapidly. It passed through what has been termed the first charter of Canadian liberty, the Quebec Act of 1774, through the Constitutional Act of 1791, through the Union Act of 1840, the confederation, and numerous imperial conferences. To-day, save for the fact that there is officially no Canadian king, that the British North American Act may not be amended except by the British parliament, and that appeals may still be lodged to the privy council in London, Canada is free to conduct its internal or external affairs in whatever fashion it considers best for its own private interests. Even these three restrictions are not deterring obstacles to Canada's complete and unrestricted independence, because Canada can of its own volition modify them and make them disappear.

One of our late ministers—I think it was that truly great Canadian, the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe—at the beginning of the last war drew the attention of the House of Commons to the difference existing between His Majesty George VI, king of Ireland, who had not declared war upon Germany, and His Majesty George VI, King of Canada, who had. Numerous are those who since that day have expressed similar views dealing with the separate entity of our sovereign. His Majesty the King, whatever may be his other titles, is in the affairs of Canada advised solely and completely by his Canadian ministers through the governor general or his administrator, and very definitely he could, and does, upon their counsel, decide differently from the king of Great Britain. I say, therefore, that even if in name he does not exist, in fact there is a king of Canada. I submit that when reference is made to the crown in any statute of Canada or in any imperial statute dealing with Canada, it is to this authority, to His Majesty George VI, who rules over Canada irrespective of his affiliations with other countries of the same commonwealth. I suggest that it is the essence of the statute of Westminster that Canada be united to Britain through the crown, and not to the crown through Britain.

Concerning the amendments to the British North America Act, I do not believe that it would be exaggerated to claim that if both provincial and federal Canadian authorities were to apply to the British parliament and unanimously ask to be relieved of the obligation of submitting future amendments to London, and to be given such powers, these would be immediately forthcoming. The main obstacle is our lack of cooperation; there is no unanimity amongst ourselves.

As for appeals to the privy council, the question whether Canada has the power to abolish them is not even being discussed any more. The present difficulty is to know which jurisdiction, federal or provincial, has authority to act.

I am therefore justified in saying that Canada is a sovereign state, a world power; that it proved it magnificently and unques-

tionably during the last war, and that externally it has universally been recognized as such for a long time. It is a pity therefore that internally, in the minds of its own inhabitants, Canada should be denied its own independence. It is regrettable that there should be one man in Canada, that there should be one representative in this house, who should belittle his country and lack the necessary confidence in it to pronounce it sovereign and give it the necessary attributes to make it such.

In a recent editorial, *Saturday Night* of Toronto recognized the following principle: it is a good one to apply:

It would be far better to admit frankly that we have a Canadian citizenship, which is not the citizenship of the British empire or of the United Kingdom; that we admit to this citizenship those whom we wish to and exclude all of those whom we don't, and that we regard the whole question as our business and our business alone. We should then, it may be hoped, begin to attach some importance to this Canadian citizenship and to desire to have it respected not only by other nations, but by our own lesser authorities.

This desire for respect should dictate our action. We are unfortunately lacking in it.

There need be no doubt—

Suggests Clokie in the book already cited—

—that the people of Canada generally possess the feeling of separateness from the rest of the world. They are conscious of being distinct from, though in varying degrees akin to the peoples of the British isles, France and the United States of America. This separateness is the product of political separation. Canada is a term of political geography and Canadian nationalism is derived from political concepts. There is neither common language, religion, race nor prospect of establishing these.

He goes on:

The preliminary difficulty with Canadian nationalism lies in the attempt to create a nation without being able to establish homogeneity.

Do the people of Canada think of themselves as a distinct people? It is hard to answer. There exist, definitely, British sentiments in some of the English-speaking Canadians, separatism in the mind of some French-speaking Canadians—cultural and economic Americanization to which all Canada but especially English-speaking Canada is exposed. The Canadian nation is not indestructible as the Swiss. Its continued existence has been largely experimental and its future depends chiefly on the capacity to tolerate marked dissimilarities and yet cultivate mutual interests and loyalties.

Why is it impossible for us to imitate Brazil, whose inhabitants, Zweig tells us in his famous book, "Bresil, Terre d'Avenir":

—rival each other in one ambition—that of erasing all particularism and of becoming, as completely and as rapidly as possible, true Brazilians—melted in a new nation. This systematic fusion, of national or racial closed groups, closed primarily to combat each other, has considerably facilitated the creation of a national and united conscience and it is astonishing to see how much the second generation already feels Brazilian.

In praising the Brazilian fusion, I am not forgetful, Mr. Speaker, of the opinion expressed by Sir George Etienne Cartier in presenting the confederation act. He said then that the fusion of the races in Canada into one was an impossibility, and that there was no power on earth capable of making us lose our language and be renegades to our faith. What was true in 1867 is truer to-day; I am glad to note that Cartier was right and that our French language and our Catholic faith are to-day stronger than they were in his days. Roman Catholics constitute 43·34 per cent of our Canadian population, and Canadians of French descent represent the biggest individual source of our "inhabitants," having contributed 30·27 per cent thereof in contrast to 25·80 per cent of English, 12·20 per cent of Scotch descent, 11·02 per cent of Irish origin.

There are, however, factors other than race and religion whereby all groups could be melted together and be brought much closer one to the other. One of these factors is our Canadian history, which should and could be written and taught in such a way as to make all Canadians devoted to Canada, proud of their country. The various elements of the Canadian population should not be made foes of one another at an age when they are unable fully to appreciate by themselves the consequences of their regrettably hostile acts or thoughts towards each other.

Everything should be studied and a plan laid down that would have the result of producing closeness of patriotic ideas, thoughts and purposes. There are other countries where languages and religions are dissimilar and yet where patriotism is not different. Why is it impossible for Canada to imitate Switzerland, where men of three very different and distinct origins and mentalities have melted themselves together to create a new and independent state, a concrete and distinctive entity?

Everybody knows, as Edwin Muller expressed it, that:

The Swiss have no racial unity, no common language; they differ in religion and culture; they are German, French and Italian. But they have one thing in common—democracy. The German-Swiss dairy farmer of Appenzell may not speak the same language as the French-Swiss factory worker of Geneva, yet they understand each other. The cantons remain separate and individual, but under their motto, "One for all and all for one." they have formed a nation whose unity has withstood the most violent strains.

World war I was a severe test for this union of free men. In 1914 the German-

speaking Swiss felt themselves close to Germany, had shared its literature and culture. The French cantons were ardently pro-French and pro-ally. When it came to the test, the loyalty of German-Swiss and French-Swiss to their union was more binding than any other loyalties. Came world war II, and Switzerland was soon an island in a sea of triumphant nazism. But this time there were no divided sympathies. All Switzerland was anti-nazi, the German Swiss probably the most anti. The nazis then endeavoured by all imaginable means to promote "the pure race" complex. Hitler and his henchmen were making every effort, throughout the world and especially in Switzerland, to group all German-blooded populations. The German Swiss remained faithful to their own country; the Italian Swiss refused to answer the call of their fascist cousins, and the French Swiss forgot that he was French and remained a Swiss. Altogether, as one, they were neutral and ready to fight any enemy of Switzerland that dared lay a foot on its territory, whether that foe might be German, Italian or French. This is what I call true citizenship.

Why cannot Canada operate in the same way? Why cannot Canadians be Canadians —as Swiss are Swiss or as Brazilians are Brazilians? Differences of religion, race, language, are not worse here than they are, or were, over there, or in Spain, Greece, Italy, Poland, Russia, France, or Great Britain.

We have heard a great deal, Mr. Speaker, about a "bifocal" army and the harm this army is supposed to have caused to the unity of the country. This harm is infinitesimal compared to that caused by the bifocal mentality of certain self-styled Canadians. Bifocal mentality—there is the reason for our incapacity to create a really distinctive nation. Some residents of Canada are Canadians only in part. Primarily, they are British, French, German, Italian, Scottish, Irish. Nothing apparently can take away the hyphen between their country of origin and their country of residence. They are, and apparently must remain, British-Canadian, French-Canadian, et cetera. Canada for some is a transient place which will be left behind as soon as fortune has been made therein. Whether it be London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, or any other place, numerous are those whose minds wander through the streets of a foreign city which they consider the ideal place in which to spend a quiet and well earned old age. They are Canadians in name; in soul they are English, French, German, et cetera.

The bill now before the house will not alter this fact. What we need is a law which will change this bifocal mentality, which will create patriotism, non-existent at the present time. It is fine to have a Canadian flag or a Canadian anthem, but I am not of those who think that these external signs will do much to promote patriotism. Patriotism has to come first and to be exteriorized by a flag or an anthem. They have a meaning, inasmuch as they have a soul. Without patriotism, a flag is a meaningless piece of cloth, and an anthem is an empty song. Not that I disapprove, Mr. Speaker, of the resolution presented to create a distinctive flag. I do most heartily approve of it, because there are in Canada, and they form the majority, true Canadians who have no other country than Canada, who have Canadian souls. For them, the flag will be the symbol and the anthem will be the call of their nation. And for them, I hope, both the flag and the anthem will be wholly, exclusively and conclusively Canadian.

I do not wish to throw discredit upon, or to be disrespectful of, any culture having contributed to the education of a single Canadian. I admire the Anglo-Saxon culture; it has many good points. I am proud of the French and Latin cultures; they also have many excellent qualities. But, I say, let us extract from the English and French characteristics and from any other culture, whatever is good in them, to achieve a distinctive, Canadian mentality—remembering, Mr. Speaker, that in order to form one big Canadian family we must include not only the French, the English, but all other nationalities which together represented, in 1941, twenty per cent of our population.

It is good sometimes to look at population statistics and to learn the lessons that flow therefrom. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that Canadians of other than British stock represent a majority in our country. It is well worth noting that whereas in 1871 the composite percentage of the French-English groups was ninety-two per cent of the total population, in 1941, it represented only eighty per cent. It is clear from these figures that more and more we must think in terms of other than French and English elements and take into consideration the demands, ideologies, antecedents and history of the other increasing twenty per cent and not restrict ourselves to British heritage, as the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) suggested in his speech of April 2, page 514 of *Hansard*, where he said:

> Canada to me means . . . a citizenship which maintains in this part of North America the highest heritage of British peoples every where in the world.

We must include everybody. In the same line of thinking, it is well to consider that whereas in 1871 only 2·64 per cent of our population was foreign born; in 1941 it was 8·82 per cent, more than three times as much.

These figures will be sufficient to show that it is important and urgent that something be done to promote true Canadianism, to absorb this influx and to transform it in terms of Canadian culture. The post-war period will bring with it thousands and millions of demands for settlement in Canada; let us not be found sleeping, and let us not be found wanting. These immigrants must be made to be Canadians both in name and in soul; they must be made to recognize that this is their sole country, and that by asking to be made part of it they become real Canadians.

I am at ease, Mr. Speaker, in talking about true Canadians, because I feel that I am a true Canadian. The majority of the population of the province of Quebec feel that we are the true settlers of this country. Is not this complete attachment to the soil true patriotism? The people of Quebec refer to themselves as "Canayens" and to representatives of other groups as "les Anglais". And mind you, Mr. Speaker, there is a justification for such an attitude. Their ancestors felt, and they to-day feel, that this country is theirs. If we look back at history, at the text of the capitulation of Quebec, we note a marked distinction between the terms used to qualify the inhabitants of the country and the French garrison. The difference is still more marked in the text of the capitulation of Montreal, which differentiates between the French, the Canadians and the Acadians. The Canadians, ancestors of practically all our Quebecers of to-day, who had been at that time established in Canada for three, four or five generations, some who had settled there over one hundred years previously, felt really at home here in Canada. They were referred to by the representatives of both the British and French crown as "the Canadians."

The descendants of these Canadians of 1760 —they total some 3,500,000 to-day—are scattered all over Canada. They have remained truly Canadians and, to this day, they still are and feel Canadians. They could have returned to France had they so desired, but they preferred staying here, because they had no other country, no other home than that of America. These Canadians in 1946 figure that they, or at least their ancestors, have made a positive act of Canadianism, and they fail to see how and when the British subjects of English descent residing in Canada have done the same.

Under the statutes as they are, Mr. Speaker, is it not true that a British subject, born in any part of the British commonwealth, is not obliged to do anything in order to possess the plenitude of Canadian rights? He does not have to make a formal act of acceptance of Canadianism in the same manner as all other immigrants have to do. He does not have to take an oath of allegiance to our king, because the oath he has given to his king is deemed sufficient. Now, I may appear to repeat myself, but my king and the British king are not legally the same; they are not the same entity. And this the statute of Westminster implicitly recognizes. I have as much respect for and submission to my king as the inhabitant of Great Britain has for his; and I insist that, upon coming to my country, upon settling in the territory of my king, everyone should take an oath of allegiance to the king of Canada, and forego his submission to the king of Great Britain.

This may seem drastic, Mr. Speaker, but is it not the procedure that immigrants from all countries are asked to follow? They must renounce their former allegiance if they are to be made subjects of my king. Now, if Canada is a distinct nation, a different state, would it not be logical to say that to act differently, to allow anybody to owe allegiance to another but its king, constitutes an act of disrespect or disloyalty to the head of the country, to the king who rules Canada, to George VI, King of Canada?

The British commonwealth has been variously defined. I like the definition given by Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia university: "A federal relationship which consists in loyalty and devotion to a person who is the symbol of unity." The symbol of unity for the commonwealth is His Majesty the King, George VI, to whom loyalty and devotion are due. He represents the *trait d'union* between the various nations of the British family. He is a multi-entity, who, in his various capacities, advised by his different governments, reaches his multitudinous subjects of "divers appellations." But I say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as Canada is concerned we must look to only one symbol, to the king of Canada.

This affirmation is not to be interpreted as a cry for secession or separatism, because it is not. I do not wish Canada to cut away from the British commonwealth of nations, because I believe that it is in the real interest of Canada and of the other sister nations to continue in this association. But I want to emphasize that our present citizenship status does not correspond to the importance Canada

has assumed in world affairs, that our projected bifacial citizenship only tends to prevent Canada from developing, by accepting the dictates of other than its own people. I wish Canada to grow as a nation. Why should this frighten the proponents of the commonwealth? In my opinion, as in that of the Winnipeg *Tribune*, loyalty to Canada does not mean Canadian isolationism, or any loosening of the real bonds which bind Canada to the British commonwealth. On the contrary, the better our citizens become as Canadians, the better member of the commonwealth Canada will be. If the individual Canadian's sense of partisanship in the Canadian community is dull and nebulous, his sense of sharing in the commonwealth will be, by that much, the more tenuous. The stronger Canada becomes, the stronger the commonwealth will find itself. Far from weakening the empire, as the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) has suggested, a stronger and more united Canada will strengthen the commonwealth.

Mr. GREEN: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, I am sure quite unintenionally, has misinterpreted what I said last evening. I am all for a stronger Canada and a stronger empire.

Mr. RINFRET: I am glad to hear that, because I am for it too.

Mr. GREEN: And for a more united Canada.

Mr. RINFRET: We are both in accord, then. I have already referred to the absence of formal acts of Canadianism performed by British-born coming to Canada. I cannot help but think, Mr. Speaker, that the different treatment accorded to these as against the other immigrants has something to do with the lack of complete Canadian unity, and this, in my opinion, is a complete answer to the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) on the question. In the United States of America all immigrants, without exception, have to take out papers in order to become American citizens. All are treated alike, and when they do have their papers they all feel that they are Americans; they are proud to be called Americans and to be Americans without any hyphens. Here in Canada it is different; only certain of the immigrants are obliged by law to apply for citizenship, and when the naturalization certificates are issued to them the petitioners are made citizens of another country or, according to another prevailing view, not of a country in particular but of a group of independent states. Would it not be more decisive, if we wish them to become true Canadians, to make them Canadians, and to give them a true Canadian status?

There are, of course, fanatics who will gasp at these various propositions of mine. I am not concerned, because those fanatics are not Canadians; they are anything but Canadians. We have some in the province of Quebec, who will not see further than their provincial noses. They are the separatists, the nationalists. The result of the last election shows the extent of their weight in the voter's mind. I know them well; their provincial leader is the representative of part of my constituency of Outremont in the legislature of Quebec. I visited that portion of my county and I vehemently attacked the narrow point of view of those partisans of a parochial nationalism. I am against all narrow and petty nationalism, Mr. Speaker, whatever its origin. In the last campaign I insisted upon telling all my electors of Outremont that I despised short-sighted nationalism, and, in order to be certain that interested parties would understand, I condemned French nationalism in the French section, English or Irish nationalism in the English and Irish section, and Jewish nationalism in the Jewish community. I told them that my nationalism was not a regional one. In my manifesto I made one single request; a really Canadian vote and the opportunity of assuring the Prime Minister of the country of the true Canadian feeling of the electors of Outremont. This mandate I have received by an overwhelming majority, and this mandate I am carrying out to-day.

There exists, Mr. Speaker, outside of my province another peculiar, narrow nationalism. Its difference from that of my province resides in the fact that it is the exact opposite, which does not make it more Canadian. The proponents of this narrow view are convinced that they are expressing the view of the majority of the people of Canada, which makes it more dangerous. The sooner these gentlemen realize that they have not a monopoly of patriotism, that they make a radical mistake about the meaning of the word Canadianism, and that they represent only extremists, the better it will be for the country. They are presumably the descendants of some British subjects coming from New England, not from Britain, whom Governor Murray, in January, 1764, tagged the "most inveterate fanatics"; like their forefathers, they would seem to—

> think themselves superior in rank and fortune to the soldier and the Canadians, as they are pleased to deem the first, voluntary, and the other, "born slaves."

These were Murray's own words, in January, 1764, when referring to merchants who had then resorted to this country. Let there be no mistake. They are not superior, and Canadians are not slaves.

I have mentioned two groups of extremists; both of them refuse to recognize the fact that Canada is and must remain a bilingual and bicultural country. However, as far as recognizing the bilingual principle, one portion of the population has contributed to a much greater extent to the fulfilment of our goal. Of the total of 1,474,000 who could speak both French and English in 1941, some 1,152,713 were of French origin, whereas only 216,385 were of British Isles races. Percentage-wise, it is 78 per cent of total in the first instance, and only 14 per cent in the other. Figured in percentage of the respective groups, it shows that 33 per cent or one-third of the French descent population were bilingual in 1941, whereas only 3·7 per cent of the British Isles descendants could speak both French and English.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. RINFRET: My purpose in bringing these figures to the attention of the house is to emphasize the effort made by the French-speaking population to understand its English-speaking compatriots and the lack of cooperation given in the other direction. Unilinguism, whether it comes from recognized French or English-speaking portions of the country, will not help union and understanding between the two big races.

Mr. Herbert Lank, vice-president of Canadian Industries Limited, born in Great Britain, recently delivered an address in French before the annual congress of the association of the commercial science graduates of the school of higher studies of the university of Montreal. He said:

(Translation):

I like your language and I am proud to be able to speak it. My knowledge of French, however limited it may be, has opened for me the door to your culture and your civilization, which are unfortunately beyond the reach of all too many English-speaking people, while your knowledge of English makes it easier for you to become acquainted with our culture and our civilization. Let us use our respective languages, which are priceless instruments for the purpose of carrying out beneficial exchanges, since the only result can be, on both sides, a higher civilization and culture.

(Text):

I agree with Mr. Lank, and, with him, I regret that the desire to interchange studies of cultures and civilization has been unfortunately one-sided, with the French element providing most endeavours and the English-speaking practically none.

I have referred to extremists or fanatics. Naturally they are the most prolific in articles and speeches. They speak the loudest, and they are given the most space in certain newspapers and elsewhere. Care should be exercised to prevent utterances unimportant and insignificant in one part of the country from being given undue publicity and thereby being exaggerated, or given credence to, in other parts of the country.

Fortunately for Canada, between the two poles of extreme thoughts that I have indicated lie the big majority of my fellow countrymen, those who have only one country, bounded by the Atlantic on one side and by the Pacific on the other; those who wish to make of Canada, of the whole of Canada, a true, a strong nation. They must unite to fight reactionary groups.

Leaving the anti-Canadians, pro any other country, whichever it might be, to their bifocal mentality, let those in favour of Canada—as a country—as a nation, as a sovereign state, not only wish for the realization of their ambition, but do something about it.

Let us follow the example set by l'Abbe Maheux, and teach to all Canadians that Canada, in its entirety, is a real entity, a glorious reality, an object worth while cherishing. We must convince them that their hearts are sufficiently big to contain the love of their family, of their town, of their religion, of their province, and above all, of the whole of Canada.

We must teach to all Canadians that their country, as a matter of fact and reality, is a bicultural, bilingual one, that, in order for one section of the country to understand the other it is necessary to learn both languages and cultures. We must teach a common history of Canada, as a means of avoiding errors and horrors of the past, and as an inspiration for the accomplishment of what is advantageous to the homeland.

Finally, we must teach to all Canadians, a patriotism and a civism that will give one a proper sense of his responsibilities towards his country, whereby he will have more respect for his duty than for his privileges.

With these purposes in mind, the naturalization or citizenship act should be amended in such a way as to make us the Canadian subjects of His Majesty George VI, instead of maintaining directly or indirectly the anomalous and paradoxical appellation of Canadian-British subjects.

The election act should also be changed to grant voting rights only to, and restrict eligibility to, Canadian subjects. This would guarantee that no foreign-minded individual would sit in the House of Commons.

What I claim for Canada is a national synthesis, the preservation of the immeasurable wealth that could be accumulated by the contact of the many races and inherited from the various national cultures belong to Canada's people.

I want Canada for Canadians and Canadians for Canada. With the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, "I desire to see the largest possible measure of the same ability to unite different religious groups in the support of a single national policy."

I would regret a continued lack of collaboration on the part of certain elements of the population, because in the words of Gabriel Jaray—

(Translation):

A divided Canada, instead of making the weight of her power felt in the sphere of world affairs and playing therein the part of an arbitrator, will find it difficult to maintain true independence, drawn along as she will be to one side or the other by outside pressures and internal oscillations.

(Text):

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat belongs to a family which has had a distinguished career in Canada. For many years his uncle was secretary of state, but I believe he would never have introduced a bill such as that now before the house.

The motion for second reading affords an opportunity to discuss the principle of legislation, and when a bill is read a second time it is assumed that the principle has been adopted. When we are considering the principle of the bill we must keep in mind, too, as we do when reading a statute, the marginal notes, the headings, the schedules, all of which are part of the bill.

I do not like to disagree with the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin). He is an old friend of mine, and any successes he has had have always brought pleasure to me. But I can tell him this, that when he was in the old country, had he but hearkened to what is going on over there he would have known that this is the wrong time to introduce a bill of this kind into the House of Commons in Canada.

In my view this measure, if it becomes law, will give the judges a headache; it is nothing but a Tower of Babel bill. Who is asking for it? I believe it has been asked for by only a few people, almost all of whom are from one province. In my view this measure represents a notice to the mother country that we do not want any more of them over here, that we have a "to let" sign out, so far as they are concerned.

We will not read much about this measure in the press or hear much about it over the radio, because for many weeks the newspapers, with the exception of one or two, have been putting the soft pedal on it. However the people of Canada will wake up to-morrow night and find out what it is all about. From the time of confederation, right down to to-day we have had no complaints about citizenship. Our men went overseas, and many thousands of our citizens have fallen on the field of battle. Why did they go—large numbers of them from Canada, and many from my own city? They went because they believed our citizenship was good enough for them. If it was, it should be good enough for those of us who stayed at home.

Again I ask: Who is asking for this bill? I have tried to find out in Toronto, and in the county of York. But I can find no one who has asked for it. This is not the time for it. If Mr. Churchill were to come here as a citizen, and also Mr. deValera, Mr. Churchill would be treated just the same as Mr. deValera, although the latter was an active supporter of Germany in the last war. But if they came to Canada, they would be treated exactly alike, and could not become Canadian citizens for five years.

This is to be known as the citizenship bill, and I must point out at once that it invades the jurisdiction of the provinces. I suggest there should be a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada under the Supreme Court Act to find out whether parliament has power to enact a measure of this kind on citizenship. I believe that it has not, and that it is ultra viries of the dominion. This will be one of the most unfortunate measures ever brought before the House of Commons and will create more disunity in Canada than we have seen since confederation.

As I say, this bill should be referred to the supreme court to find out if this parliament has power to enact such a citizenship bill as this. After all, the provinces have been created, and under section 92 of the British North America Act citizenship is, under property and civil rights, largely a matter for the provinces. True it is that certain features of this bill such as naturalization and the status of aliens are federal matters, but undoubtedly there are certain clauses of this bill which, in my opinion, are not within the powers of this parliament.

I believe that this bill is going to lead to a lot of disunity in this country. It is based on the statute of Westminster, which changed the status, autonomy and sovereignty of this dominion. This bill is based on that empire-wrecking statute. We can never hope for empire unity so long as bills like this are passed. Empire unity is not being considered at all in this bill. Now is the time when we should be devoting all our energies to solving the great problems before us, such as trade, defence, and immigration within the empire.

This bill puts the cart before the horse. We should first decide what we are going to do about immigration from Britain, the United States and Europe. Are we to treat the British-born from the British isles the same as some people on the continent of Europe, many of whom supported the axis powers in the last war? I say no, that charity begins at home, within the empire first. It is appalling to me the time that has been devoted this session to a lot of secondary matters like the one we had before the house yesterday, and this bill again to-day. We shall have still more of them as the session goes on, and it is because certain promises were made to the electorate in certain parts of the country. We should rather be discussing primary matters like fuel, housing, clothing and reconversion of industry.

I am speaking just as a private member, although I believe on this bill I express the views of a large body of the citizens not only of Ontario but throughout the country. I have always argued for the principle for confederation, namely, the old Cornish battle-cry, "each for all and all for each", and what should be for the good of one province should be for the good of all.

According to the census returns that were tabled recently, the British-born in this country are down about 42½ per cent. I have always been an admirer of the glorious French nation, which did so much in the first world war. France has been a great nation and it will rise to greatness again. The two great races in this country were originally the only ones in this country. Then the government decided on a policy of broadening out and brought in others. I am not opposed to the best type of settlers coming in here from other countries, even selective immigration from Europe. Between the two wars Canada was the weak link in the chain of the dominions. We kept step with South Africa and Eire, instead of keeping step with New Zealand and Australia. New Zealand and Australia proposed an empire conference and empire cabinet, a citizenship bill and a meeting of the dominions and wanted to deal with citizenship, trade, defence, migration, nationality and status of aliens. But what was the answer of Canada? The answer was: We have no commitments; parliament will decide.

As far as I am concerned I am opposed to the principle of this bill. Canada was the weak spot in the British empire between the two wars through its policy of isolation and separatism and drift. This bill, in my opinion, indicates a great lack of appreciation of the value of our British citizenship. The other day I was talking to one of our most prominent citizens of Toronto, a man who gives as much to charity as any other citizen, if not more. He is a man of foreign birth and he said to me, "I am utterly opposed to this citizenship bill." I believe that most of the people who come from Europe will be opposed to this bill. They value too much British citizenship. Why? You remember the sinking of the *Athenia* on the third day after the war began. This British ship was sunk and 136 Canadians lost their lives. What was the good of our policy of isolation and separatism? It was ten days later before this parliament declared war. We might have known that when Britain is at war Canada is also at war. When the *Athenia* was sunk what good would it have been for a man to be able to produce a card showing that he was a Canadian citizen? We had no Canadian army, navy or air force at that time to protect ourselves.

I am a Canadian and a British subject. They are both the same. That is what the minister forgets and what the cabinet forgets in framing this bill.

Mr. KNIGHT: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. CHURCH: I would rather the hon. member take up his own time.

Mr. KNIGHT: It is just a question.

Mr. CHURCH: The hon. member cannot interrupt without my consent. He will have plenty of opportunity to discuss this matter.

Mr. KNIGHT: I can only ask the hon. member if he will permit a question.

Mr. CHURCH: I am only stating my own views and speak what I believe to be the truth. The hon. gentleman can state his views later. I am not complaining about his views. He can have his views as far as I am concerned, and I do not care what his views are.

I am speaking as a Canadian born in this country. I am a Canadian, but I also am a British subject. They are both the same and always have been. The minister must surely

be the greatest discoverer since Jacques Cartier and John and Sebastien Cabot because he has discovery that a Canadian citizen is a British subject. A Canadian citizen has always been a British subject.

Who is asking for this bill? We do not know. If the government put the bill through they will live to regret it. It may satisfy some people in the country, but I would point out that we all owe allegiance to one sovereign and one empire. British citizenship is the greatest thing in the world.

Just look at this bill. It says that a person born in Hamilton or St. Catharines of Canadian parents is a British citizen. Everyone knows that without being told. We have all been Canadians and British subjects, ever since the treaty of Paris. This bill should be sent to the archives—earth to earth, dust to dust and ashes to ashes, in the sure and certain hope that it will never be resurrected. It can only cause the widest division amongst the people of this country when unity is what is wanted at this time. We were Canadians before. We were Canadians and British in the war of 1783, when our splendid citizens from Quebec did so much, in the war of 1812, the Northwest rebellion, the South African war, and the two other wars in our generation.

The bill provides that a British subject not previously resident in Canada will have to live in Canada for five years before becoming a Canadian. Aliens who fought against us in this war are treated the same as those men of other dominions who served in the forces with us; before they will be eligible to become Canadian citizens they must live here five years. The bill requires a British subject not formerly resident here to go through the same formalities as an alien to become a Canadian subject.

This is, in my opinion, one of the most untimely, un-needed, mischievous bills introduced into this parliament for a long time. It is separatism *in excelsis*. It will cause widespread disunity and resentment. It is a glorification of one class at the expense of another, something which should never be allowed to happen; it is political first, last and all the time. Why is it put forward at a time like this? In my opinion—and I have read a number of speeches made throughout Canada during the last election—it grows out of the last two elections; it is just window-dressing, there is a whole lot of shadow-boxing in it, and it is of the nature of vote-hunting propaganda. It is strange that some of those outside this house who are supporting this bill seem to favour a republic in Canada similar to what South Africa and Eire want.

[Mr. Church.]

In my opinion this bill should not have been introduced at the present time. Section 25 speaks of a Canadian citizen as a British subject. Who ever said he was not? I am surprised that any minister from Ontario would introduce such a measure into the house. The bill states that people born in Canada or people from Great Britain already in Canada shall be known as Canadians. I never knew that to be questioned before. I am a Canadian and also a British subject; they are both the same, and we need no bill like this to make them so. To be able to say, "I am a British subject," means something, because if you were a British subject on the seas and produced a British passport, it guaranteed a safe journey to your journey's end. British supremacy on the seas saved the world in four centuries—those of Philip of Spain, Louis XIV, Napoleon, and twice in our genration against Germany. Are we to lose all this now for the sake of a meaningless bill?

When St. Paul was before the centurion he said to him, "I am a Roman citizen." The episode is told in the book of Acts, chapters 22 to 24. He was then sent to the chief captain, and also to the high priest; afterwards he was brought before the security council, or the council of state, as they called it in those days. When they heard him they took him into the great hall, and when he appealed to Cæsar they sent him over to Rome. In those days to say, "I am a Roman citizen," meant something. I say these things in no spirit of exclusiveness. I know a large number of the foreign-born in Toronto, and they are among our best and most distinguished citizens; I am anxious that they shall have fair treatment in connection with all our future policies; for I recognize, while I am a member of the house, no racial or religious considerations; such things are out of place in the House of Commons.

A grave warning has been issued in relation to the principles of a bill of this kind. It is contained in an address by the ex-Prime Minister of Canada, Viscount Bennett, and will be found, I believe, in the library. It was delivered by Viscount Bennett to the Royal Society of Arts on June 3, 1942. In a foreword prepared by Mr. Patrick Donner, one of the leading and ablest members of the British House of Commons, it is stated that Viscount Bennett gave

> . . . a grave warning that the problem of finding machinery to secure a common foreign policy for the British empire is still unsolved . . . He begins with a very full statement of the constituent parts of the empire—dominions, colonies, protectorates, mandated territories, et cetera; goes on to trace the development of dominion status and gives the history of the imperial conference. He emphasizes the large

number of subsidiary empire conferences on such matters as copyright, patents, forestry, education, cables and wireless communication, and so forth, but comes back to the inadequacy of the means for securing a common foreign policy. Speaking of the ten years prior to 1942, he observes:

"True, there have been consultation and discussion on foreign policy, but such policy has been the policy of the United Kingdom, and while generally speaking the dominions have been advised and consulted, circumstances made it almost impossible for them to do other than agree."

The foreword continues:

Lord Bennett argues that nothing in the Statute of Westminster alters the law made clear in the case of Williams v. Howarth (reported 1905) that there is only one king ruling over the empire and not a separate king for each dominion. He accordingly makes it clear that in his view the neutrality of Eire is unconstitutional and would otherwise potentially imply "an obviously impossible and ridiculous situation." He asks pertinently: "Can the legations of warring enemies of the British commonwealth of nations be legally or honourably maintained within the territory of that commonwealth?"

The case cited by Viscount Bennett is relevant to the matters now under discussion.

This bill is going to cause a lot of trouble. I repeat, British subjects coming from other parts of the empire, including the mother country, are to be treated as though they were outsiders and aliens; and the impression has gone abroad in the empire, and, indeed, in France as well, that the people who supplied our two great racial stocks are not wanted here, and that if they try to get in they will have to line up at immigration offices and take their chance and reside here for a long time before they can become citizens or are allowed to vote.

The first schedule to the bill, may I point out, refers to some countries which are not in the British empire at the present time. In one, Eire, a republic has been set up, one of the so-called dominions. In the schedule it is called "Ireland"; it is not that at all. The schedule speaks of "the United Kingdom". It should be "the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland", and "Eire" should be substituted for Ireland, for Eire is not a dominion; it has already set up a republic.

I do not know that I need say anything further. I have received a number of protests against this bill. I tell you this, regarding citizenship of the empire, that unless the dominions hang together they are going to hang separately, because none of them is capable of "going it alone", either in respect of citizenship or any other matter, and Canada will have little to say at the peace table. I believe in what Mr. Churchill said at Fulton, Missouri:

Let no man underrate the abiding power of the British empire and commonwealth. Because you see forty-six millions on our island harassed about their food supply, or because we have difficulty restarting our industries and export trade after six years of passionate war effort, do not suppose that we shall not come through these dark years of privation as we have come through the glorious years of agony, or that half a century from now you will not see seventy or eighty millions of Britons spread about the world and united in defence of our traditions, our way of life and of the world causes you and we espouse.

I quote also from Lieutenant-General Montgomery:

We must maintain a strong and united British empire. The empire has great responsibilities. Much of the world looks to us to give a lead in solving the many problems that lie ahead. We must give that lead, and we must shoulder these responsibilities. To do this we must always be strong so that never again can the tyrant consider that he can safely twist the lion's tail. No tyrant can ignore a strong British empire which stands for freedom and justice.

In conclusion, let me say simply this. I have been in this house for a great many years and during all that time I have tried to speak what I believe to be the truth temperately and moderately. I am opposed to this bill. It is not needed at present. While I have great respect for my hon. friends to the left, I suggest that there are three views, the right view, your own view and we must consider and respect the other fellow's views, and I have always tried to follow that principle. One must be interested not only in his own ideas but in the views of others, and must endeavour to find what the right views are. I believe I have expressed the views of a very large number of the Canadian people regarding this bill. Even if we wanted this bill, this is the wrong time to introduce it, because it will cause disunity and will satisfy no one. It is meaningless and it will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to enforce it. Elaborate machinery will have to be set up and already our judges are overburdened with work, with divorce cases and other litigation. Now we are going to pass an act requiring every citizen to register before he can be regarded as a citizen. In my opinion it will lead to endless confusion and before long the government will regret that it ever had anything to do with it.

Mr. ROCH PINARD (Chambly-Rouville): The bill which we have to study and examine is one which, in my opinion, will engage the attention not only of this country, not only of neighbouring countries such as the United States, but of all other countries to which we

are bound by ties either political, diplomatic or commercial. We are considering a bill which is extremely important. Indeed, I would call it a halting place in the life of the Canadian nation.

I wish to comment briefly on the bill and to refer to some of the principles involved. Then it would be useful, I think, to analyse the effects of the bill on our country and on our relations with other nations. This I shall try to do, and then I shall attempt to draw certain conclusions or lessons from the bill, having regard to the future of Canada.

The history and the origin of the bill are particularly interesting. Since it is legislation dealing with Canadian citizenship it will be necessary, if we are to study it properly, to look at its sources and for that purpose to go back to the birth of the country. That, however, I do not intend to do. It would not be of any benefit whatever in the purely practical study which I wish to undertake.

To give a rapid summary of the matter I would say this. During the French regime there obviously was no law on Canadian citizenship. Canada was then a French colony; all French people who came to settle and establish themselves here were French citizens and remained such, and their children born in Canada remained French subjects. When this country was conquered by Great Britain it became simply a colony of the British crown and did not constitute a separate country. It formed a single British territory, part of which became later the United States of America, with the exception of one portion, Louisiana, which remained French until 1803 when it was sold to the United States by the French.

In 1783 the United States of America was formed and in 1812 the frontiers between the United States and Canada were fixed by special treaty. During all that period our country enacted no law relating to Canadian nationality, the initiative being left entirely to the mother country, and it is only in 1814 that one can find traces of the first Canadian legislation relating to nationality. However, those first laws enacted by Canada had only local scope and influence. In 1867 Canada became a dominion by virtue of the British North America Act and retained for a long time all basic laws of the mother country, which it took care to approve systematically

In 1881 our country promulgated a really important law which could then clearly be distinguished from those enacted by the imperial parliament. That was the Naturalization Act, 23 and 24, George V, chapter 49. But it was soon discovered that this new legislation providing for local naturalization was creating serious inconveniences not only in Canada but in the other dominions. At the imperial conferences of 1907 and 1911 Sir Wilfrid Laurier brought these difficulties to the attention of the other dominions and suggested the adoption of a uniform law on imperial naturalization. The principle was accepted by all parties and the new law was enacted at the same time by Canada and Great Britain. As a matter of fact, it was adopted first by Canada and it was adopted just a few months later by Great Britain.

In our statutes this law is known as "An act respecting British nationality, naturalization and aliens," and it is in substance the same as the British law, which is called "an act to consolidate and amend enactments relating to British nationality and the status of aliens." This British law is chapter 17 of the private and general acts of Great Britain. All the other dominions accepted and adopted the same legislation, but they did so only many years after the first world war. As a matter of fact, Ireland never adopted such legislation. Ireland enacted its own constitution in 1935. Before this date, in 1914, Canada promulgated in 1910, for the first time, a law mentioning the words "Canadian citizenship." It is the act respecting immigration. That special law, frequently amended, has become chapter 93 of our revised statutes, and one can still find in it the same definition of "Canadian citizen" as in the previous law which I have mentioned, the law of 1910.

This law on immigration is still in force to-day. I stated a moment ago that in 1914 our country was the first among all the nations of the commonwealth, including Great Britain, to adopt the imperial law of naturalization, which was later ratified by all the other dominions of the commonwealth, except Ireland. Then, until 1921, there was no important legislation affecting nationality or citizenship in Canada enacted by our parliament. In 1921 our country enacted the Canadian Nationals Act, which is to be repealed by the present bill.

This act was adopted, as mentioned by the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin), on the occasion of the selection of judges to represent Canada at the permanent court of international justice. It seemed to be necessary, and I think rightly so, to distinguish those judges from those who were appointed by Great Britain and those who were appointed by the other dominions. I submit that it was the first time a real distinction was ever made by our parliament between the subjects

of Great Britain, the other dominions and those of Canada. Until then there was only one British subject. By that new legislation, the Canadian Nationals Act, a British subject who is at the same time called a Canadian national, is created. The question then arose whether that new legislation did not have the effect of provoking the creation of a double nationality for all the nationals of the dominions of the British commonwealth, for I must add that all the other dominions adopted a law similar to that of the Canadian Nationals Act. As I said, the question arose as to whether or not this did not have the effect of provoking double nationality.

This interesting legal question was studied very carefully and was dealt with by many authorities on constitutional law. It was dealt with and capably discussed by my former legal partner, Mr. Chateauguay Perrault, in his book "Nationality", published in 1939. This book was published after Mr. Perrault obtained a doctorate of law from the university of Montreal based on a thesis he had written. I had the great pleasure of attending the event. In this book Mr. Perrault ably discussed these questions, and he came to the conclusion that this unusual legislation cannot effect a division of nationality, but is, as he calls it, rather the qualification of a new nationality. In other words, the Canadian person of 1921 when this Canadian Nationals Act was adopted was not acquiring a second nationality; he was only adding a new quality to his nationality as a British subject by becoming a British subject of Canadian national denomination. Such was not the case with the people of the Irish Free State because they never adopted the imperial naturalization act. One might think that as far as Ireland is concerned they actually acquired a double nationality, at least so far as the British commonwealth is concerned.

From 1921 until the present time Canada has not adopted any other law affecting nationality, except in 1937 when special legislation was enacted to prevent Canadians from enrolling in the Spanish war. In that act respecting foreign enlistment, chapter 32, I George VI, 1937, a distinction was made between a British subject and a Canadian national. Such in short is the history of this legislation and the sources of bill No. 7, which I shall now study briefly.

The bill is entitled, "An act respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens", and is to be known as the Canadian Citizenship Act. One immediately realizes, Mr. Speaker, that Canada breaks the unity of legislation on nationality in the British commonwealth, and that our country is swerving away from the beaten path to proclaim its own independence, citizenship amongst other things. Until now in the whole British commonwealth the legislation was uniform, for everywhere the imperial law of 1914 had been adopted except in the Irish Free State. It is my humble opinion that so far as that particular country is concerned Ireland can be no longer considered a dominion, because in 1934 it adopted its own constitution by which it declared that Ireland is a sovereign, independent and democratic state.

Mr. MARTIN: It was 1935.

Mr. PINARD: Yes. It is a *fait accompli.* As far as international law is concerned, a situation of fact soon becomes a situation of law. I think it would be interesting to follow in the future the development of that country from the constitutional point of view.

It is now Canada's policy to proclaim its own distinct nationality and citizenship. I said a moment ago that Canada was breaking the unity of legislation in the British commonwealth. It does so first my repealing the Naturalization Act of 1914 by a special section of the bill, and, second, by setting aside the Canadian Nationals Act. There is another section of the bill which is important, and the principle which it contains is categorical. A Canadian citizen is a British subject; but a British subject is not necessarily a Canadian citizen. On this point I must say I was very much impressed with the argument of the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Jaenicke), an argument which he succeeded in expounding clearly in spite of numerous interruptions. The hon. member has voiced the opinion that the special provision of the bill which enacts that a Canadlan citizen is a British subject is ultra vires, because in our legislation we have no right to say who is a British subject. I concur in his conclusions that this special section should be changed, and I intended to offer the very same suggestion but for some other reason. I do not intend to discuss whether that special legislation is beyond the powers of this parliament or not, although I might say that if such a contention were true it could be said also of numerous other provisions of the bill. Moreover, the British subject was defined by parliament in the Naturalization Act, and such a definition would also have been ultra vires if, as my hon. friend contends, it is up to the British parliament alone to say who is a British subject.

My reason for voicing objections to the special section which provides that a Canadian citizen is a British subject is different, although it may be qualified as also originat-

ing from a legalistic mind. But when it comes to the drafting of legislation I submit that it is not being legalistic to ask from our government that the legislation under study be prepared in accordance with our constitutional rights. That is what my hon. friend contended. As far as I am concerned I do not believe that my reasons for opposing that special legislation will likewise be considered legalistic.

Mr. MARTIN: You mean the special section?

Mr. PINARD: Yes, that special provision. After examining the present measure very carefully I have noted—and that is why I must concur in the conclusion that this provision should be changed—that the Naturalization Act being repealed, there is no more definition in our statutes of a British subject, no other definition having ever been given other than the one contained in paragraph (j) of section 2 of that act. There is then every reason to conclude, if in our statutes we have no definition at all of a British subject, that this section of the present bill has no practical sense whatever. For these reasons and remembering also the suggestion which was made by the Secretary of State who has asked us to make suggestions for the drafting of this legislation, and also because I wish that my participation in this debate be somewhat constructive, I concur in the opinion. I wish to make a suggestion that has, in my view, the effect of giving a more precise and practical sense to that disposition of the present bill which provides that a Canadian citizen is a British subject.

Since this bill has for its purpose the affirmation of our sovereignty; since this legislation seems to be intended to proclaim better our identity in the British commonwealth of nations, as Canada wishes to distinguish its entity from that of the other countries of the British group, there is a very simple way to attain that aim, by simply modifying this ambiguous disposition contained in the bill.

It is useless to say that a Canadian citizen is a British subject, since nowhere in our statutes is there a definition of a British subject. I might be told that anyone knows what a British subject is, that a British subject is a subject of His Majesty the King. But, Mr. Speaker, we must also keep in mind the rights we have acquired as a result of the imperial conferences and the statute of Westminster. I hope we would not wish to enact legislation which would be retrogressive simply because it lacked the necessary clarity. We know the aim of the government is precisely to distinguish a Canadian subject of His Majesty from any other subject of His Majesty. We know also that the purpose of this legislation is to inform the rest of the world of our sovereignty as a nation of free individuals. Finally we know that through this bill the government desires to give us a name and to define clearly, once and for all, our national status. Therefore, why should we not eliminate all ambiguities; why not clarify that section of the bill which would seek to achieve precisely that aim? By declaring that a Canadian citizen is a British subject the present bill is contradictory, in my opinion, to the status which we have thus far acquired as a nation. I am absolutely convinced that no one in this house will deny that His Majesty the King is the king of Canada. I am further convinced that no one in this country will contend that it is not to His Majesty the King of Canada that we owe our allegiance. I therefore suggest with the hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret) to the Secretary of State, who has moved the second reading of the bill, that the ambiguous sections of this legislation be clarified, and accordingly I would recommend that it be declared in the bill that a Canadian citizen is a subject of His Majesty the King of Canada.

Some time ago I was discussing the consequences of the Canadian Nationals Act of 1921 in relation to the Naturalization Act of 1914 in so far as duality of nationality is concerned. With the adoption of the present bill I believe there can be no question of a double nationality for the Canadian people. Up to the present we have been British subjects and nationals of the Dominion of Canada; now we become Canadian citizens. We remain with only one nationality, but at least this time it will be ours, the Canadian nationality.

The other sections of the bill are proof that such a nationality will not be granted to anybody simply upon request, since the conditions necessary to acquire it are strict and onerous; and I think that is well. Even the British subjects of Great Britain and the other dominions will have to submit themselves to these requirements, and that is only fair and just. I shall not undertake to discuss the conditions or the offences provided in the bill which will lead to loss of Canadian citizenship. Such prescriptions are contained in the major part of the bill; they are clear and concise, and cannot bring any confusion. In my opinion, that is the economy of this legislation which, as I said a moment ago, constitutes an important step in the life of the Canadian nation.

I wish now to define briefly the consequences and results of this important legislation. There is not the slightest doubt that by asking this house to adopt this bill the government

continues, with the same constancy and spirit, its progressive march forward; that it is following with the same resolution the very same policy in this country that it followed also at the imperial conferences. The opinions expressed at the imperial conferences, and the legislation following them, clearly established that the Canadian government, at least when it was represented by the party to which I belong, has always endeavoured to work with wisdom and prudence but also with firm determination toward the emancipation and independence of our great nation. Liberty and independence are two of the privileges dearest to peoples and individuals, and they also constitute basic qualities which are indispensable to the influence of a nation. Since the beginning of its already long history our country has been twice under the tutorship of two great nations which were leading the world because of their greatness and power. The descendents of those two great races still constitute a mighty portion of the actual population of the Canadian nation. Little by little, while it has grown stronger and more vigorous, our country has freed itself from those tutorships which paralysed its efforts and great enterprises.

Canada did not break away with violence from the tutorship of Great Britain; it simply left that protection as the fruit falls from the branch when it is ripened. This right to sovereignty was gained by Canada gradually, and it has just been consecrated by the effort our country has put forth to safeguard that civilization to which it wanted to belong and which it wanted to protect and defend. That right Canada may affirm with pride in the sacrifice of all those Canadians who fought; it may proclaim it with honour on the graves of those of her sons who died to defend it.

I am proud that our government has done so much to prove not only to Canadians themselves but to the world at large that today our country is sufficiently great and powerful to take care of its own national destinies. By asking our people to adopt this bill Canada is going forward with vision and certainty toward its progress and greatness. Thanks to the Canadian government, a new citizen is born in the world. That citizen is now very well known and regarded. That citizen is inferior to no other because of the greatness of his origins and the pureness of his blood. That citizen is already great, and has proved to be noble and generous. He will be received everywhere in the world, when he shows his new credentials and passport, with great admiration and respect. I heard the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) say it has meant a great deal to say that we are British subjects, but I still maintain that it is also a great thing to be able to say that we are Canadian citizens. The hon. member also said that St. Paul one day declared, "I am a Roman citizen." I do not want to get in wrong with the hon. gentleman, but I would remind him that what St. Paul said was, *"Civis Romanus sum."*

Mr. MARTIN: Was it Paul or St. Paul?

Mr. PINARD: I think they are both accepted as St. Paul. How many Canadians, Mr. Speaker, dreamed of that memorable day when we would acquire our Canadian citizenship; and that day has finally come, thanks to this government. The proclamation of our nationality is a definite and peremptory affirmation of our complete autonomy.

But, Mr. Speaker, to such a proclamation gerat privileges are attached, of which the greatest undoubtedly is that of allowing our country to enter international councils as a distinct and free entity. To those great privileges are attached serious and important corresponding tasks whose consequences cannot be ignored either by those who govern or by the people at large. Since the government has decided to create Canadian nationality and citizenship, it is to be hoped that it will always realize the value and price of such a title and privilege and impress it upon others who may wish to acquire it. Those who govern this country should always be very careful and upon their guard not to award too generously and without the necessary discretion and discernment such a privilege, which is the greatest any country can offer. To-day this warning becomes of greater significance, in view of recent events which caused the creation of a royal commission to investigate the activities of certain agents who are charged with having given secret information to a foreign power. Many of those were people who were admitted to Canada and who were not British subjects by origin. In the near future a great number of persons will be knocking at our doors asking the right to come in, the right to live with us and the right to acquire our nationality. It is the duty of this government to be cautious and circumspect, and even parsimonious, in awarding this precious privilege.

The example of certain European countries must be our guide. I could recall the errors of France who was too generous and too hospitable, who was receiving with open arms all those who were asking for refuge and assistance and who was giving them the right of citizenship without always going through the necessary investigations and inquiries.

Since our government knows the value of the title it confers in giving Canadian citizenship, it should always be assured and convinced that the person asking for it deserves such a privilege and that he will become a real Canadian valuable to the country and to the community at large.

The Department of Justice in the United States has understood the importance of that question and it decided some time ago to launch a campaign of national education on American citizenship. In a pamphlet published by that department in 1943, entitled, "Introduction to citizenship education," I find these important remarks which should be a warning to all Canadians:

> And so, in the United States of America, it must be good-bye to the old, easy days when the assimilation of those who came to us was scarcely even recognized as a problem. Not that we shall seek to make it hard to become an American citizen. God forbid that we should ever place needless formalities or raise artificial barriers before men who love our way of life and seek to share it fully! But safety for our nation in a dangerous world and safety for the alien within our borders demand alike a humane, liberal, carefully thought-through approach to the problem. In free America we dare not cut any man off from the goals of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" merely because he lacks certain "papers"; but just as surely, we dare not permit any man to endanger our free America.

I come now to the chief point of this speech, to the very reason why I decided to participate in this debate. I ask our government to form and appoint a special committee to study the problems resulting from our new nationality and from the creation and establishment of Canadian citizenship. Such a committee would have a definite aim and a clear purpose.

It would accept the great task of defining for the general benefit of the whole nation, and also for all strangers who will happen to acquire our nationality, the privileges and rights, the obligations and responsibilities; in other words, it would clearly determine the fundamentals of Canadian citizenship. Every Canadian who loves his country and who wishes to see it grow and prosper, would be glad to have a clear, national definition of Canada's ideals and aspirations.

I desire to add that such a committee formed by a group of Canadians of good will could do a useful and practical job. That would be to summarize, with its report in a special book, the conclusions arrived at; such a book would state in brief the principles of Canadian citizenship and would become the code of Canadian citizenship.

I strongly urge my government to take that great and patriotic initiative for the best interests of our country. After all, it seems to me that it is the task of this parliament clearly to define for the future, and in the light of the national situation, the rights and obligations of the newly-born Canadian citizen.

It is obvious now that to-day the people of Canada understand all the advantages and privileges to be derived by living in this fair land of Canada according to a single Canadian ideal. In proclaiming in Canada, in the parliament of the nation, the existence of the Canadian citizen, the government is giving to all the inhabitants of this country wherever they come from or of whatever race, creed or religion, solemn and precious advice. It is asking each and everyone of us not to think any more in narrow and provincial terms; it is demanding that we all elevate our minds and thoughts, and be glorified in acquiring the rights of a citizen; it is asking all Canadians to abandon any restricted and purely racial ideals; it is urging everyone of us to be nothing but real Canadians.

From a book entitled, "For education in a sovereign country," published in 1945 in Ottawa and written by Reverend Father George Simard, I wish to read these few lines:

> By examining that question carefully, everything in our country is settled as depending upon 1760, and narrow forms of nationalism are confronting each other since 150 years without the Canadians having yet succeeded in discovering a real formula in which we could find harmony if not a real Canadian peace.
>
> "Things will remain the same as long as the two major races of our nation will not accept to consider Canada, the whole of Canada and nothing else but Canada, as their only country, even if they must keep and maintain certain ties with the European countries from which they originated.

I believe that our government ought to engage immediately and in a practical way in a campaign of national unity to fortify the national structure of our people.

We would be very much in error to ask strangers to come and live with us; we would be very unwise to receive them and ask them to become Canadian citizens if we do not wish to possess the qualities and accept the conditions which must be attached to the title and characteristics of our nationality. We could not grant to anybody a right of Canadian citizenship of which we would not know and accept ourselves the real and definite meaning.

I wish to close, Mr. Speaker, with a note of national pride. All Canadians will be happy, I am sure, to put on for good the

glorious uniform of the free peoples which the government is offering everyone. All will be proud to become in the eyes of the whole world Canadian citizens. I am particularly fortunate in the beginning of my parliamentary life to participate in the adoption of such memorable legislation. I shall draw from that occasion the lessons which impose themselves upon all Canadians. I am proud and happy of this new title of Canadian citizen which our government is awarding me and all the others in my province and my country.

I hope—and this has been said so often that it is a hope which seems sometimes to be completely lost—that the time of our unfortunate national quarrels is definitely ended and that it will be forever forgotten. On the ashes of that painful past, Canada is rising with new power and greatness.

After more than three centuries of toil, effort and struggle, our country wishes now to break, one after another, all her ties, to proclaim her faith and confidence in herself and in her future. Other legislation, such as that for the adoption of a distinctive Canadian flag, will confirm this new profession of national faith, and I shall be proud to give it my entire support.

Canada left many years ago the humiliating valley of colonialism; she has marched slowly but with firm determination in the thorny path of the conquest of her liberties. With the help of all her people, she has now reached the gates of the City.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains): Mr. Speaker, I am deeply pleased to congratulate the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Pinard) who has delivered a splendid speech, based on a real Canadian spirit.

(Translation): In introducing this bill, the government takes another step towards the independence of Canada. As soon as Canadian citizenship has been proclaimed, we shall have covered a further stage in the achievement of an ideal shared by those who believe that Canada is a nation. Canadian citizenship symbolizes the nation's spirit. Whoever is ashamed of being a citizen of his own country does not deserve the protection of its laws. The bill now before us should have been introduced at the very time when confederation came into being. We are in honour bound to create at last a Canadian mentality and a Canadian citizenship. We should not let the last traces of a narrow colonialism hinder the development of such mentality and citizenship. It must become known everywhere that Canada has reached her maturity. In this country as well as abroad, Canadians must proudly bear their own name and no other. We must personify Canada. No one can glory in personifying a country that is not his own. The refusal to bear its name would be unfair and disloyal to our country. Is there a true-hearted and honourable man who would deny his compatriots and himself the dignity which Canadian citizenship implies. No one but people with a subservient mind can ignore a sacred patriotism achieved through sacrifices, the loyalty and the spirit of justice and freedom of the men who have been the builders of this country.

The material, moral, social and spiritual personification of a Canadian motherland will never enter the hearts or minds of colonials, because the feelings they harbour are for another land than Canada. Let us respect and honour the motherland by respecting and honouring ourselves. Let us pass this measure which transcends individual selfishness, because it embodies the freedom and the glory of the motherland and her sons. The time has come to give a name suggesting the motherland to every man, woman and child in Canada. There is no freedom and no glory in concealing her origin and her true name, whether at home or abroad. Canadian citizenship will prevent many acts of treason. It will give to the weak the courage of remaining loyal and honest to their country. Let us sever the last links which carry with them the humiliation of bearing a name that is not our own. Let us hold up our heads and assume again our name and our rank as a nation, We are now a mature nation. We should do nothing that could depreciate and dishonour the nation. We have no right to deny our compatriots and ourselves a name which belongs to us and illustrates the nationality of every one among us. What Canadian citizen would want to be called a pariah or a man without a country, here or anywhere in the world? If such a man exists, I say that he does not deserve to live in this country, or to enjoy the privileges that belong to a Canadian citizen. Is it because favours have been showered on him? Is it because he has enjoyed all the privileges and prerogatives of this country's citizens that he would be ashamed of being a Canadian? I say that such a man is a constant danger to the motherland because his attitude borders on treason. Is there not something tragic in the state of mind of people of that ilk? We do not belong to a civilization lost in some wilderness. We do not want to follow any longer in the wake of the empire. We want to be and remain our own selves. That is the lofty ideal of a whole

nation. Nothing humiliates and debases a people as much as the restriction of its freedom. Let us proclaim before the whole world that Canada is a mature nation and that her people are proud of their distinct nationality which will be consecrated by this measure that I heartily support.

I have had an opportunity of hearing sound arguments on this bill. Some members of this house would like the last trace of the expression "British subject" eliminated from the bill. I agree with them, but I think it is my bounden duty to Canada and to our fellow-citizens to support the principle of this measure which consecrates Canadian citizenship. In spite of its flaws, this bill evidences a progress which we should acknowledge loyally and without any reservation. Some say a measure supplementing this bill will become necessary as a matter of course. The principle that underlies it is excellent and I should not be justified in opposing it. I am in duty bound to help the evolution of our new prerogatives. I shall do so most willingly, with the conviction that in a country like ours nothing must be left undone when her freedom and sovereignty are at stake.

If I am not mistaken the week which will soon end is the week of national pride. That is why this bill should be passed unanimously. The rights of the citizen will at last be recognized and respected in Canada. Canadian citizenship ought to remove the differences which divide us in this country. Let us confidently hope that those convictions which are at variance with our own will be dissipated by the much nobler and higher ideal of a Canadian nationality and a Canadian motherland. Even in the sphere of politics, the differences which have separated and divided us should vanish before the freedom and sovereignty which are proclaimed in the bill now under consideration.

Mr. BRUNELLE: Cross over to this side.

Mr. LACOMBE: We have fought for freedom and justice. We have no right to shirk the duty of giving more freedom and justice to Canadian citizens. That is the purpose of the measure which we are asked to support. I shall do so without effort, in the name of the national unity and harmony which I would like to see forever entrenched in this country. I hope no one will protest in the name of colonialism. All true Canadians are looking forward to-day to a revival of an internal peace based on a Canadian nationality and a Canadian flag. We are used to hearing the partisans of colonialism voice their protests when the issue at stake is our right to self-government. At a time when Canada must restore its economic and social life, we must advance determinedly along the path of political and national evolution. Let us not sacrifice on the altar of imperialism, the fruits of many years' suffering.

I believe the time has come to restore in every Canadian citizen the dignity of his rank both in our country and outside, so that he may no longer depend, directly or indirectly, on a foreign power. This bill does not satisfy me entirely, but it nevertheless embodies a principle which is essential to our Canadian nationality. Because of that principle, I have decided to vote in favour of the bill. I do not want my fellow-citizens to retrogress; such a disgrace could be used by our worst enemies to their own advantage. On the contrary, I want them to be respected everywhere. Canadian citizenship is the synthesis of individual political rights.

I positively state that it is up to the legislator to develop in this country a truly national spirit, if Canada is to attain real greatness. The administration is discharging an imperious duty to Canadians and Canada, in giving our citizens a national status. Henceforth the Canadian citizen will have his distinctive characteristics. His national status will now be recognized both at home and abroad.

I conclude my remarks by quoting section 3 of the Canadian Citizenship Act:

> Where, under any act of the parliament of Canada or an order or a regulation made under such act, a person is required to state or declare his national status, any person who is a Canadian citizen under this act may state or declare himself to be a Canadian citizen and his statement or declaration to that effect shall be a good and sufficient compliance with such requirement.

The short title of this act is a proof of the evolution of Canadian nationality. I support this bill, hoping that time, which improves and humanizes legislations, will evolve in the case of the measure under consideration, the amendments that will render it perfectly acceptable. I prefer being a Canadian citizen to mourning the loss of my nationality. I have taken an oath of allegiance to the King of Canada. I am faithful and loyal to His Majesty, and I am proud to serve him in Canada as a Canadian citizen.

Some object to section 26 of the Act which reads as follows: "A Canadian citizen is a British subject".

Does this mean that I should reject this bill just because it contains that clause? I say no. It is true that I should like to see the last vestige of dependence disappear in the matter of Canadian citizenship, but I am

justified in supporting the bill as a whole in view of the principle essential to the Canadian nationality which it establishes.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house I shall complete my remarks in a couple of minutes.

Mr. PINARD: Go ahead.

Mr. LACOMBE: Further, I shall not adopt an uncompromising attitude and condemn everything worth while which this bill contains merely in order to undertake a dissertation on the advisability or otherwise of section 26. After all, it is better to seek the good in everything, than to constantly complain about possible defects.

Yesterday was Canada's day. To-day is Canadian citizenship day. To-morrow will be national flag's day. How well these measures supplement one another and tighten the bonds between the present and a past marked by greatness and valour! Notwithstanding the presumptuous protests of a small number of colonial-minded persons who would withhold from their country the right to grow in stature, let us unfurl our sails towards a future in which Canada will be recognized and respected as one of the great nations of the world. Despite the ultra-loyalists and imperialists who prefer tutorship to full nationhood, bondage to liberty, despite the deplorable colonialism shown by those who refuse to join in Canada's march of progress towards independence and sovereignty, let us continue with unflinching courage the struggle from which our Canadian citizens will emerge victorious, having attained dignity, individuality and citizenship.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT

POWER TO PROHIBIT SOUND SIGNALS AT CROSSINGS IN OR NEAR CITIES AND TOWNS

The house resumed from Tuesday, April 2, consideration of the motion of Mr. Adamson for the second reading of bill No. 3, to amend the Railway Act.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): I listened the other evening with keen interest to the debate on the second reading of bill No. 8, to amend the Railway Act, as brought forward in this house by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) on behalf of the sponsor, who was unavoidably absent.

The bill raises an important point, and I think I can sum up pretty well everything I have to say by stating that there are a number of things to be said in favour of it As framed, it meets the situation referred to by the hon. member for Peel. On the other hand, there are two objections to the bill, and, having these in mind, I think it behooves the house to send the bill to a committee. Before making a motion to that effect, however, there are several facts which I should like to bring out.

The condition referred to by the hon. member for Peel as existing in the city of Toronto and the neighbourhood contiguous thereto is one of which I have been aware for some time. There can be no doubt that in that locality a great deal of annoyance exists among the citizens living outside the city of Toronto in consequence of the ringing of bells and the blowing of locomotive whistles. Complaints have been made to the board of transport commissioners and the Department of Transport from time to time, and I agree with the hon. member for Peel that the situation is certainly not an enviable one, particularly when the health, quiet and peace of mind of residents are concerned, seeing that, as the hon. gentleman stated, some 700 whistles are blown during the course of one day. With the residents there can be nothing but understanding and sympathy.

As I have pointed out, however, there are fundamental and technical objections to this bill, and those objections I should like to draw to the attention of the house to-night.

Section 308 of the Railway Act is that section which was put in for the purpose of protecting the public from accidents, and it reads:

> When any train is approaching a highway crossing at rail level the engine whistle shall be sounded at least eighty rods before reaching such crossing and the bell shall be rung continuously from the time of the sounding of the whistle until the engine has crossed such highway.

There is a definite and clear obligation, placed in the statute, on the part of the railways. That section is the foundation of all actions in damages arising out of accidents or deaths at level crossings. Apart from that statute, there may be, and I believe there is,

a common law liability on the part of the railway if the crossing is not properly protected.

Subsection 2 of this section 308 provides a breakdown and takes away from that basic action which lies against the railway, when it states:

> Where a municipal by-law of a city or town prohibits such sounding of the whistle or such ringing of the bell in respect of any such crossing or crossings within the limits of such city or town, such by-law shall, if approved by an order of the board, to the extent of such prohibition, relieve the company and its employees from the duty imposed by this section.

In other words, if the municipality of a city or town by by-law prohibits the sounding of the whistle or the ringing of the bell, and the board approves that by-law, then the company shall be relieved of the obligation. The company shall not be relieved of liability, however, as the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) intimated the other night in his remarks. It will be relieved only of liability to blow the whistle and ring the bell.

What the bill purports to do is to cut down still further that statutory obligation on the part of the railway by extending the prohibition to townships and villages contiguous to or near such city or town; and if all the municipalities which are villages and townships and in which there are these level crossings were to pass by-laws of the kind referred to in this bill, then there would be no reason whatever for the existence of section 308. It would have been practically all nullified by these amendments.

I say that by way of a general statement because I believe that parliament will want to see that the rights of the public are protected so far as level crossings are concerned.

In cities and towns where under existing provisions the sounding of a whistle may be prohibited, the speed of trains is restricted both by the provisions of the statute and by the actual necessities of train operation. The speed of motor cars is also restricted as a rule to thirty miles an hour or less. In the open country trains travel at faster rates of speed, sixty and sometimes eighty miles an hour, and in the open country motor cars also travel at faster rates.

In these circumstances the general adoption of the prohibition for which the bill provides, even in only those portions of municipalities adjacent to cities and towns, would increase enormously the risk of accident to those using the highways and add considerably to the dangers of train operation, because a collision between a locomotive and an automobile usually results in death or, at any rate, serious injury to the occupants of the motor car and sometimes also in injury to the train crew and the passengers when the brakes are applied quickly in an emergency. I make that statement simply to point this out to the house. While the bill seeks to rectify a situation which should be corrected, still in doing that in municipalities contiguous to cities it may create a set of circumstances elsewhere and defeat the very purpose of the bill.

There were one or two things said the other evening by two hon. members who took part in the debate to which I wish to refer. The hon. member for Broadview seemed to complain about the board of transport commissioners generally; he felt they were not performing their duty in cases such as this. I should like to say to him that the obligations of the board of transport commissioners are set out in the Railway Act. It is their duty to enforce the sections of the act as they are brought to their attention. If the hon. gentleman would take the time to look at the annual report of the board of transport commissioners for 1945, which was tabled in this house a few days ago, he would see for himself the scope, work, and operation of that board.

Dealing particularly with the complaint of the hon. gentleman, let me say that the report of the engineering department of the board of transport commissioners indicates that 420 inspections covering the whole dominion were made in 1945. These inspections covered opening of railways for the carriage of traffic; highway crossings; signal protection on highway crossings; bridges; subways; interlocking spans; drainage; private crossings; railway lines in connection with maintenance; signals on swing bridges; fencing; improved view at crossings; investigation and inspection in connection with accidents on railway lines and at highway crossings; automatic block signals; less than a standard clearance and many inspections in connection with projects to provide post-war work.

The hon. gentleman said that he was in favour of this bill, and yet toward the end of his remarks he at least led me to believe that he was strongly opposed to anything which might tend to create accidents at crossings. That is the very thing which this house should guard against. It should not do anything which, while it may help a group which is deserving of help, may on the other hand tend to affect the great mass of the public by taking away from them certain rights which they already have under the statute.

The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Stephenson) made certain references to automatic

signals. He was of the opinion that the government should take steps to instal automatic signals at every level crossing in the country. That is a large order, because the protection referred to by the hon. member would be in addition to that which is already granted under the act. The total number of railway crossings in Canada is 33,396. Of this number only approximately 3,020 are protected by grade separations or some form of automatic protection such as gates, wig-wags and bells or flashing lights and bells. It is therefore clear to the house that the magnitude of the task becomes apparent.

For many years it has been the practice of the board of transport commissioners in administering the act, where protective devices are directed to be installed, to set aside at places or points where the junction between the highway and the railway is dangerous, forty per cent of the cost of the construction of a device for protection. As a rule, the remainder is made up by an assessment against the railway and the municipality having jurisdiction over the highway. There is no set rule as to the amount which should be assessed against one or the other. That may depend upon the amount of traffic. For instance, if the highway is responsible for the increased traffic it may well be that the board of transport commissioners will assess a greater proportion against the highway than against the railway. On the other hand, if it is the railway which is responsible for the increased traffic the board would act accordingly.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Would the minister permit a question? I am going to agree with everything he says by the time he gets through, but I wonder whether he is quite accurate in his last statement. Let us take a highway in the precincts of a town that grew after the Canadian Pacific railway was built. If the municipality crosses the railway and wants a separation of grade the municipality must bear all the costs—if my memory serves me aright, and it may not—and vice versa. That is my memory unless the rule has been changed.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is certainly not my understanding.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I may be wrong, but I doubt it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am referring now not only to grade separation but to any sort of protection which may have to be set up in order to protect the public against accidents. As the practice exists to-day the board of transport commissioners pay forty per cent. That is the maximum amount they are allowed to pay under the act and under the railway grade crossing fund toward the actual cost of the construction of the protection. The board has no authority to make a grant toward the cost of maintenance or operation. The remainder of the cost is divided between the municipality and the railway. I am informed that that is the practice of the board.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Does the minister include subways in that?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No; that comes under a different category.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): After all, a change of grade is a matter of a subway.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I make that general statement because I thought the house would be interested in it in view of the statement made by the hon. member for Durham.

I do not think the house believes that the board of transport commissioners or even parliament should pass legislation under which parliament would provide all the funds for the protection of all crossings in Canada.

To sum up what I have said, I repeat that the condition which this bill seeks to rectify is a meritorious one; it is one which deserves consideration. On the other hand, there are technical objections to the bill because the words "township", "village", "town" and "city" do not include all the municipalities across this country. There are other words used in other provinces which would not be covered by those four words, so that which might meet this situation contiguous to the city of Toronto would not meet it in other parts of the country. Under the circumstances, therefore, I think the proper thing is to refer this bill to the railway committee and to invite before that committee representatives of the railway association of Canada, of the railways and any others who want to give evidence. If that is done the merits of the bill will be carefully considered. I therefore move—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I think it would be better to have a second reading, and when the bill is read the second time—

Mr. CHEVRIER: I propose to have submitted to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines the subject-matter of the bill; and I now move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell):

That the bill be not now read a second time but that the subject-matter thereof be referred to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): The city of Toronto has put millions of dollars unnecessarily into grade separation along the water-

front. If this bill goes to the railway committee, will the Canadian National Railways bring forward any plans for the electrification of its lines within a radius of fifteen miles of the city? I acted for the city when we settled the viaduct case. The Canadian Pacific got a right of way many years ago, before my time, all the way down to the Don river for $600 a year, and the Canadian National is in the same position. In my opinion we shall never get rid of this nuisance until we electrify the system for a distance of fifteen miles around the city. Toronto spent millions of dollars on harbour improvements, and in the viaduct case we agreed to pay one-third of the cost, although in other cities the railways paid the entire cost. The approach to the city runs for twelve miles along the city-owned waterfront, and with the cheap light and power we have to-day it would not be a very great matter to bring about this electrification. The only cost would be the engines and the power, and that is the only way this nuisance will be overcome. I should like to ask the minister whether has any plan in that connection.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I would say to the hon. gentleman that this bill has nothing to do with the electrification of railways entering the city of Toronto or elsewhere. It has to do with the abatement of a nuisance contiguous to the city of Toronto. Therefore the Canadian National Railways would not be subject to examination on the point he has raised. I would say, however, that if the hon. gentleman wants to deal with that question when the committee on railways and shipping is set up, he will have an opportunity to examine the president of the Canadian National Railways and his officials on the point.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I want a few minutes of your time on this.

Mr. MacINNIS: I rise to a point of order. Is a motion to refer debatable? I do not think it is, under the rules of this house.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): This is an amendment; it is not a motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion before the house is an amendment to the original motion, and the amendment is debatable because the original motion itself was debatable.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Then I gather, sir, that I may proceed. I wish to assure my hon. friend that I am going to be helpful and not critical.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for Calgary West is now speaking to the amendment.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am not objecting; I merely want to see the rules observed, and in my opinion this is not in order.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I want them to be observed, too, but I also want you to be happy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I say that I think we shall all be happier if hon. members will kindly address the Chair.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I seem to be getting into difficulty. With great respect, sir, I have been thrown out by many chairmen; but I appreciate what you say and I will address the Chair.

I speak on this matter with a bit of experience. In order that you, sir, and the house may discount what I am going to say first, I should state that in some thirty years I have acted for both railways in the area in which I live, so that leaves it wide open for anybody to say, Well, his remarks do not amount to anything because no doubt he is prejudiced on that particular side. Perhaps I had better complete the story. The chairman of the transportation board is a distant relative of mine by marriage, so that I have said everything against myself that I possibly can say at this moment.

I have a suggestion to offer. We know all about level crossing accidents. I know they cost the railways a great deal of money; the railways do not carry insurance of that kind but absorb the loss themselves, and I think that lets them out. But what I have in mind is the great loss of life that we have at level crossings. It is true that many times persons in motor cars have not been struck by an engine but have driven into the side of a train. If, sir, you will permit me to divorce myself from the financial aspect of this matter it seems to me that the important point in a measure of this kind is the saving of life. It is true that we used to have two longs and two shorts blown at a crossing. The transport commission, for some reason best known to itself, changed that to three longs and one short, which must be blown eighty yards from the crossing; and the bell must be kept ringing constantly. You get into a lawsuit of this kind and I know, from the railway point of view, no one ever hears the bell ringing or the whistle blowing; in fact everyone in the area about which the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) was speaking would swear that the bell was never rung and the whistle never blown. Why is that? Because they become accustomed to these things, in the same way that we become accustomed to street-cars going by our doors if we happen to live on a car line; we are

not awakened because we can become accustomed to certain noises. Some people even like the sound of cats and dogs howling around the back fence, though I have not got that far yet.

I am glad this bill is being referred to a committee, and my thought is this. I quite realize that it is impossible to have power put in to handle 33,000 swinging signs at level crossings. That is really a tremendous undertaking. Certainly in our branch lines, which have not the block system of signals, it would require complete electrical equipment in order to do that.

Really, I am not speaking about saving the railways any money; but the answer to the problem, it seems to me, is that we should adopt the rule which is in force in the United States, namely the rule of "stop, look and listen". One will see many signs in Canada which say, "Look and listen"—in compliance with our law. But persons always say they looked and listened, but they did not hear the bell or the whistle.

How far have we gone with that, aside from the Railway Act? I believe in most of the provinces, certainly in the one from which I come, there is provision in the respective motor vehicles acts whereby all school buses, and all passenger carrying vehicles for hire, by law must stop at railway tracks. That, as I say, is the law in the province from which I come; I know it is true in Saskatchewan, and I believe it is in British Columbia.

Mr. REID: It is.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I am told it is true in Ontario. Indeed, I should like even to give evidence before the committee, although I have never been hit by a railway train. People who have been hit rarely give evidence, because they are not there to give it.

It seems to me that the bill raised a question with which the committee might well deal, and therefore I am very much in favour of the amendment moved by the minister. I hope, however, he will not regard this bill as one having to do with localized areas. Rather I should hope the committee would regard it as one having to do with the saving of hundreds of human lives every year in Canada. I am reasonably sure that if that broad rule were adopted it would, in effect, save seventy-five per cent of lives which now are uselessly and foolishly lost as a result of collisions between motor vehicles and railway trains.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, as one who is thoroughly familiar with the area to which the bill refers, namely that including the entrances to the city of Toronto, I rise in support of it.

However, before saying what I intend to say I should like to express my appreciation of the manner in which the minister always handles matters which come under his control, when he refers to them in the house. Evidently he gives these matters careful thought, and apparently inquires fully into all the background material. May I compliment him upon his handling of matters of this kind.

Having said that, I would invite him, between now and the time his estimates are discussed, to give consideration and study toward the improvement of matters such as those dealt with in the bill. Large numbers of trains pass hourly through the west of Toronto area; I believe one hon. member gave the exact number. Not only do accidents occur through collisions between motor vehicles and trains, but in addition the smoke nuisance has reached tremendous proportions. Closely associated with the high rate of accidents is the smoke nuisance.

I would ask the minister to give thorough study to the whole problem of railway entrances into large cities, and I would direct his attention particularly to the city of Toronto, and the possibility of electrification of railway lines in that area. In the Toronto area we have ample electrical power. The Ontario hydro electric commission could supply all the electricity required to electrify the rail entrances to that city, and if such development were carried out the smoke nuisance which now obtains all along the front area would be eliminated. If that electrification were carried out, with the consequent reduction in noise which is now endured, that lower section of Toronto would become a great residential centre. At the present time development is more or less at a standstill because of the smoke nuisance.

While the bill does not mention either smoke nuisance or electrification, I have taken the liberty of discussing these subjects because of the keen interest shown by the minister in matters which come to his attention.

If the house decides to send this bill to the committee on railways I believe it would be dealt with properly. I know what the hon. member for York West (Mr. Adamson) is up against. In all those thickly settled municipalities west of Toronto the noise nuisance and the injuries resulting from smoke have caused considerable annoyance.

I should appreciate it if the minister would study these problems connected with railway entrances into cities and the electrification of equipment. This is being done in England. We know that throughout England engines are now being electrified. The last time I was in London wires and cables were being laid for the electrification of the entrances to that great city. Whether it has been completed or not, I cannot say; but I plan going to England shortly, and I shall make my own inquiries—I like to do that, anyway.

I for one, would be glad to support any effort the minister may make to carry out the whole programme touched upon by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) who, on all occasions, goes deeply into matters coming under his purview. May I extend my compliments to him, too, on the keen interest he takes in everything with which he associates himself. It is evident from his observations that he has had wide experience in these matters, and I know he would be glad to assist the minister in any survey that might be made in connection with electrification of entrances to cities, the elimination of smoke nuisances, and any other matters connected with rapid transit systems running into and out of the large cities.

Amendment (Mr. Chevrier) agreed to, and bill referred to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Hon. Mr. Martin for the second reading of bill No. 7, respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, as the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) made his speech on the second reading of this bill I thought he became a little expansive. I had a vision of his bringing into the world the first of a new species of manhood—the Canadian. Then he became the wise man coming bearing a rich gift to the Canadian people—the right to call themselves Canadians. After listening this afternoon to the speeches of the hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret) and the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Pinard), I can understand that to them this bill does perhaps give them for the first time the right to call themselves Canadians. I give them credit for being sincere in their remarks and I must admit that theirs was an outlook I had not realized existed.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

For me, and I am sure for many other members of the house, there has never been any question of my right to call myself a Canadian. Those of us who served in the last war were more proud of the word "Canada" which we bore on our shoulder-straps than of any other fact about our service. I think throughout the whole of our lives we shall have that feeling of pride in being Canadians. No one, either ally or foe, ever dared to question the fact that we were Canadians. I have even quarrelled with the poor census taker on different occasions when he tried to compel me to give the racial origin of my father. I have insisted that I was a Canadian and have been registered as such. I think that is the general attitude of the majority of the Canadian people and for them this bill only does away with certain complexities and removes certain anomalies. As such it is a bill which I am glad to support. The Secretary of State himself said that was the case when he spoke on October 22 of last year on the first reading of a similar bill. He said, as reported on page 1335 of *Hansard* of that year:

> It should not be concluded from this that the bill in reality makes any sweeping change or that there has not previously been any such thing as Canadian nationality.

When speaking in the debate this year his words were much the same. He said, and I quote from page 502 of *Hansard*:

> As I shall endeavour to show, it seeks to avoid many complexities and confusions which arise from existing legislation.

In considering this bill we should come down from the emotional heights on which we have been travelling during the earlier hours of the debate and consider the bill in a more realistic way. After all, it is an important and complicated bill and it merits the most careful consideration of every member of the house. I regret greatly that the government has decided not to send it to the external affairs committee, as planned last session. I think also a great mistake is being made in not bringing down the amendments to the Immigration Act so that—

Mr. MARTIN: I cannot bring down the amendments to the Immigration Act. As I said in my speech on the second reading, the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen) will bring down any amendments which will be made pursuant to this bill.

Mr. GREEN: It is a great mistake not to bring down the amendments to the Immigration Act now so that we can consider the two bills together and get the whole picture rather

than passing the citizenship bill now and then having to deal with the immigration bill some weeks or months hence.

Mr. MARTIN: The only amendment to the Immigration Act would be to section 2, and that is covered in this bill.

Mr. GREEN: If that is the only amendment, then there is all the more reason why it should be brought down without delay.

Mr. MARTIN: There will be no delay.

Mr. GREEN: There are certain features of this bill which I should like to discuss this evening, the first being part I which deals with natural-born Canadian citizens. They are given very broad rights and perhaps that is the proper thing to do, but it seems to me that there has not been sufficient thought given to the question of what is to be done with the natural-born Canadian who has transferred his loyalty to another country. We are granting extensive rights to natural-born Canadians and yet there are natural-born Canadians who do not deserve those rights. As far as I can see, there are not adequate provisions in the bill to deal with a man of that type.

There were Japanese born in Canada who went back to Japan before the war and served in the Japanese forces. For instance, there was a Canadian-born Japanese who was the chief torturer of our own troops in Hong Kong. The way this bill reads now, that man would have the right to claim that he is a natural-born Canadian and is entitled to everything that goes to a citizen of that class. There should be some test. The bill merely says that if a person born in Canada has become an alien, then he is no longer entitled to the rights of a natural-born Canadian. But there is no definition of how he becomes an alien. The government might well consider putting in a provision to the effect that if such a man has shown himself to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty, then he should lose the rights of a natural-born Canadian. The same criticism applies in the case of people born after the bill comes into effect. The government should consider ways and means of preventing a man who is not loyal to this country from having the rights of a natural-born Canadian.

Mr. MARTIN: That is provided for in the bill.

Mr. GREEN: I do not think it is adequately covered by the bill.

I come now to the Canadian citizen who is not a natural-born Canadian; this is covered by part II of the bill. The thing that worries me is the treatment meted out to citizens of the other nations of the commonwealth. I look at the British commonwealth as a partnership of independent and equal nations, and, by the way, the greatest partnership of all time. Those of you who are in a partnership know that you cannot kick your partners around; it pays to treat them a little better than you treat people on the outside, otherwise the partnership will dissolve sooner or later.

This afternoon the hon. member for Outremont and the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville both said that they believed in the British empire; both believed in Canada continuing as a nation in the commonwealth, so that there is no disagreement between them and myself on that score; but let us see how we are treating our partners under this part II of the bill.

In the first place, the man who has come from Australia to British Columbia during the last four years is not to be considered a Canadian citizen; he must have been here for five years, otherwise when this bill is passed he must go through the naturalization court. Of course the Immigration Act provides that anyone coming to Canada does not acquire domicile for purposes of that act until he or she has been here for five years, and it is from that act that this five-year term has come. But I think the government, considering that the provision I am criticizing deals with our partners, might very well have said that any Australian or New Zealander or Scotsman or Englishman or Irishman or Welshman who is legally entered in Canada, that is, has been lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence, at the time this bill comes into effect, shall be considered a Canadian citizen. Let us not be cheap about this business. Let us say that anyone who has come here from Australia, for example and is permanently settled here shall be a Canadian citizen upon the passing of this act.

The key section of the bill is No. 10, which has to do with naturalization. I say it is the key section of the whole bill, and it changes our law. Under the present law, when we naturalize a person he becomes a British subject; it is in effect a commonwealth citizenship. That has been the case in Canada for many years, just as it has been the case in Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. Now, if this bill is not changed the only advantage a British subject will have is that he will not have to take a declaration of intention to become a citizen. That is the only advantage he will have over a person from another nation, say from Russia or from

China. He must wait here in Canada five years. That will mean sooner or later that he will not be able to vote for five years.

Mr. MARTIN: Not necessarily.

Mr. GREEN: It is true that at the present time he can vote as a British subject after one year, but the minister himself said the other day in his speech, as reported in *Hansard* at page 503, that this Canadian citizenship will be the fundamental status upon which the rights and privileges of Canadians will depend. and it is only a question of time until the franchise will be based on Canadian citizenship. That means that a man coming here from Australia will not be able to vote for five years, whereas for years now he has been able to vote after having been here for one year. It means that he will have to appear in naturalization court beside the man from Russia and the man from China—the first time that has ever been done in Canada. I believe the first time it has ever been done in the British empire. He will have to take the oath of allegiance, and—

Mr. MARTIN: No, he will not. There will be no oath of allegiance in that case. He has taken it. He is a subject of the king.

Mr. GREEN: He will have to get people to vouch for him. He will be subject to investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

In effect, this change takes away most of the value of commonwealth citizenship in Canada. Yet at the same time this bill seeks, in section 26, to retain for a Canadian citizen the rights of a British subject outside Canada. In other words, we are taking away these rights from the Australian but we are trying to keep them for the Canadian who goes to Australia.

I should like to place one thought before my good friends the hon. members for Outremont and Chambly-Rouville who spoke this afternoon. They are not in their seats this evening but many of their friends are here. They seem to place absolutely no value on commonwealth citizenship, and that is where their thinking goes wrong. Why is it not far better for us to have our rights as Canadian citizens and also to have our rights as citizens of the commonwealth? Surely two rights are better than one. They do not interfere with each other, and the citizenship in the commonwealth is of great value. I know, sir, if they think that over they will agree with me. It is not that anybody puts commonwealth citizenship ahead of Canadian citizenship at all, but it is a case of the two citizenships, the two rights being better than one. If they and their friends can agree with me on that I can see no reason why we should not have a united Canada in the years that lie ahead. In any event I suggest to the government that this provision be altered so as to put some real value on commonwealth citizenship. Do not cut away the rights of a citizen of the British commonwealth as you have done in this bill. There are good reasons for giving the citizens of a commonwealth nation a better place than the man who comes here from Russia or from China.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. GREEN: The commonwealth citizen comes here having the same allegiance as we have, allegiance to the same crown. He comes here with the same traditions; we have common traditions. He comes here understanding our system of justice, having had the same type of government, having the same democratic outlook as we have here in Canada.

These other nations, I repeat, are our partners. Let us remember that. Let us not hit at our best friends. Have the English, Scots, Irish, Welsh, Australians, New Zealanders and South Africans who have been here in Canada with us through the years shown that such a drastic change is necessary? These provisions are a direct reflection on them and on the part they have played in building up this nation. It is significant that the minister did not even refer to this drastic change when introducing this bill last session, when introducing it this session, or when speaking on it on second reading of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN: I did, on both occasions.

Mr. GREEN: I will let hon. members judge for themselves.

Mr. MARTIN: Well, look at *Hansard*.

Mr. GREEN: Let them read *Hansard* and they will see that this drastic change was not explained by the minister on any one of these three occasions.

Mr. MARTIN: On both occasions. Look at *Hansard*.

Mr. GREEN: Then, as to the part dealing with procedure and evidence, we all agree that it is wise to provide instruction in the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship to those who are applying for that citizenship, and that those rights and responsibilities should be impressed by the court that hears the applicant. This is a move in the right direction. I have been advocating it for years; so has the Secretary of State, and neither of us has ever been able to understand why such provisions were not put into our laws years ago, just as they were put into the law of the United States. I repeat,

it is a move in the right direction; and yet it is, oh, so strange, to find in section 10, subsection 1, paragraph (e) that now for the first time in Canada the applicant for citizenship need not speak either of our official languages. He need not speak either French or English.

Mr. MARTIN: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question. I am sure he does not wish to misstate the situation. This is an important measure. It does not state what the section says; it says, after twenty years.

Mr. GREEN: Yet under this bill—

Mr. MARTIN: Is that not right?

Mr. GREEN: Just wait a minute.

Mr. MARTIN: You wish to be fair now.

Mr. GREEN: I will read the provision and hon. members can judge for themselves:

(e) he has an adequate knowledge of either the English or the French language, or, if he has not such an adequate knowledge, he has resided continuously in Canada for more than twenty years.

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. GREEN: That has arisen, I believe, because of the provisions of the Old Age Pensions Act and the mothers' allowance acts in the different provinces. There are deserving persons who have been unable to qualify for old age pension or mother's allowance because they were not naturalized, and they could not be naturalized because they could not speak French or English, although the actual requirements are very slender so far as language is concerned. Those hon. members who have been in a naturalization court will realize how little of either language the applicant must know in order to pass the test. I suggest to the government that to meet those hard cases the Old Age Pensions Act should be changed rather than the Naturalization Act. I do not think it is sound to make the change in the Naturalization Act. Take the situation in my own province of British Columbia. This provision means that a Japanese who cannot speak English can qualify for citizenship if he has been in the country twenty years. The same is true of a Doukhobor, and in both cases they have lived largely in colonies where many of them have not learned to speak either of our languages.

Perhaps there is some reason for making that provision for those old people who are now living in Canada, although as I read the act it is not restricted to older people, and would apply equally to a young man of twenty-one. If he has been twenty years in the country he is entitled to apply for citizenship although he may not be able to speak English or French.

It is not so bad for those people who are already here, but this provision as it stands applies also to persons coming here in the future. A person coming here next year can wait twenty years and then apply for citizenship without having learned one of the official languages. It certainly is contrary to the whole spirit and intent of the bill, and being of a suspicious nature in political matters, I regard it as a change to get the government votes.

An hon. MEMBER: Get them what?

Mr. GREEN: To get the government votes. You know what votes are.

Then to come to general suggestions about the bill; I suggest to the minister that it might be well to provide in the regulations for some welcoming ceremony, and it might even be wise to include in that ceremony our own young Canadians who have become twenty-one. Let them all go in together, all enter our citizenship together.

Mr. MARTIN: That will be covered by the regulations.

Mr. GREEN: Let the naturalized and the natural-born Canadian who reaches the age of twenty-one go in together. Then the naturalization court judges should be given wider discretion. Let them see the reports that are made by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police before they hear the application. I suggest also that the naturalization court should be given a little money so that it can function.

Mr. MARTIN: Hear, hear. You will help me when that comes up.

Mr. GREEN: At the present time it is just an orphan in the provincial courts. At present no provision is made for transcripts of evidence; there is no provision for stenographers and very little provision for clerks. It is done on the cheap and that is not good enough when the job is that of making new Canadian citizens. It might be worth while to advertise for complaints against applicants. That is done in the United Kingdom. I believe it would be very much worth while to put immigration, the nationalities branch and naturalization all under one department so that they would deal with the citizen coming to Canada, acquainting him with our laws and customs and making him welcome, and then naturalizing him. That work should all be under one department rather than spread out under different departments of government. Those are suggestions I have to make with regard to the bill.

In the time that remains to me I should like to say a few words about another problem having to do with citizenship and naturalization, and that is the Japanese problem. I am asking for a statement from the government on the effect of this citizenship bill on the government's policy with respect to Japanese in Canada. The bill is being cited as a means of retaining all the Japanese in Canada. The Japanese problem is directly involved with this bill and we do not want to have any misunderstanding about the effect the bill will have on the problem.

Last December the government announced a policy which was in effect that Japanese nationals who had asked to be sent back to Japan and had waived their rights to citizenship should be sent back; also that Japanese nationals who had been interned should be sent back; that naturalized Japanese who had not revoked their request for repatriation before the 1st of September, 1945, should go and Canadian-born Japanese who did not revoke their request for repatriation prior to a deportation order being issued; they are still able to revoke that request, right up to this very date.

Another branch of the policy was that a loyalty commission would be set up to check over Japanese nationals and those naturalized who had not asked to be sent back; if any were found disloyal they were to be repatriated.

There are to-day in Canada, or at least there were on February 28 of this year, a little over a month ago, 413 Japanese still interned. I saw some of them on my way east two weeks ago in the old German prisoner of war camp near Schreiber. There were 413 at the end of February, of whom 203 were born in Canada, 39 naturalized, 168 Japanese nationals and 3 United States citizens. The total number of Japanese in Canada as of December 31 who had asked to be repatriated was 10,380. They had also asked to have their rights as Canadian citizens waived. The request, of course, was made by the father and in some cases by the mother, but this figure also includes the children.

It is significant that over half of this 10,380 have not changed their minds even to this day. I have the figures here from the Department of Labour of requests for revocation received up to December 31. These figures show that 4,720 requested revocation of the application to be sent back; therefore, over five thousand still want to get back to Japan. Yet we have our C.C.F. friends here and a few pinks across the country, the editor of *Saturday Night*, the editor of the Winnipeg *Free Press* and the editor of the Toronto *Star* putting on a great pressure campaign to have all these Japanese kept in Canada whether they want to go back or not. These people are more Japanese than the Japanese themselves. That is the strange part of it.

Government policy was brought down by order in council last December. At once there was a hue and cry that the Japanese must not be repatriated. The government permitted a case to be taken to the Supreme Court of Canada. The decision was handed down some weeks ago. This decision in effect said that the orders in council were valid. There was only one defect, namely, that in one of the groups the wives and children could not be sent back. Since then there have been delegations to the cabinet. All the pressure has been in favour of keeping the Japanese here. I would suggest to the government that they do not pay much attention to pressure campaigns of that type. As members of parliament we know just what these campaigns mean, how easily they are organized and how few people make how much noise.

We want to know whether the government is now preparing to drop this last policy on the Japanese question. If the government weakens and the Japanese now in British Columbia are allowed to stay, there will be over 14,000 there. Three-fifths of the Japanese are still in British Columbia. I have the figures here. As of February 28, 1946, 14,692 were still in British Columbia despite all the attempts of the government to get them to disperse across Canada, out of a total of 24,157. Most of those now east of the Rockies would come back to the coast. Take, for example, the 3,000 Japanese relocated in Alberta by the Department of Labour. They were put there under an agreement with the province that after the war, if the province wished it, they would be taken away again. On February 4, Premier Manning of Alberta is quoted as saying:

> We want them moved as soon as the agreement terminates at the statutory end of the war period.

That has been his stand throughout.

If the government caves in on its policy the net result will be that the Japanese problem in Canada will be back just where it was in 1941, namely, in British Columbia's lap; and in forty or fifty years there will be forty or fifty thousand Japanese on the coast, again in contact with Japanese merchant ships, going back and forth to Japan, again under domination of the Japanese consul, still worshipping the Japanese emperor and still a menace.

I cannot point out to the house how serious the situation may well be. Take the fishing industry on our coast. Many years ago it was necessary to cut down the number of licences given to the Japanese. When war broke out they had to be taken off the sea. Every Japanese boat had to be called in because the government did not know who could be trusted. Other fishermen have come in. White fishermen and Indians have replaced the Japanese. There are more fish being caught now than ever before, and if the Japanese come back into the fishing industry on the British Columbia coast I believe there will be bloodshed there; the situation is just that serious.

We intend to hold the government to its policy. We ask also that the whole of British Columbia be made a protective zone permanently as a defence measure. That is the policy advocated by the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie). I hope he has not changed his mind since the announcement he made just a little over a year ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not one bit.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Would the hon. member permit a question for information purposes? Is that the policy of the Conservative party? If so, he may get some recruits over there. I should like to know if it is the official policy.

Mr. GREEN: I am surprised that the member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) has taken so long to get over to this side because that has been the policy for a long time. That is the policy on which we fought the campaign in British Columbia. Certainly there is no reason why those who have never revoked their request to go back to Japan should not be sent there without delay. If the government is not satisfied with the orders in council enabling the policy to be carried out let it bring a measure before parliament and see how the members stand on this question. The main reason why there was trouble in the Supreme Court of Canada was that this policy was carried out under order in council. The difficulty can be met by parliament enacting a measure. Last fall the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) said that the government intended to carry out this policy even though there was a change in the national emergency powers bill. I hold in my hand *Hansard* of December 5, 1945, and in the translation from the French edition the following appears in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond). This is what the Minister of Justice said:

I shall tell him quite frankly that what was requested in the bill introduced on November 23 implied things that are not asked for at this time, but which we have not forgone and will request from parliament through other measures.

Parliament can empower the government to act on this question. We will support the government. I am confident that the Social Credit party will support them because of the stand they have taken throughout. The C.C.F. will not.

An hon. MEMBER: We all know that.

Mr. MacINNIS: We will support Canadians.

Mr. GREEN: But they and their pink friends are not yet running Canada. This Japanese problem is a practical question. It must be dealt with in a practical way. The real genius of the governments of the British nations has been that questions are dealt with realistically, not by theorizing at which my friends of the C.C.F. are so good.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Golding): The hon. member has exhausted his time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think he has exhausted his subject as well.

Mr. GREEN: Nor by being righteous at the expense of someone else like the editors of those newspapers, and many of the people who are opposing the people of British Columbia on this question. This citizenship bill must not be used as an excuse for the government to abandon its Japanese policy. British Columbia would never forgive or forget such action.

Mr. MAXIME RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some comments on this bill before the motion for second reading is carried. What are the purposes of the bill, as explained by the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) when he introduced similar legislation on October 22 last and when he introduced this bill on Tuesday of this week? I think I can sum up those purposes as follows. First, it is to give a clearer definition of Canadian citizenship; second, to give to Canada one of the symbols of nationhood, and, third, to promote national unity in Canada.

Having in mind those three purposes, let us examine the bill and see if it corresponds to those enunciated aims. In reading over the bill, I fail to see any substantial change from the legislation we already have on our statute books. The change is more super-

ficial than real. It has a promising title but it gives nothing more than we already have. After all, what counts is not so much the label on the box but what the box contains. As a matter of fact, as the minister said, already we have a Canadian nationality derived from the Canadian Nationals Act, passed in 1921. Let me quote the words of the minister as reported in *Hansard* of October 22, 1945, at page 1335:

> It should not be concluded from this that the bill in reality makes any sweeping change or that there has not previously been any such thing as Canadian nationality. Despite what one often hears to the contrary, there has been a Canadian nationality . . .

I wanted to make this point clear at the beginning of my argument. It is now proposed by this bill to substitute the words "Canadian citizen" for "Canadian national". I do not see the difference; Canadian national or Canadian citizen means the same thing. Is there any difference? If there is any difference, Canadian national means perhaps more. Then what about the proposed definition of "Canadian citizen" as compared with the existing definition of "Canadian national". In the Canadian National Act, 1921, we have the following definition of a "Canadian national":

> Any British subject who is a Canadian citizen within the meaning of the Immigration Act.

Then the Immigration Act gives the definition of a Canadian citizen as follows:

> "Canadian citizen" means
>
> (i) a person born in Canada who has not become an alien;
>
> (ii) a British subject who has Canadian domicile; or
>
> (iii) a person naturalized under the laws of Canada who has not subsequently become an alien or lost Canadian domicile.

Section 2 of this bill defines a Canadian citizen as follows:

> "Canadian citizen" means a person who is a Canadian citizen under this act.

Then parts I and II of the bill enumerate the qualifications required to be a natural-born Canadian citizen and a Canadian citizen other than natural-born; but to find the exact meaning of "Canadian citizen" one must read also parts III and IV of the bill. There will be found, among others, section 26, which says without any ambiguity that a Canadian citizen is a British subject. If both definitions amount to the same thing, nothing is added by the bill to clarify the ambiguity which the minister intends to remove. If they are not the same thing we have more confusion than ever, having two definitions of a "Canadian citizen", one in the Immigration Act and this new one, in addition to all the confusion arising out of the interlocking of Canadian citizenship with British nationality, a subject with which I intend to deal.

Mr. MARTIN: If the hon. gentleman will permit a question, did I understand him to say that when this bill is passed the definition of citizenship will continue to be found in the Immigration Act?

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I do not know.

Mr. MARTIN: I can tell him it will not.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): The minister has already said that he intends to bring in an amendment, but for the time being we are dealing with this bill. It is the only bill before parliament, and we must deal with it and with the Immigration Act as it is, as long as it is not amended.

Mr. MARTIN: We can do only one thing at a time.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Consequently I fail to see that this bill as it is now will achieve the first purpose enunciated by the minister, and I venture to say that it is rather a consolidation of the Naturalization Act and the Canadian Nationals Act under the new title.

I now come to the main purpose of the bill, which is to give Canada one of the symbols of nationhood. Everyone who is proud of his country, who believes, as has been repeated time and again, that Canada is a sovereign country, was delighted to hear that at last Canadians were to have a citizenship distinct from that of any other country, a real Canadian citizenship, recorded in the statute books. Unfortunately we are yet far from the realization of that; and the minister took pains to explain that there was a change and at the same time there was no change in our statute. At this stage I do not intend to go into the details of the measure. I shall have another opportunity to do so, but what I wish to emphasize to-night is this. While the bill is supposed to be for the purpose of clearly defining Canadian citizenship or national status in this country, and to avoid confusion, it offers a Canadian citizenship completely mixed up with British nationality, when the two should be considered as entirely different. Take section 26, which says:

> A Canadian citizen is a British subject.

If a Canadian citizen is a British subject, as stated in the bill, he has a dual nationality which is inadmissible in principle. Then where is the symbol of nationhood, which was referred to so eloquently by the Secretary of

State? Canada is a nation, a sovereign nation. The United Kingdom is another sovereign nation. Both are equal in status. Citizenship means membership in a sovereign nation. When a man chooses to become the subject of a country by naturalization he automatically ceases to be a subject of the nation to which he belonged before naturalization. In acquiring a new nationality, he loses the one he had. Nobody will contest this. A Canadian citizen cannot be at the same time a British subject, because there cannot be dual or multiple citizenship or nationality. An individual cannot be a member of two nations at once. It is inadmissible and a well settled principle. Let me refer to one authority in the matter, namely Cleveland on "American citizenship." Here is what he says:

> Dual nationality irreconcilable
>
> Owing to the fact that every independent, politically organized, national group has always reserved the right of determining its own membership, conflicts of law have developed and in these conflicts the question of dual nationality has been raised. That such a thing as dual national citizenship must not and cannot possibly exist is quite a well-settled principle now. Morse says, "That any one should be a member of two nations at once is inadmissible in principle . . . An individual cannot be at one and the same time a citizen of two states; and as a general proposition an individual can have only one allegiance . . . The fact is, any doctrine which recognizes a double citizenship or nationality attempts to perpetuate a political hybrid, which is as abnormal and monstrous as its prototype in the natural world." This principle is an old one, first applied in the ancient city republics as we read from Cicero. "According to our civil law no one can be a citizen of two cities at the same time; a man cannot be a citizen of this city who has dedicated himself to another city." It would seem absurd on the face of it, for, as Woodburn says, how can the allegiance and service of a particular individual be claimed by more than one country? "As a man cannot serve two masters, so two nations may not claim a citizen's allegiance . . .
>
> It is certain that a 'double allegiance' cannot be tolerated in America. Subjects of European nations who come to this country, take the oath of allegiance to America and become naturalized citizens, cannot be allowed to acknowledge allegiance to any European nation. Such 'hyphenated citizens' would be dangerous in any country. Loyalty to America is expected of all."

The fact of being a citizen of a country involves rights and duties. As a man cannot serve two masters, so two nations may not claim a citizen's allegiance. What is the full meaning of section 26? It means that an individual cannot be a Canadian subject without being a British subject. This creates a dual nationality.

By this bill, the quality of Canadian citizenship is reserved to those who are willing to become British subjects with all the consequences of being subjects of another nation, with the obligations, duties and so on derived from it. If a newcomer—a Pole, Swiss, Ukrainian, Chinese, Frenchman, Belgian—chooses Canada as his new country to live in he cannot become a Canadian subject without accepting to become a British subject with all its consequent obligations. This is the meaning of section 26, and the Secretary of State when he spoke on October 22, admitted the fact. I quote his words as they appear in *Hansard* at page 1336:

> A person who is hereafter born a Canadian citizen will thereby also be a British subject. An alien who comes to Canada and is naturalized as a Canadian citizen will similarly become a British subject.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, gives as much importance to British nationality as it does to Canadian nationality. It submerges it in British nationality. An effect of double patriotism or double loyalty has been shown in the espionage investigation now in progress. The report of the royal commission refers to the fact that some of those accused have stated that they have a patriotism higher than their patriotism to Canada. The report of the commission says:

> In a case of this nature where evidence has revealed the existence of on organization, constituting at least a threat to the safety and interests of the state, as evidenced by the fact that some witnesses, holding strategic positions have made the significant statement under oath, that they had a loyalty which took priority over the loyalty owed by them to their own country, and for that reason they acted as they did, and would unquestionably have continued so to act, had they not been detected, we are of opinion that should these persons be allowed communication with outsiders or between themselves until their activities have been fully investigated, some of the basic purposes of this inquiry would be entirely defeated.

Can one find a better example of the consequences of having double loyalty? A British subject must serve the interests of Great Britain first, and a Canadian citizen must serve the interest of Canada first.

On October 12, 1937, at the Ritz-Carlton hotel in Montreal, on the occasion of the annual dinner of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, the late Lord Tweedsmuir, then Governor General of Canada, made the following declaration:

> Canada is a sovereign nation, and cannot take her attitude to the world docilely from Britain, or from the United States, or from anybody else. A Canadian's first loyalty is not to the British commonwealth of nations but to Canada, and Canada's king, and those who deny this are doing, to my mind, a great disservice to the commonwealth.

What the Governor General of Canada said was not the promulgation of a new idea. It

was entirely in accord with the spirit and the letter of the statute of Westminster proclaimed in 1931.

It is the duty of a citizen of a country to promote the interest of his country first. His patriotism cannot be divided. In Canada the duty of a Canadian citizen is to promote the interest of Canada. But if a Canadian citizen is at the same time the subject of another country, he will have to promote the interest of both countries, and if those interests are in opposite ways, in what position would he be? That is why dual nationality cannot exist.

I come now to the third purpose; that is to say, to promote national unity. On October 22, the minister concluded his statement by saying:

> New Canadians should all be made to feel that they, like the rest of us, are Canadians, citizens of a great country . . . For the national unity of Canada, and for the future and greatness of this country, it is felt to be of utmost importance that all of us, new Canadians or old, have a consciousness of a common purpose and common interests as Canadians; that all of us be able to say with pride and say with meaning: "I am a Canadian citizen."

I agree entirely with that statement, but I ask the minister how he can create that spirit with this bill which means that a Canadian must serve two masters, that he must have a dual nationality with all the consequences. You will find that nowhere else. You will not find in the nationality act of any sovereign country such a provision as appears in section 26 of this bill which provides that a citizen of a country is the subject of another country.

I have here the Irish nationality and citizenship act—

Mr. MARTIN: Will the hon. member permit me to observe that this bill does not provide that anyone shall be a subject of any country but this country. Under this bill we would not be a subject of the government of Great Britain. Being a British subject does not imply that at all.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): A moment ago I quoted the exact words of the minister when he spoke on October 22 last. He said that the moment a man became a Canadian citizen he became a British subject. He would then assume British nationality and would have to obey the laws of Great Britain because he is a British subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN: It does not mean that at all.

[Mr. M. Raymond.]

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I have here the Irish nationality and citizenship act of 1935. An Irish citizen is an Irish citizen or a naturalized Irish, and no more. The same applies to the American, the Mexican, the Swiss and the Belgian citizen. The population of Switzerland is composed of the people of three races, French, Italian and German. You do not call a Swiss a German citizen or a French citizen or an Italian citizen, you call him a Swiss citizen. An American is called an American; he is not called a German subject or an Italian subject or the subject of any other country.

Mr. MARTIN: Nor is a Canadian.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): He is referred to as an American and as a subject of America. How can we be proud of being a citizen of a country when we declare that we are only a particular type of citizen of another country? If we want to promote national unity in this country we must have one nationality, which is Canadian nationality, and not a dual or double nationality. There must be the one loyalty to our country and not a loyalty toward any other country.

What we are doing by this bill is to design, not a Canadian citizen but one type of British subject which will be called a Canadian citizen, like the citizens of Papua are one type of British subject. Unfortunately some are more British than Canadian and this bill as it is now framed would contribute to maintain the ambiguity and disunity.

In conclusion, I say that if this bill becomes law we shall not have a definition of Canadian citizenship that will be any more clear than the one we had before. We shall not have that symbol of nationhood which is lacking in Canada at the present time, as was stated by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he spoke in Winnipeg last May. Worse than that, we shall be taking a step backward. This bill adds little if anything to what we had already on our statute books and constitutes a renunciation of our sovereignty.

We are now in the year 1946. Since 1931 we have been recognized as a sovereign nation, equal in status with the United Kingdom. Before that date we did not have the powers which we now have. The Immigration Act of 1910, the Naturalization Act of 1914 and the Canadian Nationals Act of 1921 were passed before 1931, at a time when we practically had the status of a colony or the equivalent thereof and when we certainly had not the powers of an autonomous state. As a matter of fact our Naturalization Act of 1914 was passed to concur with the British Nationality Act of 1914. According to the statute

of Westminster we were granted the power to repeal any existing act passed by the parliament of the United Kingdom in so far as the same was part of our laws, and also the power to make laws having extraterritorial operation.

Subsequently to the statute of Westminster the parliament of Ireland in 1935, exercising the powers of a sovereign state granted by the statute of Westminster, enacted the Irish nationality and citizenship act which is a real citizenship act. Under that act an Irish citizen is not called a British subject; he is a subject of Ireland. Section 33 of that act says:

> The British nationality and status of aliens act, 1914, and the British nationality and status of aliens act, 1918, if and so far as they respectively are or ever were in force in Saorstat Eireann, are hereby repealed.

Ireland exercised its power as a sovereign state, but what are we doing in Canada?

Mr. KNIGHT: Are you distinguishing between Ireland and Eire, which is the Irish Free State? If not, I think your argument would be much clearer if you would. Are you including the six Ulster counties in your statement?

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I am quoting from the statute of Ireland. On one side that is printed in Gaelic and on the other side it is printed in English. On the English side, instead of using the word "Ireland" they say "Saorstat Eireann".

Mr. KNIGHT: The south of Ireland would like to call themselves Ireland, but they have not yet reached that stage.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): They belong to the commonwealth of nations.

Mr. KNIGHT: Eire?

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Yes. What are we doing here in Canada? Under the smoke-screen of the title of this bill, "Canadian citizenship", which sounds very well, we are simply reenacting in other terms the same laws of colonial spirit which were already on our statute books. There is no sweeping change, as the minister said the other day, What was not objectionable in 1910 or 1915 or 1921, when we were not a sovereign nation, is now objectionable since the passage of the statute of Westminster in 1931 when we were officially recognized as a sovereign nation.

This bill, which recognizes that we have no distinct nationality, that we are purely and simply a particular class of British subject called a Canadian citizen, is the negation of our sovereignty; it is a renunciation of our sovereignty; it is a step backward. If we are worthy of being a nation we should be satisfied only with a nationality of our own, not one mixed with that of any other country. Far from being a symbol of nationhood, this bill as it now reads is a symbol of colonialism. I hope the Secretary of State will modify it. All we want is a real Canadian citizenship, a distinctive citizenship, not a mere shadow of Canadian citizenship. We are and we want to be purely and simply Canadian subjects. We want to inscribe in our statutes an act which will assure any suitable man coming into Canada that he will enjoy all the privileges of a Canadian citizen and that he will assume no other obligations than those which are due to his new country, Canada.

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I think it is perfectly true to say that we have in the bill now before the house a measure which is generally acceptable to all parties in the house. There are certain aspects of this bill which I shall not hesitate to criticize, but I could not proceed without joining at the outset with my hon. friends in all parts of the chamber who welcome this occasion when the achievement of the status of citizenship by the Canadian people has finally been recognized.

I do not wish to detain the house unnecessarily, so at the outset I shall define the purpose of my remarks. What I have to say can be dealt with under three heads: first, the attributes of citizenship itself; second, citizenship in Canada with relation to the larger idea involved in the words "British subject"; and, third, the possible expansions and protection of citizenship in Canada.

With respect to the first of these, that is the attributes of citizenship, as I say, we have here a bill which finally recognizes the status of Canadian citizenship. At the same time it prescribes who may become citizens, and how, and what qualifications they must possess. This brings up the question of whether or not certain classes or groups of people should ever be barred from or admitted as groups to citizenship; and it is this problem which I propose to deal with first. There is such a group whose fate remains to be decided in Canada to-day. I refer to the Japanese in Canada. This problem has been raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), and no truer words were ever uttered than when he said that the problem must be settled before this bill becomes law. If the bill becomes law before the Japanese problem is settled it means that these people, having resided in Canada for more than five years, can make application to become citizens. Many of them have resided

here for twenty, twenty-five, thirty and more years without becoming Canadian citizens. Consequently I feel we cannot allow this bill to afford an excuse by the government, as the hon. member for Vancouver South said, to yield to that pressure which is being applied to it by, I submit with all respect, uninformed and unenlightened groups in the country.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: A very small minority, too.

Mr. FULTON: The Japanese in Canada fall into two main groups, those born in Japan and entering Canada subsequently, and those born in Canada itself. The first group is further subdivided into those naturalized after their entry into Canada and those who have not yet been naturalized. It is the first group, that is those born in Japan and subsequently entering Canada, with which I propose to deal mainly this evening. It was mainly with this group that the orders in council passed last December dealt. Those orders in council have been reviewed by the hon. member for Vancouver South. They provide that Japanese nationals who had made application would be repatriated to Japan. That was the announced policy of the government on December 15. I might point out to the house here a matter which I think should receive explanation. That is that, of those who applied to go back, some 5,000 have not yet revoked their decision and the order for their deportation was not ruled invalid by the supreme court. I am very much interested in knowing why those 5,000 have not been already sent, and I should like particularly to hear that they have been sent before this bill becomes law.

The authorities for the orders in council themselves are contained actually in the War Measures Act and, since the first of this year, in the Emergency Powers Act. Most of the criticisms directed against the government for its policy are that this deportation is proposed to be carried out under order in council. It is represented to us that such a procedure is a horrible state of affairs; that to deprive people of their citizenship—that is the way it is put—by order in council, is a hideous crime. I submit to hon. members that this is not a true picture. Most of the people affected are not citizens of Canada; that is the first thing. They are not being deprived of their citizenship by order in council. I would be among the first to object to such a step. The second thing is that there exist on the statute books of this country many authorities, much legislation, giving authority to revoke naturalization by order in council. It is not a new thing dreamed up by somebody to deal with a new situation. There are on the statute books of this country to-day precedents for that sort of thing existing for many years.

I should like to refer to the Naturalization Act, chapter 138 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, which has been under discussion in connection with this bill. Section 9, summarized, reads as follows: The governor general shall by order revoke a certificate of naturalization in any case in which he is on the report of the minister satisfied that the person to whom the certificate was granted remains, according to the law of a state at war with His Majesty, a subject of that state. I cite that because we know for a fact that many of the Japanese who came to this country and had children born in this country registered those births at the Japanese consulate. The Japanese government made it compulsory for them to do so up to the year 1924; after that time it was optional with them to register their births at the Japanese consulate. We have heard a good deal here to-night about "dual nationality" and "dual citizenship"; but I submit to hon. members that there is a clear case where, the birth having been registered at the Japanese consulate, the child was a subject of Japan and therefore a subject of a state at war with His Majesty; and then, according to this statute, there exists all the authority which any minister could want for passing an order revoking naturalization and issuing an order for deportation.

In the same act we find section 10:

> Where a certificate of naturalization is revoked the governor in council may upon the recommendation of the minister by order direct that the wife and minor children, or any of them, of the person whose certificate is revoked shall cease to be British subjects, and any such person shall thereupon become an alien.

A great to-do is made, in these papers which have been referred to by the hon. member for Vancouver South, as to the terrible thing which is being done to the wives and children of these people. I cite that section to show that there is authority on the statute books of this country for taking that action. I think hon. members and the people generally should bear this in mind also when dealing with this matter, that the weight of evidence is to the effect that many of the Japanese evicted by these orders of deportation were certainly not subjects or citizens, nor were they loyal Canadians. That being the case, there is nothing horrible, new or deceitful in passing these orders in council. As I say, I feel that the reason it is important to point this matter out is, to some extent, to combat the wave of hysteria and ill-considered agitation which is sweeping the country against these orders in council.

However, the orders have been questioned, and perhaps the method adopted need not have been followed. The Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) could have passed an order revoking the naturalization of every individual. There is a statute giving authority for such a procedure. But although the method has been criticized, presumably the government's attitude and policy are still the same. The policy has not been revoked, certainly not in such a manner as to be known to the people. That policy was announced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) and by my good friend the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie), who comes from British Columbia and who, in fact, is vitally concerned to see that the policy is carried out since his resignation is at stake, and I am not too sure about those vacancies in the senate. We are here in a most unusual role to-night—to offer assistance, even to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the Minister of Labour, and to help them to carry out the policy. If they feel, however, that the matter is *sub judice,* that they cannot carry it out under the order in council, then I say that they should introduce a measure into this house. As a matter of fact, I feel that this house is the place where the whole question should be discussed and not only in Mr. Sandwell's paper, or by delegations appearing before the Prime Minister. It should be discussed in this house.

In this respect, as has been said before, I suggest that there are two things to which a member must give heed. First, he has to say what he feels to be right, and, second, he has to try to interpret what he thinks his constituents wish. Sometimes there may be a conflict between the two. If that conflict arises, then it is the member's duty still to say what he thinks to be right. At the next election he will be tried by his constituents. If they do not agree, well, we live in a democracy and that is the verdict of democracy. That is the correct way to go about the matter.

In this case, however, I find no such conflict. I believe that for certain reasons, namely, because the Japanese are not assimilable and by their actions they have shown that they were not loyal Canadian subjects, as evidenced by registration of births at the Japanese consulate, and many other actions which they perpetrated after the war broke out with Japan, as well as for a number of reasons which have been summarized in this house before, they should be sent away, and I believe that my constituents feel the same way. They do not like them and they do not want them. The people of British Columbia do not want to have them, and we are willing to present our case to the House of Commons, have the matter discussed here and have an act passed in this highest court of the land, higher than the Supreme Court of Canada, so that if it is the verdict of the Canadian people that our case is justified, the Japanese can be deported.

I felt it important to deal with that question because it involves a matter which is vital to the ideal of Canadian citizenship.

I should like next to deal with the question of Canadian citizenship as it affects all Canadians, and particularly as it is connected with the question of citizenship within the empire. I listened carefully to the speech delivered this afternoon by the hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret), and as I followed what he said it occurred to me that he—and very probably the same is true of a good many of those whom I may call his compatriots on the other side of the house—is proceeding under a misconception of what is involved in the words "British subject". It seems to me that the hon. member by his attitude showed that he felt that the words "British subject" mean that a person who is a British subject owes allegiance to the country, Great Britain. That is to say, that he is in some respects and in some manner a subject of England. That is what I thought was in the hon. member's mind, and it was that which, I believed, caused him to oppose and to criticize bitterly section 26 which states that a Canadian citizen is a British subject. He said in so many words as I recall them, that a Canadian citizen should owe allegiance to the empire through the crown and not owe allegiance to the crown through Great Britain. Those, I believe, were substantially the words he used in one passage. To my mind, that proves conclusively that the hon. gentleman feels that being a British subject, as the words are used in this act, means being a subject of Great Britain.

Let us analyse what is involved in being a British subject. I submit that it means nothing more or less than being a citizen of the British empire. A citizen of the British empire may be a citizen of Australia, or New Zealand, or Canada, or South Africa, or the United Kingdom. We are all citizens of the empire, citizens of the commonwealth, and we are all equal. If hon. members have anything to say I should be glad if they would speak up.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: What about India?

Mr. FULTON: India is not a member of the British commonwealth.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: A subject race.

Mr. FULTON: I am referring to the commonwealth. Being citizens of the British commonwealth, we do, all of us, owe that allegiance to the crown which even the hon. member for Outremont was prepared to concede. But in my mind that does not detract, nor in the minds of any of the hon. gentlemen in the group immediately to your left, Mr. Speaker, does that detract from our status, our qualities as Canadian citizens. It simply means that we have all the advantages of citizenship in a larger and more widespread world organization as well. We are citizens of Canada, subjects of His Majesty, and we are citizens of the British commonwealth.

To substantiate my argument I should like briefly to outline the status of British subject as it was instituted in the act of 1914. In 1914, as the outcome of an imperial conference, an act was passed in the British House of Commons defining the status of British subject and defining also the status of aliens and, to some extent, outlining the procedure by which an alien could become naturalized and become a British subject. It was therein provided that if a certain part of the act was adopted in member countries of the commonwealth, then those countries had the right to create British subjects, and that a British subject created in any one of those countries would be a British subject in every one of the other countries. In other words, we had what was the first step toward a world citizenship. I believe it is illuminating to look briefly at the relevant statutes to find the situation in other parts of the empire, and it is significant to note that no other part of the empire is doing what Canada is seeking to do by this bill. I shall come in a moment to my first main criticism of the bill, that although the bill seeks to retain the status of British subject for a Canadian citizen and that is good, yet in section 10 the world connotation of the status is swept aside because it is provided that a British subject would have to be naturalized all over again in Canada. That is not the case in any other part of the empire . One might say, "Once a British subject, always a British subject." If he is created a British subject in Canada he can go to Australia and become a citizen without becoming naturalized, because he is a British subject.

Let me refer to New Zealand. In the debates in 1928 when the principle to which I have referred, "Once a British subject, always a British subject", was being adopted in that country, the Right Hon. Sir. Francis Bell, on moving second reading of the bill adopting the Act of 1914, said, as reported at page 937 of the New Zealand *Parliamentary Debates*:

[Mr. Archibald.]

The main point that we insisted upon was this: that a foreigner—

Mark this, a foreigner, not necessarily a natural-born British subject but even a foreigner—

—who had acquired the right of British citizenship acquired the right of entry of his name on the electoral roll, his residence in New Zealand for a year qualified him for this. We deny it to no British subject.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): They keep it white.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They do not have any Japanese.

Mr. FULTON: They keep it white, apparently, but it is done under their immigration act. They restrict immigrants, but I understand they granted the status of British subject to Samoans who are not white.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They have no C.C.F. either.

Mr. FULTON: That makes it a lot easier for them. I continue with the quotation. At page 938 he said:

I never denied at any time the attraction of the adoption of the principle of a Britannic citizenship—the right to say, "I am a citizen of the British empire."

That is how New Zealand looks at the matter. As I said, I examined the statutes of Australia, and I could find there no provision similar to that which is sought to be introduced into Canada by this bill, namely, that a British subject coming from any other part of the empire would have to be naturalized all over again.

Mr. MARTIN: Will the hon. member permit me to correct him or to make my point? I am sure he will. A non-Canadian British subject coming to Canada does not in any circumstance lose his status as a British subject; this bill does not interfere with the status at all of British subjects, under such circumstances.

Mr. FULTON: I cannot accept that for a moment, Mr. Speaker. What are we interested in? We are interested in citizenship. We want everybody who comes to Canada to be a citizen.

Mr. PROBE: No, you do not.

Mr. FULTON: I want every suitable person who comes to Canada to be a citizen. Before a person coming into Canada under this bill can become a citizen he has to go through a naturalization process, no matter what his status.

Mr. MARTIN: That does not mean he loses his status as a British subject.

Mr. FULTON: What value is his status as a British subject if he has to go through naturalization to become a Canadian citizen? I shall deal further with this point as I go along, because I wish to deal with it at some length. This concept of being a British subject is, in my view, as I have said, the only approach that we have yet had to the idea of a world citizenship, a common citizenship throughout the world. Up to the present time it is to be found only in the British empire.

In support of my general thesis I should like to cite the present Prime Minister in a statement made in 1920 when he was leader of the opposition. On March 16, 1920, one of the peace treaties came up for ratification. There was submitted by the Borden government to the house at that time a resolution advocating ratification of this treaty by Canada. Among the reasons submitted was that Canada had achieved national status and that her signature as a nation was required to this treaty. On that occasion the then leader of the opposition took over an hour to deal with the question of Canada's status as a nation and to show that this was not a thing that was achieved overnight by the then administration but had been a growth ever since 1867, just as we have said that this status of Canadian citizenship is not a thing achieved overnight, but has been a growth ever since 1867. It is something which must be preserved and fostered and should not be allowed to be detracted from by diminishing our status as world citizens. This is what the leader of the opposition said at that time as reported at page 473 of *Hansard*:

> We believe . . . that it is possible for the British empire to become, as regards the league of nations, a league within a league, if you like, for the preservation of freedom amongst the different nations of the world. That position will be maintained by the attitude of conference and cooperation.

Mr. BRACKEN: Who was the leader of the opposition at that time?

Mr. FULTON: The leader of the opposition at that time was the right hon. gentleman who is Prime Minister at the present time.

What I have in mind is that to-day we hear a great deal about the necessity for the concept of world citizenship. As I have said, the only approach we have so far in this world to-day is this common citizenship which we have in the British empire. I repeat that under section 10 the common citizenship which we have is rendered valueless in so far as it concerns a British subject coming from any part of the empire into Canada. I realize that the minister disagrees with me. Perhaps we cannot reach agreement on that point. I leave it to the hon. mmbers and to the country to decide.

Mr. MARTIN: Will the hon. member permit me? I am sorry to have to interrupt, but this is an important matter. I know the hon. gentleman is trying to give it his best study, but I would not want it to go out that if a non-Canadian British subject comes into this country and does not take advantage of section 10 he thereby ceases to be a British subject. Once he comes into this country as a British subject he remains a British subject, whether or not he takes out citizenship in this country. Surely that is the fact.

Mr. FULTON: I suppose it cannot be denied that this bill does not contain any provision revoking the status of a non-Canadian British subject coming into this country, saying that he shall cease to be a British subject. But, after all, the thing which this bill is directed toward is the establishment and clarification of the status of Canadian citizenship. In doing that it says that any person coming into this country who wants to become a Canadian citizen must be naturalized. It makes no exception in the case of a British subject. Therefore a British subject who wishes to become a Canadian citizen must be naturalized.

The minister has not yet said, in answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), whether it is intended to make the franchise hinge on becoming a Canadian citizen. I submit it is quite proper and would be quite proper, and I think it is inherent in the minister's remarks, for him to say that the status of citizenship will from now on determine all our civil rights, and that a person must be a Canadian citizen. Although the minister has not said that, all his colleagues behind him who have so far spoken on this said that everybody must become Canadian citizens.

Mr. MARTIN: You must not put into my mouth words I did not say. This is a difficult matter, and one should not overgeneralize. I made no such remark. When we come to deal with the section I shall deal with the question the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) put to me the other day, but which the Speaker, relying on the rules of the house, precluded me from answering.

Mr. FULTON: I admit that the minister has not yet said it, and I ask him to do me the courtesy of not accusing me of putting words into his mouth, when I was careful not to do that; I said the minister had not yet said it.

Mr. MARTIN: I am sorry; I would not be discourteous to anybody.

Mr. FULTON: To get on with my point, it is this. At present we have an empire citizenship. A Canadian citizen who is a British subject can go to any other part of the empire and become a citizen of that part by virtue of the fact that he is a British subject. By this bill we in Canada are seeking at one stroke to cut away that world-wide aspect of the status of a British subject, because a British subject who comes here is no longer automatically a citizen. He is not and cannot be a citizen until he becomes naturalized.

Mr. MARTIN: He is not now a citizen automatically and this has been the law for twenty-five years. Under the existing act a non-Canadian British subject—

Mr. FULTON: I do not wish to be discourteous, but at the moment it is obvious that the minister and I cannot agree on this point.

Mr. MARTIN: May I say—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Golding): Order.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. member has given me permission to say this, Mr. Speaker. Under the present law the non-Canadian British subject must reside in Canada for five years before becoming a citizen under the Immigration Act. That has been the law of the land for over twenty-five years, in this and practically every dominion of the commonwealth—before he can acquire domicile under the Canadian Immigration Act, which is the only existing definition of citizenship in this country.

Mr. FULTON: I do not mind allowing the minister to ask a question, but when he proceeds to make a speech and to quote the Immigration Act when I am referring to the electoral act and the right to vote and the right to be a citizen, then I must say I cannot allow the minister to go on any longer. I am talking about the essence of citizenship; I cannot be any clearer than that, and I submit that it will be denied to a British subject when this bill becomes law. At one stroke, by one arrant gesture of isolationism, Canada is throwing aside and cutting down the one approach that has yet been made to a world citizenship.

An hon. MEMBER: Beating a dead horse!

Mr. FULTON: I am not beating the C.C.F. yet; then I would be beating a dead horse.

[Mr. Fulton.]

The third subject to which I wish to address myself briefly to-night is the question of the enlargement or expansion of Canadian citizenship. Here I should like to pay tribute to the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), who first brought this subject to my attention at least and who, I think, has taken the lead in bringing it to the attention of this house and of the country generally. He has brought to the attention of the house in a most forceful manner all through the years he has been here the dangerous threats to our citizenship and to our liberty which are inherent in the present trend of government. Speaking in this house on this bill a day or two ago he said he felt that the minister should proceed further. He has now introduced a bill which seeks to clarify the status of Canadian citizenship, and the hon. member felt the minister should go further and that he or some member of the government should introduce a bill of rights which would safeguard forever the privileges which are ours when we acquire Canadian citizenship.

I submit that the time has come when this country does need a bill of rights. I do not want to labour the point, but we have heard a great deal about a forgotten order in council. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) rose in their places and told us that an order in council had been passed. We heard them describe their reluctance to accept that order in council, which infringed upon the rights of Canadians, and we heard them say that after it had been passed they forgot it. Some journalist—this is not an original expression with me—permitted himself to wonder—and I just say I share his amazement, since these two powerful individuals were so opposed to the passage of that order in council—just who it was got around them and persuaded them to pass it. Perhaps, this journalist said, it was the office boy. Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is time we had a bill of rights which would safeguard us against the malevolent influences of office boys, if that is the way this country is run.

On the general subject, we have heard a great deal about citizenship. It is a magnificent concept and one which I submit is worth safeguarding. Human experience shows that we are apt to forget the lessons of the struggle for liberty; that liberty rests so easily on the shoulders of the people, is so welcome, so acceptable, that the necessity for constant watchfulness to preserve it is easily forgotten. Therefore it seems that we should take every

precaution to make sure that we can wear safely and lightly that mantle of liberty, that cloak which is ours by virtue of our citizenship. We should safeguard it by introducing a bill of rights.

Finally, I wish to leave this thought with the house. I should have liked to conclude my remarks with a few words in French, but I did not actually expect to speak this evening, and I do not yet trust myself to speak in French to this distinguished chamber without first preparing my remarks. But I should like in closing to leave this thought with the house, that the first and perhaps still the greatest Canadian was the man who united Canada in confederation, 1867. The next great Canadian will be the man who truly reunites Canada at any time in the future.

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): Much that has been said on this subject has been very interesting to me, and some of it practically fascinating, but it is perhaps unfortunate that whenever an important measure of this kind comes before this house the discussion seems to overflow into all sorts of by-paths and side-lines which really have nothing to do with the measure. I would not want to interfere with anyone's right to express an opinion, nor would I take any exception to opinions expressed, but I respectfully submit that much of the discussion we heard to-night was not on the bill; it was not even on the beam.

I do not believe there is anything sinister or omnious about this bill. It has not been sprung upon us suddenly, as last night some hon. gentleman said another measure was sprung on us. This bill was introduced in very much the same form last year, and hon. members have had an opportunity of studying it and carefully considering its implications ever since last fall. I do not always agree with the government; more often than not I disagree. This time I think the minister is to be complimented on the work he has done. I believe this bill is something the people of this country have wanted. I have no hesitation in expressing my approval of it, and I think the same can be said of all hon. members of our group, because it happens that a Canadian citizenship was one of the things we included in our party platform. Therefore we feel that we have a mandate from the people who sent us here, to support such a measure. But even if there were not I would still feel it is the general opinion of the people of Canada that there is no harm at the present time—and certainly there are great possibilities of good—in having on the statute books something which will give us officially an opportunity to call ourselves Canadians in every respect. I do not see anything there to quarrel about.

There may be details that will have to be changed. I believe that the hon. member who sits in front of me has some amendments which he will propose when we get into committee. But we are now speaking to the principle of the bill, and I believe that principle is one which is acceptable to all sides of the house.

I do not think we should engage in histrionics or emotional outbursts in respect of measures which require as much cooperation and unity as we say this one does. I want particularly to compliment the officials who drew up the bill, and also the minister, upon having included in it a provision for instruction and education in citizenship. I believe that if these provisions are carried out properly and if sufficient money is appropriated to make it possible to do this work, with a view to impressing upon those who are becoming naturalized just what privileges and rights are involved and, what is more important, the responsibilities which go with citizenship, that will be money and time well spent.

This is something which has been needed for a long time. I also suggest to the minister and the house that in future it might be wise to provide all immigrants with a pamphlet setting out in an understandable form the status of aliens. They must understand their position, and a pamphlet of that kind would help keep them out of trouble, and help them to appreciate the advantages, responsibilities and privileges of citizenship. It would help them along that road from the status of alien to that of citizen, step by step. The immigrant would be able to compare his position upon entry into the country with that far more advantageous position he can ocupy if he makes an effort toward improving his position.

I would also suggest that in future we make greater use of our facilities for adult education. I am referring particularly to rural and semi-rural areas, where most of the immigration finds its way. I can say from experience that in those areas there are many schoolteachers who would be only too happy to provide evening classes for immigrant children and adults so that they might have the first elements and rudiments of democracy, citizenship, and the Canadian way of life.

I have had some practical experience in that respect. I taught in a district where there was a group of immigrants, and during a couple

of winters I conducted classes in which adult education was taught. I can assure the house that not only was it advantageous to them, but it was a great education to me to have an opportunity to interpret to them the Canadian way of life. In that way I got a better appreciation of it myself.

In concluding, let me say that if we are to reach that stage of unity which all seem so anxious to attain, I believe we shall do it best and most effectively by emphasizing in the house those things we have in common, rather than those which seem to divide us. It is for that reason that I was not very happy while the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) was speaking this evening. I should not like to say anything that would offend him, because I have great admiration for his ability. I felt, however, that during part of his speech he was getting into territory that did not bring any advantage to this discussion or to the political group with which he is affiliated.

In particular, he attempted to make a case against people who have resided in this country for twenty years or more, who have been granted citizenship or naturalization without having to have a knowledge of English or French. I would be the last to suggest that they should not be motivated toward learning either of the two official languages; or, still better, both of them. But with respect, may I submit to him, that there are people in Canada, some of whom I know personally, who have contributed a great deal to the development of this country, but who have had no opportunity to learn either of the official languages.

For instance, I know a lady—and now she is fairly old—who sent six of her sons to the last war. Most of them did not come back. She does not know how to speak either English or French. Would the hon. member for Vancouver South say that she is not entitled to vote, after that sacrifice and that contribution to Canada? Her case could be multiplied by the hundreds, probably by the thousands, and I suggest that before we take a narrow or intolerant view, we should take careful thought, lest we offend far more people than we have dreamed of.

I am not accusing the hon. member; I am simply pointing out that if we want unity and cooperation we must be prepared to go at least half way.

On motion of Mr. Fleming the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

[Mr. Zaplitny.]

Monday, April 8, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

EXCHANGE OF NOTES

UNITED STATES-CANADA—AGREEMENT RESPECTING DEFENCE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table an exchange of notes between the United States of America and Canada constituting an agreement on the subject of war surpluses and related matters. In relation thereto I should like to make the following statement.

Both the United States government and our own have found it advantageous to simplify the procedure followed hitherto in disposing of defence facilities and equipment provided in Canada by the United States. They have therefore agreed that Canada shall pay the United States $12,000,000 (U.S.) in return for which there is transferred to the Canadian government a long list of defence facilities and equipment, the original cost of which was approximately $59,000,000 (U.S.).

These installations and materials include items related to the Alaska highway and the northwest staging route, to weather stations in northeastern Canada, movable property reported to War Assets Corporation under an earlier agreement, but not sold, and certain naval and air equipment which had been provided by the United States to the United Kingdom under lend-lease and which, when returned to United States account, remained in Canada. The price paid is a reasonable one, in view of the usefulness of many of these installations and materials to the armed forces and other agencies of government, and the agreement is regarded by both governments as a satisfactory settlement of a property disposal problem which otherwise might have been long drawn out and complicated.

There is an additional aspect of the exchange of notes which is important.

In order to provide equipment necessary for the training programmes of the Canadian armed forces, the United States government will endeavour to make available, surplus military type equipment up to a maximum value of $7,000,000 (U.S.). The agreement calls for negotiation between the two governments as to quantities and prices and will enable the Canadian armed forces to obtain much of the training equipment that they will require at figures considerably less than would be the case if orders had to be placed with manufacturers for new equipment.

Mr. BRACKEN: In connection with this adjustment, I understood the Prime Minister to say that there were included therein certain items relating to the Alaska highway. I was under the impression that that matter had been closed some time previously. Perhaps the Prime Minister would clear up the point.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: "Items related to the Alaska highway" are the words I used: "These installations and materials include items related to the Alaska highway and the northwest staging route." I cannot give my hon. friend further particulars at the moment. I will look into his question and if there is additional information I will give it later.

[*Later:*]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have just been informed by the Minister of Justice that what is referred to as matters related to the Alaska highway is in the nature of building equipment and the like. The highway was to be turned over to the Canadian system of highways but the Americans were to have the right to take away building equipment and other materials they have been using.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—C. O. MOLLBERG

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. Has C. O. Mollberg been an employee of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at any time since 1943, and to date?
2. If so, is he now so employed?
3. What was his salary?
4. If not now employed, when did his employment cease, and for what reason?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. Yes. Appointed May 5, 1942 as an investigator, Prince Albert local office, Saskatchewan.
2. Yes.
3. $1,860 per annum, plus $221.04 cost of living bonus.
4. See answer to question No. 2.

CURRAN-KNOWLES COKE AND GAS PLANT, HAMILTON

Mr. LENNARD:

1. What was the overall cost to the government of the Curran-Knowles Coke and Gas plant at Hamilton, Ontario?
2. Are any moneys still owing the contractors who erected this plant?
3. If so, what are the amounts?
4. What disposition is the government making of the plant?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. The capital cost of the plant, including additions to December 31, 1945, was $4,084,717.60.
2. No. The contractor is making a claim but the department denies liability.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. The disposition of the plant is a matter of government policy to be made known in due course.

IMPORTS OF SUGAR FROM WEST INDIES AND CUBA

Mr. ISNOR:

1. What quantity of sugar was imported from the West Indies in each of the years, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944?
2. What quantity of sugar was imported from Cuba in the same years?

Mr. MacKINNON:

Cal. year	Barbados cwt.	Jamaica cwt.	Trinidad cwt.	Br. West Indies other cwt.	Hayti cwt.	San Domingo cwt.	Cuba cwt.
1927	1,042,061	769,632	371,029	674,720	101,745	1,446,863	1,262,598
1928	1,132,149	797,114	723,349	409,985	141,614	522,945	1,446,333
1929	1,250,264	765,331	867,353	158,012	35,358	865,732	1,129,490
1930	1,083,257	1,018,376	773,546	777,235	....	278,692	739,218
1931	760,010	867,369	1,282,978	431,806	....	408,553	235,133
1933	787,067	332,345	413,360	371,436	....	94,517	734,078
1934	1,478,051	1,006,149	429,167	302,348	....	1,369,482	573,241
1935	770,938	1,269,969	1,124,051	521,512	....	....	37,941
1936	1,222,400	1,397,138	1,366,468	478,070	....	....	57,971
1937	807,126	1,349,716	397,644	294,497	....	....	330,092
1940	610,847	853,662	671,578	250,957	58,944	1,993,603	508,288
1941	875,608	1,008,381	1,131,769	458,580	12,003	2,350,208	1,320,711
1942	172,860	1,305,801	678,215	67,766	....	184,842	1,800,782
1943	1,435,569	2,725,587	157,044	114,240	....	41,600	2,601,470
1944	1,811,760	2,687,343	248,938	111,420	490,820	1,603,893	437,563

CANADIAN TROOPS IN JAMAICA

Mr. COLDWELL:

How many Canadian troops were in Jamaica on or about February 20, 1946?

Mr. ABBOTT: 722.

DOMINION BONDS HELD BY CHARTERED BANKS

Mr. ISNOR:

1. To what extent of their savings accounts are privately-owned banks permitted to hold Dominion of Canada bonds?
2. Is there any limit to the amount banks may hold as collateral?
3. When Dominion of Canada bonds, bearing interest at the rate of three per cent per annum, are deposited as collateral with privately-owned banks, is there a maximum or fixed rate of interest which may be charged by the banks? If so, what is the rate?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. By voluntary arrangement between the chartered banks and the Minister of Finance, the banks have agreed that their holdings of dominion government domestic bonds (including guaranteed issues) will not average more than 90 per cent of the amount of their Canadian savings deposits (i. e., their notice deposits other than balances of corporations).
2. No.
3. No other than the maximum of 6 per cent permitted under section 91 of the Bank Act.

WAR ASSETS—CAMP BORDEN BUILDINGS

Mr. MENARY:

1. Is the War Assets Corporation at present disposing of any of the surplus buildings at Camp Borden?
2. If not, when is the disposal of these buildings expected to begin?
3. Would these buildings be available to returned soldiers by direct purchase and, if so, at what date?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No.
2. No information (not yet declared surplus.)
3. Federal government departments, provincial government departments and municipalities including educational institutions, in this order, will be given an opportunity to purchase these buildings. When these priority applications have been met the remaining buildings will be advertised for sale by tender.

REGIONAL WAR LABOUR BOARD FOR QUEBEC—PAUL EMILE MARQUETTE

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Was Paul Emile Marquette of Montreal recommended for appointment to the Regional War Labour Board by the Canadian Congress of Labour?

[Mr. MacKinnon.]

2. Has the Canadian Congress of Labour requested the removal of Mr. Marquette from this position? If so, what action has been taken?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. In February last the Canadian congress of labour requested that Mr. Marquette be removed from the Quebec regional war labour board.

On March 5, 1946, an official communication was received by the department from the Canadian congress of labour nominating Mr. T. Prezeau to replace Mr. Marquette.

On March 8 a unanimous resolution, which had been passed by the Quebec regional war labour board on February 26, was received from the board to the effect: "that Mr. Marquette should be maintained in office as a member of the regional war labour board, first, because of the lengthy experience he has had in dealing with matters pertaining to the control of wages—besides that which he has acquired since he is with the board—also because of the fairness and impartiality he has always displayed in the judgment of the applications which up to now have been presented to the board".

On March 12 the department notified the Quebec regional board that the Canadian congress of labour urged that Mr. Marquette be replaced.

The Quebec board was organized by agreement between the government of the province of Quebec and the dominion government. The necessity, therefore, for consultation between the parties in this matter will be appreciated.

On April 2 the names of Messrs. T. Prezeau, J. E. Corbeil and J. M. Bedard were submitted to the department by the congress for consideration.

On the same date, April 2, these three names were telegraphed to Honourable Antonio Barrette, Minister of Labour for Quebec, requesting that he indicate his choice.

On April 3 the regional war labour board for Quebec wrote the department repeating its recommendation of February 26 that Mr. Marquette be retained on the board for the reason that "his integrity and experience have proved to be most valuable to the regional board".

On April 3 Honourable Mr. Barrette wrote the department suggesting the appointment of Mr. J. M. Bedard to the Quebec regional war labour board.

On April 8 the dominion Minister of Labour had a telephone conversation with the Quebec Minister of Labour and the latter made it

clear that he wished to have Mr. J. M. Bedard appointed a member of the Quebec regional war labour board in place of Mr. Marquette.

Steps are therefore being taken to revoke the order in council appointing Mr. Marquette a member of the board and to recommend to the cabinet council that Mr. Bedard be named as his successor.

AIR FORCE—OFFICERS

Mr. COCKERAM:

1. How many officers, holding the following ranks, are now on the strength of the Royal Canadian Air Force, at home and abroad (a) air chief marshal; (b) air marshal; (c) air vice-marshal; (d) air commodore; (e) group captain?

2. How many of these officers have received promotion since V-J day?

3. Who are they and what ranks do they now hold and what appointment do they now hold?

4. How many of these officers, in addition, have received promotion since December 1, 1945?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West):

1. (a) Nil; (b) 2; (c) 11; (d) 18; (e) 98.

2. Five.

3. Acting Air Vice-Marshal A. L. James, CBE, Air Member for Research and Development; Acting Air Vice-Marshal J. L. Plant, CBE, Air Officer Commanding Western Air Command, Vancouver; Acting Air Commodore L. E. Wray, OBE, AFC, Air Officer Commanding, No. 9 Group Rockcliffe; Acting Air Commodore R. A. London, OBE, Director of Equipment Supply; Acting Group Captain S. B. Rhude, MBE, Director of Accounts and Finance.

4. None.

*FREE PORTS

Mr. MENARY:

1. Are there any free ports in Canada?

2. If not, what has been done by the government to establish same?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I should like to answer this question orally. The answer to the first part of the question is no. With regard to the second part, an interdepartmental committee has been set up to study the general question of the establishment of free ports in Canada, and the committee has not yet reported.

AMBASSADOR AT THE VATICAN

Mr. LACROIX:

1. Have any steps been taken towards appointing an ambassador at the vatican?

2. What has been done in this connection?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. No.

2. Answered by the answer to No. 1.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

SHIP "ARLEUX"

Mr. ISNOR:

1. Prior to the outbreak of war in 1939 did the Department of Fisheries operate a ship known as the *Arleux?*

2. If so, for what purpose was this ship used during the war?

3. Was the ship passed over to the Royal Canadian Navy? If so, on what date, and what was the date it was released?

4. Has the ship since been sold? If so, was it by private or public sale and how was transaction handled?

5. If by public sale (a) how many bids were received; (b) who were the bidders, and for what amounts?

DESERTERS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many alleged deserters in the United States army have been apprehended and turned over to the United States authorities under the provisions of P.C. 6577?

2. How many Canadians in the United States have been returned to Canada under reciprocal arrangements?

SERVICE PERSONNEL STATIONED IN WASHINGTON

Mr. COCKERAM:

1. What is the number of service personnel, of all services, at present stationed in Washington?

2. How many officers of all ranks of all services are now stationed in Washington and what duties do they perform?

3. What are the names of the senior officers of all services now stationed in Washington?

OFFICERS SECONDED TO OTHER BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. COCKERAM:

1. How many officers of the following ranks (a) army, general, lieutenant-general, major-general, brigadiers, colonel; (b) navy, admiral, vice-admiral, rear-admiral, commodores, captain; (c) air force, air chief marshal, air marshal, air vice-marshal, air commodore, group captain, now on the strength of the armed services, are seconded to other branches of the government?

2. Who are they and what is their substantive rank as against temporary rank held at present?

3. To what department is each of them seconded?

OFFICERS RETIRED ON PENSION

Mr. COCKERAM:

1. What are the names of all officers retired on pension from the Royal Canadian navy, army and air forces since September, 1939?

2. What was the rank of each such officer and what was the rank held in September, 1939?

3. What is the amount of pension being paid to each such officer?

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—STAFF

Mr. McKAY:

1. How many (a) appraisers; (b) other officials, and staff are now in the employ of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act branch, Department of Agriculture?

2. How many of these employees are located in (a) Alberta; (b) Saskatchewan; (c) Manitoba; (d) Ottawa?

3. What amount has been paid out since the inception of P.F.A.A. in respect of such employees for (a) salaries; (b) expenses?

4. What is the total expenditure under the act for (a) rental of office space; (b) other expenditures?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

WAR ASSETS—MATERIALS FOR VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and other documents in the possession of the Department of Reconstruction and the War Assets Corporation relative to the gift or sale to educational bodies in Canada for vocational training and educational instruction, of any machine tools, equipment, motion picture projectors, typewriters, hand tools and other material.

Mr. McILRAITH: The information sought to be produced by this motion as it stands is of such length that it would require several filing cabinets to hold it. I have discussed the matter with the mover and he has agreed to place a question on the order paper which will, I believe, give him the information that he desires. I ask that the motion be dropped.

Mr. FRASER: I will drop the motion and put a question on the order paper in a different way, Mr. Speaker, with your permission.

Motion dropped.

CANADIAN FORCES—WITHDRAWAL OF OCCUPATIONAL FORCES FROM GERMANY

Mr. PEARKES:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and other documents exchanged between the Prime Minister and/or the Minister of External Affairs of Canada with the Prime Minister and/or the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs or any other member of the cabinet of Great Britain, relative to the withdrawal of the Canadian army occupational forces from Germany.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Correspondence of this kind is, according to long standing precedent, privileged. I would ask the hon. member not to press for it, because it would not be possible to meet his wishes at present.

Mr. PEARKES: Statements have been made in the British House of Commons which would indicate that the agreement to withdraw these troops was of a unilateral character and against the wishes of the authorities in Great Britain. There is a good deal of feeling about this in the country. If the Prime Minister is unable to produce all the papers, perhaps he could produce sufficient to clear up the matter, or he may be prepared to make a statement with regard to the reasons behind the withdrawal of this force.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no doubt the matter will come up when the Minister of Defence is dealing with his estimates or at some other appropriate moment. I know the minister will be only too ready to make a statement at that time.

Motion dropped.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

AVAILABILITY TO ALL PERSONS OF CERTAIN RESIDENCE OR BIRTH QUALIFICATIONS

On the order:

Mr. Castleden—the following proposed resolution:—That, in the opinion of this house, it is in the best interests of Canada to establish a distinctive Canadian citizenship, which shall be available to all persons of certain residence or birth qualifications within the dominion.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Stand.

Mr. MARTIN: This matter should hardly be allowed to stand. It is now before the house in the form of a bill. Under the rules of the house I believe this motion should be dropped.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Speaking of the procedure in that regard, I might say that last year I had practically an identical motion on the order paper and I dropped it because a bill having to do with the matter was introduced in the house. But the bill received only first reading and was then dropped from the order paper. I prefer to have this motion stand until the bill is passed.

Mr. COLDWELL: Stand until then.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The rules of the house are quite clear in this matter.

Motion dropped.

WATER CONSERVATION

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO QUESTIONS AFFECTING SASKATCHEWAN RIVER WATERSHED

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport) moved:

That, in the opinion of this house the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of introducing legislation during this session to set up a permanent interprovincial board or commission on which the three prairie provinces and the dominion would have equal representation under the chairmanship of a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or some other qualified person, to conduct investigations and make studies of the most feasible

and economic means for the conservation and utilization of the eastern watershed of the Rocky mountains, particularly the watershed of the Saskatchewan river.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the matters referred to in the resolution are of such tremendous importance to the three western provinces as well as to all of Canada, that I hope out of this debate much good will result to the country generally. The whole economy of the western provinces is threatened by the presence of areas which may be described as arid or semi-arid, or, better still perhaps, as desert and semi-desert; and unless immediate steps are taken to reclaim these areas the consequences to the western provinces will be disastrous. I hope those who take part in the debate may bring home to the people of the three prairie provinces a keen conception of the situation as it exists to-day; and I hope proper emphasis will be given to the lowering of the water plane of the three western provinces. which is one of the main causes of these arid areas. I trust that the business men and financial interests of eastern Canada will take an active part in trying to reclaim these areas, because as a former eastern business man I am convinced that unless these desert and semi-desert areas of the west are reclaimed, the eastern companies will have great difficulty in maintaining their present position, let alone bringing about any expansion.

I should like to give just two examples of what is resulting from our failure to reclaim these areas. I believe the census is taken in the western provinces about every five years, whereas the census for all Canada is taken every ten years. Between the taking of the census of 1935 and the time war broke out in 1939, the population of the great central province of Saskatchewan dropped by some forty thousand persons. In my opinion that was a major disaster to Canada. Then in January last, on my way west, in a report issued either by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Trade and Commerce, I saw an announcement that in 1945, notwithstanding the fact that the farmers received substantial prices for what they had to sell, the returns to the farmers of the three prairie provinces were $186,000,000 less than those of 1944. That is another problem of major proportions, because if additional crops to the value of $186,000,000 had been produced the difference would have more than paid for the programme I have in view in this connection. I hope every hon. member of the house will take note of those two striking figures; a loss of population of 40,000 souls in Saskatchewan alone from 1935 to 1939, and a loss through drought, principally in Saskatchewan, of $186,000,000 in 1945 as compared with 1944. In my judgment these are staggering figures.

The only antidote for arid or semi-arid areas, or desert and semi-desert conditions, is water. Nothing else can reclaim such areas. A few days ago in an engineering article I read that deserts do not stand still, that they can be reclaimed by water but that if water is not applied, they march on. This article went on to say that what had been the great city of Timbuktu in north Africa is threatened with destruction by the continuing march of the Sahara desert toward the south west, and that already it has been partly destroyed. So our objective should be not only to reclaim but to try to arrest any expansion of these desert conditions.

Now may I say just a word about the resolution. It divides itself into four parts. I must confess that it could have been much better worded, but I suppose the ministry will have no difficulty in accepting the first division, namely that immediate consideration should be given to the advisability of introducing legislation during this session. As a matter of fact I am very happy to say that the estimates for this year contain the sum of $10,000,000 for this work, which is a substantial start toward reclamation. I believe that $10,000,000 can be divided up among several projects, and I shall deal with that later.

The second division has to do with the setting up of an interprovincial-federal board. Recently when I was in the west I discussed this whole problem with every engineer with whom I came in contact—city engineers, government engineers, and general engineers. At that time I had in mind that we might have in Canada something similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States, with which I am very well acquainted. What they have done is revolutionary in regard to expanding the economy of the seven states through which the Tennessee river flows. At the time I thought we would have to set up some such authority here. However, I must confess that I am quite pleased with what the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act has done, and I have great confidence in the director of that organization, Hon. George Spence. However, the P.F.R.A. legislation, which I believe was enacted in 1935, does not take in the whole of the area. It does not include northwestern Alberta or northeastern Manitoba, both of which would come under any project of the magnitude of that I have in view. However, I have no doubt the government can expand the control of P.F.R.A., and if they should so decide, well and good.

The next division of the resolution pertains to the participation of the provinces. The states do not participate in the T.V.A. set-up; the United States government has financed the whole undertaking.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you can do anything to bring about a little better order. We cannot hear the hon. member at all down here; others are speaking almost as loudly as he is.

Mr. MacNICOL: I had in view the participation of the provinces in suggesting a separate board. I cannot conceive of works of this magnitude being carried on without the consent and perhaps assistance of the three western provinces, and I can see no reason why they should not participate and why their participation would not be helpful. Of course I am not going to tell the minister what he should do; he will use his own judgment in that regard. I merely point out in my resolution that to include the provinces in these works in my judgment would be beneficial.

In my reference to the chairmanship of the proposed board I had in mind one whose decisions would inspire the utmost confidence throughout the country. I have suggested a judge of the supreme court, but I have noted a good deal of opposition to the appointment of judges to boards. If the government decided that the chief engineer in the department, the chief engineer under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, or the director thereof, in whom, as I said a minute ago, I have great confidence, would be suitable, I should have no quarrel with that decision. When I suggest the appointment of a judge I am not offering something which could not be altered.

The provinces are already acting. Each of the three western provinces has sent engineers —I am not sure whether they have sent their chief engineers, but information to this effect appeared in the press. Those engineers, meeting in Regina, have formed themselves into a small board. They cannot act, of course, because the Saskatchewan is a navigable river. I am sure however that their participation in the matter of western rehabilitation and conservation could not be other than helpful.

In the latter part of the resolution I refer to the conservation of water and the utilization of the eastern watershed in the Rocky mountains, particularly the watershed of the Saskatchewan river. I shall proceed from that point, because it is with that matter I wish to deal particularly.

I have made as careful a survey as was within my power, both by foot and on horseback, of a considerable portion of the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains. I learned—I was going to say with horror, because what I saw affected me in that way—about great acreages of fine timberland which had been burned. I learned that for years a minimum of 30,000 acres each year have been destroyed by fire. In consultation with engineers in the west I learned, and I have reason to believe what I was told, that the destruction of 30,000 acres a year in the foothills of the Rocky mountains, timber which had retarded the run-off of the snows and water in the spring so that it was retained in a manner which permitted its flowing down the river more evenly, had a disastrous effect on the glaciers.

I have not sufficient technical knowledge about these matters to check on that information, but I was told by two outstanding engineers that the great forest fires on the slopes of the Rocky mountains, through the process of hurling soot on the glaciers, retarded the accumulation of those glaciers, with the result that they have shrunk to a considerable degree. I can see nothing but disaster to the west if those glaciers shrink appreciably. Of course it would take a long time to bring this about—perhaps not in our time—but I do urge it is our duty, to the extent of our ability, to protect the generations which will follow us. One of the protections we could afford would be the preservation of the watershed of the Saskatchewan river, through the protection of the glaciers. A step in that direction would mean the restoration of vast areas of foothill forests which have been destroyed by fire, and every effort made to prevent future fires in the foothills of the Rocky mountains would be worth while.

As to the conservation of water, might I point out that I have been up and down all the important parts of the river, from its mouth to its source in the mountains. I travelled up as far as I could go, to view the Columbia glacier. In company with engineers I have seen many splendid sites for reservoirs. P.F.R.A. has issued some instructive maps and excellent reports which indicate that on the source rivers of the Saskatchewan there are about thirty-six splendid sites for reservoirs, some of which are large. I have in mind two which I inspected, one called the Whirlpool and the other the Gap. The Gap was located not far from Nordegg in Alberta, and the Whirlpool also in Alberta but much closer to the Banff-Jasper highway. Both these sites are large, each one capable of conserving about 380,000 acre feet of water. That is a lot of water, Your Honour. If one

adds to those two the other thirty-four reservoir sites, he might well be convinced that we have ample opportunity in the source rivers of the Saskatchewan for this type of work. I have in mind rivers like the Castle, Old Man, Waterton, St. Mary's, High, Bow, Brazeau, Clearwater and Mistaya. One reaches all those rivers when making a survey.

So far as I can estimate all those reservoir sites on the head waters are sufficient to store approximately 10 million acre feet of water. That, too, is a lot of water.

In addition, along the main river there are many excellent sites. As hon. members are aware, the main river has two great branches, the North Saskatchewan and the South Saskatchewan. In consultation with engineers, and after inspecting as thoroughly as is possible by a layman—that is, outside of digging down below the water line—I can say that the site near the Riverhurst area, if it were developed by the construction of a dam 175 feet high, would back the river up 100 miles. And I am satisfied the average width of water at the top water level would be not less than three-quarters of a mile. One can figure by taking the top 50 feet of that reach that he would have available 2,500,000 acre feet of storage. I have seen other excellent sites, just as good as the one at Riverhurst. If one were to limit himself to only four such sites—and there are many more—he would have another ten million acre feet of storage. In other words, from what I have seen of the river and its source branches, there are reservoir sites capable of conserving twenty million acre feet of water.

When I think of the priceless necessity for water in western Canada, and think that almost every drop runs to the sea without giving any advantage to those great provinces —with the exception, of course, of what is done in southwestern Alberta—I feel that we are confronted with nothing short of a tragedy. I am not blaming anyone for this. I know the country has a big load to carry, and that it cannot go ahead faster than it can secure the money for purposes of development. But let me point out—and I shall develop this later on—that these projects are self-liquidating and in reality cost the country nothing.

For instance, let us consider what has been done in recent years in India. One often thinks of India as a backward country. It is far from that. Within the last few years in the province of Sind a very great irrigation work has been created. Water is stored behind the Sarda dam, and the main canals running from that point are 4,177 miles in length. Just try to imagine any canal in this country to equal that. Then let us ask ourselves how we compare with India. We will remember that in our childhood we read, times without number, about the tremendous loss of life in the Punjab, and the province of Sind, because of drought. In the province of Sind, behind the Lloyd dam, they have backed up sufficient water to irrigate five and a half million acres. In the Punjab they have their great irrigation works which irrigate millions of acres of land. They have worked on the basis, and rightfully so, that these are self-liquidating projects which will pay for themselves and which will save millions of lives in that country. When I think of what I have observed in the west and what the people in the western provinces have come through, my heart bleeds. I am going to stay with this business as long as I am in public life. I am going to advocate the completion of these projects which will restore that western country.

When the house rose in December I was planning several trips. One was to Arizona to make a further study of the great Roosevelt dam and the Salt river irrigation works associated with it. Any one who has been in Arizona will have observed the vast transformation that has taken place in that formerly cactus-ridden state because of these irrigation works. The magnificent city of Phoenix has grown up where formerly nothing but cactus grew. It is a beautiful city of about 150,000 people. Just fancy the returns to the United States from the production in that area, from sales tax and income tax from a city like Phoenix. It is a self-liquidating project which will not cost the country anything.

I was considering going to the west, although I was a little afraid of the winter—but I should not have been afraid, because I learned afterward that the winters there are delightful. I like the winters in the west and I am planning to go there again in the winter time. The fact was that I had never seen the Saskatchewan river in the winter. I have seen it at other times of the year, when it was in flood and when it was in half-flood. I realize that the Saskatchewan river is not comparable to many other large rivers because its water resources are comparably not as large. But the Almighty has provided enough water to take care of any of the requirements of the three western provinces.

I have seen that river when it was flowing at not less than 100,000 cubic feet per second and when it was flowing at the rate of about 10,000 cubic feet per second. I am referring to the river east of the junction of the two main rivers, the North Saskatchewan, and

South Saskatchewan. But I had not seen it in the winter time so I visited the river at several points during the winter season, this year. I spent some time examining it at Saskatoon and at Medicine Hat in particular, and I am satisfied that at neither point was the South Saskatchewan flowing at more than 1,500 cubic feet per second, with a maximum of 2,000 cubic feet per second. There is a vast difference between 100,000 cubic feet per second and 2,000 cubic feet per second.

Someone will ask: Where has the water gone to? It has gone down to the sea without having done much good to the parched prairies, which if they are given sufficient water will grow anything. There is no better land in the world. In some places it is a little alkaline, but the vast proportion of it contains the necessary chemicals to produce crops of all kinds in abundance, provided it gets the water. It is part of my purpose to try to see that it does get that water.

In referring to the flow of the Saskatchewan river I dug up some old tables. I find that in 1915 at Edmonton, during high water, in June that river was flowing 186,600 cubic feet per second, which is a vast volume of water. In that same month the South Saskatchewan was flowing at the rate of 86,000 cubic feet per second at Saskatoon. The low flow of the North Saskatchewan in that year was 700 cubic feet per second, with the South Saskatchewan down to about the same amount.

Our duty is to conserve that water and use it for the irrigation of crops in the west.

In addition to the two other journeys I have referred to, I was considering going to the old country to make a survey into business. I have been there many times, because business is my middle name. I knew that we were considering granting $750,000,000 to help create business over there. I voted for that, and I was in agreement with it. I look upon it as an investment, as an insurance. But I said to myself: That is all very fine, but why should we not spend a few hundred millions in the west to create a home market that would be within our own boundaries? If we could build up the production of farmers, they would make something and be in position to buy from the manufacturers of Canada.

One morning on the way to the house, I believe the second day after the house prorogued, I happened to look at the monument which has been erected just southeast of the east block to the memory of Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and there flashed through my mind what he said when he opened the Saint Andrews locks on the Red River on July 14, 1910. He addressed a great concourse

[Mr. MacNicol.]

of people, and I can picture him—a handsome man, with a noble countenance and a fine head of hair. Remembering what he had said I reflected that at the time, he did not see the 2,000 people who were in front of him; he was looking away beyond them, beyond that great body of water which is one of our most splendid lakes—lake Winnipeg. Few people have any conception of its size. It is about 9,400 square miles in area, almost one-third larger than lake Ontario and only a few hundred square miles smaller than lake Erie. It is next to Great Slave and Great Bear lakes, purely Canadian lakes. I could see him looking down that great lake and saying: This is only the first step in a great vision of transportation right up to the foot of the Rocky mountains. I am not quoting his exact words. He told those people he could see ships coming down 900 miles from Edmonton to that great lake and then right up to the city of Winnipeg. Later I read that he had had the vision to predict something with which I heartily agree and which I hope some day will be carried out. He said that he could see the same boats going up the Winnipeg river to the lake of the Woods along Rainy river, across Rainy lake and then by some means or other to Port Arthur and Fort William.

From 1910 up to the present time all that has been done to carry out that great vision of the then prime minister of this country was a little bit of work done, I believe by Hon. Robert Rogers in 1913. In cooperation with the city of Prince Albert a lock was built in the Prince Albert dam at a point twenty-six miles down the river from the city. That is all that has been done to conserve those waters in the great west. My hon. leader, when premier of Manitoba, projected a grand scheme of damming the Saskatchewan at the east end of Cedar lake and then taking the water through lake Winnipegosis, thence on through lake Manitoba, through lake St. Martin and then drop into lake Winnipeg, one hundred miles south of Grand Rapids. That project has this wonderful advantage, that at the point of the drop into lake Winnipeg, 500,000 horse-power could be developed. If the Manitoba government wished to sell that power to anyone who would complete the project, there are plenty of financiers who would say: We will complete it if you will allow us the power. But I believe that large blocks of power like that should belong to the government.

These suggestions have been made in past years, and now we must have action. What I am trying to do now is to encourage the minister, who this year has put into the estim-

ates a vote of $10,000,000. I should like to see a similar vote put in the estimates for each of the next nine years; make it a ten-year programme of spending $10,000,000 a year, or $100,000,000 in the ten years. I do not say that I want to see the minister there that long, sir, but whoever the minister might happen to be would carry out any plans instituted now. Such a ten-year programme would enable us to complete this project for the conservation of water and the construction of irrigation works. That amount would not, of course, create power to the extent that it could be created, nor permit of the canalization of the two branches of the river. That would take much more money, but it is one which should be carried out. Perhaps that will be a project for the future.

We have some fine examples of what can be done. What did the late great president of the United States, President Roosevelt, do in 1933? From his boyhood he had heard of the possibilities of conservation of the waters of the Tennessee river, just as the western members must have heard from their boyhood of plans to conserve western waters which have never been carried out. The conservation of the waters of the Tennessee river was first projected in 1807. After President Roosevelt took office he said, in 1933, that that was long enough to wait, and he went ahead, and in twelve years had revolutionized the economy of seven states. He canalized that great river. built nine large dams on the main river, as well as many other dams, and to-day they have a navigable route from Paducah at the mouth of the river right up to Knoxville, 650 miles away. Last year that river transported 150,000,000 ton-miles of freight. What has been accomplished down there is stupendous. They produced from that river the greatest single aggregation of power, not in any one place, but from any one river that is to be found the world over, developing from three and a half million to four million horsepower. What that has done to restore the economy of all the cities in that river valley is something the whole world can be proud of. We can do the same thing in the Saskatchewan river valley. When I think of what those people out there in our westren country have endured I am almost ashamed that in the past I did not take the part that I am taking now. I am not going to let up now; I am going to keep at it until I see this thing finished—the restoration of the economy of the west. I know it can be done—and all these projects are self-liquidating.

I have made a careful survey of irrigation in many states, covering many thousands of miles. If any one goes out to the west and crosses the international boundary line into the United States and goes through Montana, Idaho, the valley of California, Arizona, Utah, and part of Oregon, what will you see? You will see the marvellous transformation that has been brought about in the last fifteen years. They reclaimed 3,000,000 acres of land from the dried-out desert, so dry that it would not even grow cactus, and you never saw such bountiful production as you can see there to-day. In Idaho they have land producing 750 bags of potatoes to the acre and 1,000 bags of onions, and all the other crops are in proportion. We can do the same thing in Alberta and Saskatchewan if only we give our land water; and we can give it water, because the Saskatchewan river, if conserved, will provide all the water that the west can use in all the projects that we have in mind, and will provide irrigation, power, navigation and anything else that will help to make that country grow.

Let me show you how the people in the east will profit from the carrying out of this project—because I cannot separate it from the east. The east must come forward, its business men, its bankers and financial men because the east will receive just as much in the way of returns, Mr. Speaker, as will the western farmers. The western states, from those 3,000,000 acres of reclaimed land, produced $400,000,000 of products for the states themselves, and in addition vast sums of money were obtained through processing those products and sending them to the east. Every year there went to the east $200,000,000 worth of orders for manufactured products. That is how the east will benefit if we reclaim these 3,000,000 acres in our Canadian west, and so the eastern manufacturer and the eastern banker will get their return just the same as the western farmer. We want unity in Canada, which we all love, and there is nothing that would do so much to bring about unity in this country as carrying out this project. I often used to sit in this house and listen to the western members advocating such projects in past years. None of them are here to-day, except perhaps the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine). They advocated them then, and I did not seem to know enough to understand it. But I understand now, sir, from much travel in the west. I know what the reclamation of that land would mean, what magnificent returns there would be all along the line, what a bountiful thing it would be for all of Canada, and not merely for western economy. This whole project has been a football long enough. I have read everything that I could on it—from Dan to Beersheba, I was going to say, but that would hardly be appropriate.

Mr. COLDWELL: From Genesis to Revelations.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, and I find that back in 1804 the XY company, a fur company, which had branches in the west long before there was any settlement at all, wrote to their principals that the west would never come into its own until water from the South Saskatchewan river was sent over the dried-out parts of the prairies. The father of the late General McDonald, of the pension board until his death a few years ago, was a Hudson's Bay factor at what was then Fort Ellice, at the junction of the Assiniboine and Qu'Appelle rivers. Away back in 1854 he recommended such a project, and from that day to this all that I have been able to read of engineers' reports has recommended the same thing. In heaven's name when are we going to carry out some of these things?

I know that the minister is having a survey made on the South Saskatchewan river to find a place to build a dam, and I give him credit for it. Of course you have to have something solid on which to build a dam. I presume that the minister has not yet received a report from his engineers that they have found a solid place somewhere near Riverhurst. But they will find it, and if they do not find it they can build dams as was done on the Tennessee, with bases half a mile wide and with the regular core that the engineers use. I understand that dam sites have been found at two other places. I have here a core taken from the bottom of the St. Mary's river, and I am glad to say that I have had word lately that they are now about ready to call for tenders for the building of that dam. The building of a dam on the St. Mary's would mean the reclamation of 300,000 acres south of the Saskatchewan river. I have also a core obtained from the Red Deer. Near Buffalo lake a great dam could be built, which would mean the reclamation of 500,000 acres between Buffalo lake and Stettler on the north and Hanna and Youngstown and Acadia on the south. There is no reason why a project could not be undertaken immediately across the Bow river to reclaim all that area of Redcliff, Ronalane and Medicine Hat.

This winter I made an examination of that district, even in the midst of the snow, and that would mean another 300,000 acres. From Saskatoon west to Rosetown, and further down to Kindersley, there is an area of another 1,000,000 acres waiting to be reclaimed, if we can get the dam site on the South Saskatchewan river; and there are 1,000,000 acres east of the South Saskatchewan river as far as Estevan.

Here is a programme which the minister, I submit, ought to carry out to the full. I am prepared to encourage him with all the strength I have. I would support him in this effort to put through a $10,000,000 vote this year, and I would suggest that he come back next year, if he is still minister, and ask for another ten millions, and another the year after that. As long as he is minister he should ask for ten millions every year until we get the whole project completed so that we may reclaim the dried-out areas in the prairie provinces and restore the economy of the people there, and give them that chance to which they are entitled. They were put there on lands by the government—not by this government particularly, but by all governments—and they have been trying to eke out an existence on land that does not always produce a crop.

I should like to read a few words written by that distinguished man, Mr. R. O. Sweezey, with regard to the western projects and their importance. If I might be allowed to put it on *Hansard* without reading it, it would save time.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman has the unanimous consent of the house, there is no objection.

Mr. GLEN: Agreed.

Mr. MacNICOL: With the consent of the house I will hand it to *Hansard:*

There is an area of some thirty million acres of farm land comprised within the southern parts of the three prairie provinces which is subject to such adverse conditions, caused by lack of moisture, that when sown to wheat the chances are proven to be about four to one against the farmer reaping better than one-half the crop that his labour and the quality of his land would entitle him to. Frequently he loses an entire year through complete crop failure. With wheat he has an occasional bit of luck, but it is rarely more than a bit, and, because of the arid conditions, experience shows that wheat is the only product that may in a measure survive a season's distressful drought. Too often, though, the failure has been complete, and so the mental anguish and human distress has been piling up to the breaking point. At one time the ground water level was higher, and it often sufficed to bring a crop to maturity. But the gradual lowering of the ground water level since the first breaking of the sod is responsible for the growing severity that has led to what now constitutes an utterly intolerable situation.

The problem is now a national one, and bids fair to be calamitous unless responsibility and leadership is assumed by someone for the purpose of applying the obvious remedies of simple engineering practice. Unfortunately, however, economists, financial experts and political scientists have not been keeping pace with the progress of engineering and science. So, when a large, though simple, project of this nature looms up, it is usually procrastinated to its doom.

Saving the losses from one or two years would easily provide all the means for remedial works to permanently cure the evil. From a financial viewpoint it would be the most profitable project ever attempted in this country. As a self-liquidating enterprise it merits the most attentive study of statesmen. Private capital is ready and willing to assume responsibility for rescuing the western prairies from their heart-breaking losses.

There is one other item that I would refer to, Mr. Speaker, and it is of such vital and transcendant importance that I would hesitate to omit it. I refer to the water supply of Moose Jaw and Regina, two beautiful cities. I have here some clippings from the Regina *Leader Post* and the *Times* of Moose Jaw. I will read only one item, though I could quote extensively to the same effect, because there are a number of items of the same purport. Under date March 5, 1946 there appeared the following item:

At noon yesterday there were three feet ten inches of water in the reservoir representing 190,000 gallons.

That is only one out of many items indicating the same thing. Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that we in this House of Commons, all of us without exception, stand condemned unless we do our utmost to give to the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina the means of defence against fire. We all saw recently what happened across the river here in Hull, when that woodpile was burning. It contained only 16,000 cords of pulpwood, and yet what a flame it made. How much water do you think was required to put it out? Yesterday I was talking to the chief engineer of the Hull fire department, Mr. Lanctot, and I wish to congratulate him and all his captains and the men serving under him on the wonderful job they did in saving the paper mill over there. I did not believe it was possible; but to do it they had to pour 62,000,000 gallons of water on that fire.

What would happen in Moose Jaw to-day with less than a million and a half gallons and Regina with less than five million gallons per day? They have no water to spare. Their plight would be tragic. We will stand in the light of public condemnation unless we make every effort to see that this dam is built on the south Saskatchewan river in order to provide the people of those cities with the water they so badly need. I hate to think what would happen if a fire one-tenth the size of the Hull fire started at the west end of Moose Jaw or the west end of Regina, with a wind blowing from the west. What do you think would happen to those two fine cities?

As a member of this house I would hold myself condemned unless I raised my voice and did my part to encourage the minister and to support him in any measure that is required to speed up the construction of the dam on the South Saskatchewan river near Riverhurst. The work should be proceeded with as rapidly as possible so as to provide the people of those two prairie cities with an ample water supply, apart from irrigation.

When I was in Moose Jaw I visited different factories, and I was greatly interested in one that was operated by a man from Czechoslovakia, I believe. In that factory they were making glucose from wheat, and that is something that the west is just built for. The gentleman who was with me was from the waterworks department of Moose Jaw and he told the proprietor that he would have to cut down on his use of water. The proprietor assured him that as it was he could not get enough water to fill the orders he had. When I heard that, I felt that I too would be condemned if I did not bring this matter up in the house. Those people have an opportunity to run ten factories instead of one, producing something that Canada needs. Their product is shipped east, and my good friend who represents London tells me that he buys a good deal of it himself. I want to do everything I can to stir up this house and the west, as well as the financial and business men of the east, so that we may all get behind the government and help the minister to carry through a project which will conserve water all along the Saskatchewan river, to reforest the foothills of the rockies, and to assist the Alberta government in preventing further fires. I would feel like reproaching myself if I did not speak as I am doing this afternoon.

I am going to put a map in each member's post office box. It is a composite map which I drew myself. In this connection I should like to say a word about Major Duncan Stuart, K.C., a wonderful old man who is well known to my hon. friend the member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith). I take off my hat to him, because I found his map helpful. The same can be said of his articles on irrigation. In these articles he points out, as I have pointed out, that the whole programme is self-liquidating. Although it might cost $200 millions to complete the whole job in reality it would not cost the country a single dollar, because every dollar would be returned in crops alone apart from power. Then later on there would be taxes coming in. This is a permanent programme. It is not a programme where we put money in and never get it back. It is not that kind of

programme; it is a Canada programme, a Canadian market programme, a self-liquidating programme giving thousands and thousands of jobs. Moreover it will create forty thousand new farms and provide orders for the equipment for those new farms. There will be about eighty irrigated acres to the farm.

One only has to go into southern Alberta, where we have a little irrigation, to see the wonderful results that can be obtained. I think of the fine city of Lethbridge, which went over the top in the three last victory loans, first in all Canada. Why? Because round about they have about 600,000 acres of irrigated land, taking in Taber, Cardston and Raymond and many other fine villages and towns. There is nothing that will give the same returns as a programme of this kind, and in the long run it will not cost the country a dollar.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The resolution which is being discussed will be replied to by the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen) in so far as the government is concerned, as it relates to work which has been previously suggested in his department. But there were some remarks made with regard to Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act work about which I should like to say a few words before leaving the house to meet a delegation.

The suggestion has been made that something ought to be done to locate the dam site on the South Saskatchewan river. If hon. members will examine the estimates they will find that there is an item there which makes it possible for P.F.R.A. to take funds which are being provided by the reconstruction department—there is a ten million dollar vote—sufficient funds to do all the survey and engineering work necessary for the promotion of the Red Deer river diversion, the irrigation work in the vicinity of Medicine Hat, the location of the dam site on the South Saskatchewan river, and any other survey work necessary to the determination of the areas that can be irrigated. All of that is now provided for in the estimates, and engineering investigations will be made or continued during the coming summer.

Much of the information necessary to the doing of this work has been in our records for some considerable time. It is now seven or eight years since we started making these investigations, and most of the important engineering work associated with it has already been done. What we are really doing at the present time is having that work checked by an efficient engineer who has been recommended to the department by the Department of Reconstruction. He is a gentleman by the name of Ferguson, who is now operating in the west. He has examined into the engineering work done by P.F.R.A. in connection with the St. Mary dam. My information is that he has reported favourably on that work, and has few recommendations to make of changes that might be made in the work actually done by our engineers. But it is thought important to have all the work done up to date on these other projects checked over by this same engineer, and then if possible to have further work done during this summer.

I do not know whether it will be possible to do any actual construction work so far as the last three named projects are concerned, but there is $750,000 in the estimates in relation to the St. Mary dam. That amount may be voted this year with which to proceed with the construction work there.

The main part of the work which is being undertaken at present is the tunnelling from one dam to another. I understand there are three dams in the project, and there has to be a tunnel associated with each of them. Contracts are being called for that work.

Mr. MacNICOL: I understand the tunnel is to let the river run by where they are building the main dam.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes; that tunnelling is now being done, or the contract is now being let for that work to be done, and there is money in the estimates for carrying it out. I just wanted to draw attention to these facts in order that the discussion might proceed with that in mind.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I am glad to hear the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) say that some work has been going on for the last seven or eight years. I think that is true, but I rose particularly to support the resolution of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol). Had I been drawing the resolution I might have drawn it in slightly different terms, but its intent is such that I think every hon. member of the house can support it. I and those associated with me—and I have no doubt that I am speaking now for others who come from western Canada—are very pleased that the hon. member for Davenport, representing as he does a city constituency in eastern Canada, has felt it incumbent upon himself to bring this matter up in the house at this time.

As the hon. member said in the course of his remarks, the question has been discussed in the house on many occasions in the past,

but without a great deal of success. We understand, of course, that action in these matters, involving, as they do in the final analysis, probably several hundred million dollars, takes some time, particularly when it appears that only one area of the country is interested. But the hon. member placed another complexion upon it this afternoon; he has shown clearly that to undertake work of this kind is in the interest not only of the prairie provinces but of the whole economy of Canada, and that upon the prosperity of that great area which we call the prairies depends in no small measure the prosperity of the great industrial centres of all of Canada.

I was interested when the hon. member told us about the various projects that he has visited in the United States, because over the last twenty years I myself have had the privilege of seeing many of them. In 1938, driving back from Los Angeles to Ottawa in the autumn of the year, I stayed in a little town called Needles in Arizona. I was told that there were twenty-seven motorboats in that little town—twenty-seven motorboats in the middle of the desert. The nearest water, except for the dried out Colorado river, was some 130 or 140 miles away. I was told that when the dam 120 or 130 miles south of the little town of Needles, Arizona, was completed, there would be a lake extending all the way to this town, which would be a little port and the motorboats could then be used. The same thing occurred in Montana. I visited Fort Peck before the dam was completed in Montana. I was told that a lake would be made on the Missouri river which would have a shoreline—I am speaking from memory now—of 1,628 miles. From that scheme, which was mainly a power and flood control project, there could be irrigated a great deal of land.

I have seen the developments in the state of Washington, where they proposed to use the water from Coulee dam so that it would flow once more through the Dry Falls and irrigate an area which was, when I saw it, nothing but an arid, barren desert with a little sage bush on it. I remember being told that 200,000 families would be established in that area in the state of Washington. One could mention the other great projects in the United States and elsewhere across the world; and when I think of the water which flows down the two Saskatchewans, which runs down the Red Deer river into the South Saskatchewan and into other rivers flowing south into Montana, I realize what we could do with that fertile land in the southern part of the prairie provinces if only we had that inch of water in June and that inch of water in July that would ensure always something of a crop over the irrigated area.

In 1938 I had the privilege of introducing into this house a resolution which was supported by the hon. member for Davenport. While it was debated, it was more or less brushed off. The expense was too great; the undertaking was too large, and after all, the rains would come again. I moved the following resolution:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should place before parliament at an early date plans, or proposals, for a comprehensive and authoritative survey of water conservation, irrigation possibilities, and other feasible projects for the permanent rehabilitation of the drought-stricken area of western Canada and its people.

Those of us who lived in that area then knew that the resolution placed before the house the need of the people at that time. It was a drought-stricken area. In 1938 the prairies were just emerging from the worst period in their history since the first settlement of the southern plains. I remember that in preparing to speak on the resolution I went into the library and gathered together everything I could find about the prairies in the days gone by. I remember reading the report of Captain Palliser, who made his trip through southern Saskatchewan and Alberta in 1858. I quoted from that report in 1938; I do not propose to quote from it now, but I recall that he spoke of the desolated plains and the desert cactus which grew in what is now southwestern Saskatchewan and southeastern Alberta, after he had left what he described as—and these are his exact words—"the creek where the bones lie." I have no doubt that "the creek where the bones lie" was the site of the city in which my hon. friend from Calgary west (Mr. Smith) was born, and in which I had the privilege of living for a good many years; that is, Regina, the capital of Saskatchewan. At that time Captain Palliser, as those of you who have read the report will remember, described all the country which lay west and south of the Qu'Appelle valley and the South Saskatchewan river as an arid plain where nothing grew. He spoke of a place he named The Elbow, where he met a band of Indians who warned him that if he was going in a southwesterly direction he had better take not only food for himself but fodder for the horses and even sticks with which to make fires, because he would find nothing in that country either to eat or to burn.

We saw something of that in the thirties. Not one of us who lived in western Canada

during that period will ever forget the misery of those ten years; the days when we drove over the prairies and could not see the radiator caps on our automobiles because of dust; when in the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw we drove with our headlights full on day after day in order that we might see in the darkness caused by the blowing of the topsoil of that rich prairie land. It is true, of course, that a remarkable comeback has been made in the last six or seven years. We had hoped this would occur, and it has occurred. But we know from the historic past that these prolonged droughts in western Canada are periodic. It is proved by history. If you cut down the trees and look at the rings, they tell the story of the periodic dry and wet years during the time of their growth, which is perhaps a hundred years or more in the case of the elm trees that grow in some of our valleys. We know that country is subject to periodic and devastating drought. What it has meant to the men and women of those plains no financial balance sheet can ever tell; the misery, the dread, the piling up of debt, the women living alone in prairie homes who day after day heard the winds blow and saw the dust sweeping by the house, with nothing growing on the land year after year. Many of them, and it cannot be wondered at, even lost their reason as a result of the conditions under which they lived. And in this country, east and west, we spent millions and millions of dollars in relief. I am not going to complain, because the people of eastern Canada came to the rescue of the people who lived on the plains. They sent us carloads of vegetables, of food and of clothing, and this parliament appropriated millions of dollars for the relief of man and beast. And when it was all over, after the low level of relief upon which people were compelled to live, what had Canada to show for what had been done? Nothing but a people who still hoped that the rains might come and the land might once again be productive.

As the hon. member for Davenport has said, the cause of the drought in western Canada can be explained in only one way, the lack of moisture in the soil. Yet when that lack of moisture was clearly before us and the rains were scant or came not at all, millions and millions of gallons of water were flowing through those plains in the various rivers, which might have been utilized to relieve at least in part the tragic conditions with which we were confronted. And let us remember that in a period of drought the dry soil blows, and wind erosion is added to the disastrous consequences of the lack of moisture. I remember a constituent of mine writing to me in 1937; I have the letter in my office even now. He lived quite close to the South Saskatchewan river, near Saskatchewan Landing, just north of Swift Current. He said, "I have been sitting to-day on the bank of the Saskatchewan. All the valley up from the Landing, through Kyle and Tuberose right up to Elrose and Rosetown, is a scene of devastation; nothing grows. Yet to-day I see the Saskatchewan river in flood." That was in July, the flood period. He went on to say, "The river is lower than it sometimes is at this period, yet millions of gallons of water are going by which might be used to relieve the drought on the farms of this locality."

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Like the hon. member for Davenport, at that time I discussed irrigation with the best engineers I knew. I went carefully over the contour maps of the dried out area, and as a layman I would say that widespread irrigation does not present insuperable difficulties, particularly on the northern side of the Missouri-Coteau divide, which of course is in part the southern side or Canadian base of the Palliser triangle. As we have been told this afternoon, the problem is the conservation of waters in the rivers which flow together and form the South Saskatchewan river—that is, the Red Deer and the other tributaries—and the impounding of that water in a series of dams in the deep river valleys or in the mountains. I believe, as my hon. friend says, that the impounding of water near Riverhurst and the utilization of that water by the building of channels along natural lines of flow, as the contour maps indicate, would carry water down to Moose Jaw and Regina—yes, and even beyond Moose Jaw and Regina, down to the Souris river near Weyburn and into the Souris river valley right through Estevan and beyond. The contour maps clearly indicate that this is not an insoluble problem; it can be done. I believe the physical difficulties can be overcome. Of course, as my hon. friend has said, a by-product of an irrigation project of this description would be the generating of comparatively cheap power, which could be used for the rural electrification so badly needed in the western provinces, where there is so little of it.

Many people conceive of irrigation channels as long straight cuts, like a chess-board. But that is not what irrigation might be. As I suggest, it might follow the natural channels and contour. There are depressions running north and south, east and west, through which water might be channelled. While I appreciate what the Minister of Agriculture and the government have done in connection with the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act—and if I may say so, as a westerner, I believe

one of the best projects ever undertaken by a government in Canada was that which is called the P.F.R.A. project—still, they have not been extensive enough. There are still a good many coulees, still a good many valleys, which could be dammed to conserve the spring run-off. They would carry not only the water from the rivers, but the run-offs from the land after the winter snows have melted. For instance, we had a large quantity of snow in the prairie provinces this winter. This spring, when the snow melted, it ran down the coulees, found the channels, and away it went to the rivers and out to the sea. Those coulees might be dammed and the water conserved so that at least farms in the neighbourhood would have hay and be able to grow vegetables. In the event of a dry season they would at least have something upon which they could rely for food, both for man and for beast.

I have been told by engineers that with proper conservation in the mountains, and with appropriate dams placed at intervals on the South Saskatchewan from where the Red Deer joins it in Alberta, to a point south of Saskatoon, sufficient water could be impounded to give needed moisture to a very large area of central and southern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta. I say of course that I have been told this. I do not profess to be an expert in irrigation or in engineering. Every man to his own trade. But I believe that a thorough investigation by those who are competent to make an appraisal would indicate that a great deal can be done in this regard.

I have always been in favour of a really authoritative and comprehensive survey of these irrigation possibilities. I have heard the objection raised that a project of this description would cost hundreds of millions of dollars. I noticed that this afternoon the hon. member for Davenport mentioned $100 million. Well, what is $100 million, after all? We spent more than $100 million on the very low relief levels upon which we maintained people in western Canada during those eight or nine years of terrible drought. We spent more than that. The highest estimate I have heard for damming the rivers in the mountains and for making the necessary channels to convey the water here and there, to build conservation dams and undertake a comprehensive irrigation project for the whole of the southern prairie provinces is $400 million. Yes, $400 million is a lot of money. But let me point out that it is less than we spent in one month for the prosecution of the war.

That large amount of money was only one month's war expenditures—and I am purposely citing the largest figure I have heard mentioned, because I do not think that amount of money would have to be expended. Let me emphasize the fact that to ensure life and opportunity in a vast area of this country an amount less than one month's war expenditures might be required. When we realize that this expenditure would make a great country permanently productive and give possibilities of increased prosperity, not only to the people who inhabit that country but to the whole of the Dominion of Canada, we can see that the amount involved is relatively small. As I have already said, during the years of drought, when the rains failed to come to us in western Canada, we spent from a quarter to a half that amount in unproductive relief.

Inevitably, from the history of the country as we know it, droughts will come again, and they may even be more prolonged than the one we experienced between 1930 and 1940. The Indians who have inhabited the plains throughout the years talk about lakes being dried up, although they are not now dried up. In the constituency of the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) is a body of water known as Long Lake. Long ago I was told by the Indians that seventy or eighty years ago, when they were children, Long Lake was so dry that they could drive across it in a wagon. Consequently we know that there can be even more prolonged droughts than those which we have experienced.

The hon. member for Davenport has mentioned what irrigation has brought to one part of the prairies. Those of us who have seen the irrigation in southern Alberta, around Lethbridge, realize the truth of the statement that is has done much for that country. One day a year ago last July I was in Medicine Hat. It was a hot day, and very dry. A friend of mine was to drive me to Lethbridge. We drove from Medicine Hat across a scorched plain, where the oats and wheat, standing five or six inches high, and headed out, were dry and dead. Then, all of a sudden, the wind being from the west, we could smell the odour of vegetation; and when we arrived at Taber, Alberta, the limit of the irrigation project, we passed into a country which was a veritable paradise. The corn was standing high and green, the grain waving in the wind, acres and acres of sugar beets—land that was a picture not only of beauty but of productivity. And all this because there was water: water which the other parts of the prairies with exactly the same kind of soil—just as productive, if given the opportunity, but without that one essential—did not have. And when we got to where there was water,

brought in by the cunning and ingenuity of man, we saw how productive that soil really could be.

We do not need to go to the Sudan; we do not need to go to India; we do not need to go to the places that have been mentioned—Arizona, Montana, or Washington; we do not need to go to any of those places to see what water does for what would otherwise be an arid area. All we have to do is to take a drive into southern Alberta during a hot dry summer, and we can see in our own country how prairie land has been transformed under irrigation.

This party to which I belong has always urged these irrigation projects, both provincially and federally. As my hon. friend has said, navigable waters are under the control of the federal authorities. As my hon. friend said also, the people who settled in these areas were settled there by the authority of the parliament of Canada. As far as southwestern Saskatchewan and southeastern Alberta are concerned, I can remember that there was strong opposition from persons who were living in those areas and who knew that without irrigation people who went in there to settle would be doomed to disappointment in the days to come. Sir Frederick Haultain, the head of the territorial government of the northwest territories until the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were formed, warned against the possibilities of drought. Many others, including myself, did not accept the reasons given by the ranchers in the Medicine Hat area for opposing the settlement of that land. We were under the impression that the ranchers were a little selfish, that they were trying to keep the land from settlement in order to retain their ranching leases. But time has proved that they were right and we were wrong, that the settlement of that country was ill-advised from the point of view of agriculture.

It is true there was a good crop in that area in 1915 and another in 1942, with a few fair crops in between. But without irrigation, much of that Medicine Hat and Swift Current country, as well as other parts of the country between there and Moose Jaw and Regina and to the south, cannot be made productive year after year. Ways and means must first be found of getting moisture to the land. As I said, we have always been in favour of it. In February, 1938, I moved a resolution in this house, and at the same time the C.C.F. group in the legislature at Regina moved the following resolution:

That this assembly respectifully request the federal government to set aside an appropriation of at least $50,000,000 this year, to be used in investigation and completion of feasible water conservation, irrigation and other projects, directed towards the permanent rehabilitation of the drought area of this province.

That was not a partisan resolution. None of these resolutions were partisan. At that time the government in power in Saskatchewan was a Liberal government. While they did not approve the amount suggested in the resolution, and amended it, the amended resolution which called for a study of irrigation projects in that part of Canada was passed unanimously. The matter transcends the needs of the various provinces. It is the responsibility of all Canada. It is a work of importance to the whole of our country.

I do not want to prolong the discussion, because many hon. members who come from other parts of the prairie land as well as other parts of Canada will wish to participate in the debate. A few days ago we were discussing immigration. Whatever we may think of immigration, whether we believe in wholesale immigration, as some do and as I do not, whether we believe in planned immigration, by which people would be brought in and settled where they should be settled under proper conditions, where they can be given the opportunities they should be given; whether we believe that they should not be brought in in indigestible numbers, the fact remains that there is room for many thousands of people in this country. I cannot think of any part of Canada which offers greater possibility of better homes, better climate and better living conditions than the prairie land, provided a certain amount of stability is assured in the production of crops. Give the prairie land moisture, and the prairie land will produce crops.

The other day I looked up the debates of 1938 and I found that at that time some took the view that if we irrigated we would increase our production so tremendously that we would not be able to find markets. We already had surpluses on our hands, in spite of the drought years through which we had been passing. All I can say is that it is a strange world where there is starvation or near starvation on almost every hand and yet the production of foodstuffs is discouraged.

I referred the other evening to the privilege I had had of being on the social economic council at San Francisco, when the nations of the world obligated themselves to see to it that as far as possible everybody every day in the year should have an opportunity of eating a decent meal. There ought never to be a fear of overproduction in our country. We do have great crops, and perhaps sometimes we cannot

find immediate export markets, but any surplus should be regarded as a reserve against the time when crops may fail.

I speak not only for myself but those in this party with whom I am associated when I say that we are in favour of a comprehensive investigation into the possibilities, not merely of a series of small irrigation projects but of a comprehensive irrigation project to make the prairie land productive year after year and to guarantee to the people who live there the opportunity of producing from their labours year after year, indeed an opportunity for this country to become more prosperous than it has been in the past.

We support the idea behind the resolution of the hon. member for Davenport. We are grateful that he has introduced this resolution. He sits for an eastern constituency, and perhaps is thus able to render greater service to the area we are discussing than those of us can who have been introducing such resolutions in the past, for he can have no selfish interest in the matter.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) on the campaign he has consistently waged in this country in the interests of water conservation and irrigation in western Canada. The work he has done in the past and the work he is doing to-day is greatly appreciated by all the people in western Canada. I am sure all the people in the west will appreciate the importance of the resolution he has submitted to this house, which reads in part:

> . . . to conduct investigations and make studies of the most feasible and economic means for the conservation and utilization of the eastern watershed of the Rocky mountains, particularly the watershed of the Saskatchewan river.

Forest fires and logging operations have caused a great deal of devastation on this watershed. The task of conserving this watershed in the past has been largely the responsibility of Alberta, but of course it is too large a job for any one province. It is a large job; it is a costly job. The whole dominion is vitally interested in seeing that this work is carried out efficiently, because the waters from the watershed flow not merely through Alberta but down through Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and these provinces will need every drop of water that can be conserved in those rivers for irrigation, stock watering, power development and human consumption in the future.

Again, eastern Canada has a direct interest in that work being carried out because, when the west prospers, eastern Canada benefits by an expansion of markets and sales in the west. In this house we have heard a great deal about the St. Mary's river project, the development at Medicine Hat, and certain developments from rivers in Saskatchewan—all worth-while projects; but we have not heard very much about the utilization of waters from this watershed in the east central part of Alberta, and I should like to speak of this for a few moments.

I think most members of the house remember that great engineer by the name of William Pearce and his great scheme for that area, mainly for the purposes of stock watering. Under that project it would have been possible to water between 17,000,000 and 18,000,000 acres. I do not mean by that irrigation, but it would have brought water to pasture lands of that acreage. In 1922-23, government engineers made a survey based upon the William Pearce project and as a result of this survey a scheme was developed known as the North Saskatchewan irrigation project, which would have irrigated approximately 1,000,000 acres in Saskatchewan and 500,000 acres in Alberta. The cost would have been around $100,000,000. The essential difference between the William Pearce project and the North Saskatchewan project was that the William Pearce scheme was a stock watering project, while the North Saskatchewan was an irrigation project. The mechanics of the two were very similar. They both proposed to divert water from the North Saskatchewan river and the Clearwater river down Raven river into the Red Deer river and to place a dam about fifty feet high below the junction with the Red Deer. Then it would have been possible to divert water by gravity from that dam through a canal 146 miles long to Sullivan lake, which would have provided a storage of 1,500,000 acre feet. From Sullivan lake it would have been possible to irrigate 500,000 acres, and water would also have been carried by a gravity canal and by natural waterways, namely, Sounding creek and Eyehill creek to Tramping lake in Saskatchewan, and from Tramping lake 1,000,000 acres could have been irrigated. However, that project was by many people considered impracticable, mainly because there would have been a heavy seepage of water and heavy evaporation from Sullivan lake to Tramping lake because of the sandy nature of the soil.

Another thing that weighed against the project was its actual size. It was a large one costing $100,000,000. During the war that

did not sound very much, but in those days it appeared to be an astronomical figure, and unfortunately there is a tendency now in some places to revert to those pre-war ideas on questions of expenditure.

Many additional surveys have been made since that time. A number of surveys were made from 1938 to 1940 by P.F.R.A. engineers, and I pay tribute to the fine work they have done in conducting these surveys and surveys for smaller projects. The surveys made from 1938 to 1940 were surveys with a view to providing not merely for irrigation but for power development purposes. The cost of irrigation would have been considerably higher under those projects because it was proposed to pump the water instead of having it moved by gravity. They also proposed to obtain power from the Calgary Power Company at a time when they were pumping water heavily and to make the power available to the Calgary Power Company in winter time.

As a result of all these surveys and the promises made, particularly at election time, it was only natural that the people in that area became very much interested in irrigation, and a great deal of pressure has been exerted from time to time on the government to start work on one of these projects. The people in that area are hoping that the government will finally decide which project would be of greatest advantage to the people and start construction thereon immediately. However, a good deal of opposition developed to the idea of diverting water from the North Saskatchewan and the Clearwater rivers into the Red Deer river, because it was felt that the water might be needed lower down the river in Saskatchewan, and therefore new surveys were made of a project which would irrigate a limited number of acres in Alberta, utilizing the waters of the Red Deer river alone, instead of diverting the water from the North Saskatchewan river.

A brief outline of the new scheme known as the Red Deer diversion project, which was referred to by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) this afternoon, is as follows: It is proposed to place a dam on the Red Deer river just above the content bridge and build up the water to a height of 150 feet. That dam would be approximately thirty miles east of the town of Red Deer. Then by gravity canal the water would be carried to Hamilton lake, which is at a lower level than Sullivan lake, a distance of from sixty-five to seventy miles. At Hamilton lake it would be possible to provide a maximum storage of 380,000 acre feet, and additional storage could be provided in a number of lakes surrounding Hamilton lake, one of them being Kirkpatrick lake. From these reservoirs it is proposed to irrigate about half a million acres. Actually in that area there are over 900,000 acres that could be irrigated, but the waters from the Red Deer river will only be sufficient to irrigate half a million acres. If, later on, it was possible to use waters from the North Saskatchewan river, using 2,000 cubic feet per second, it would be possible to irrigate another 400,000 acres. But that is not included in the scheme. The Red Deer river diversion provides only for the irrigation of half a million acres, using the waters of the Red Deer river alone. Under this scheme 1,200 miles of waterways could be re-watered, and on the basis that range lands benefit for a distance of three miles from live water, 8,000,000 acres of pasture land would be available under this scheme.

Some of the main advantages of the Red Deer river diversion scheme over other schemes are as follows. In the first place it is the most northerly scheme of its size to be found anywhere in the world, and for that reason there would be less evaporation than there would be on other projects farther south; also the water is carried by gravity, which costs considerably less than pumping the water. Perhaps one of the most important factors in this scheme is that substantial services have already been established in that area, and therefore it would be better to go ahead with it than with projects in some new district where there are no such services. We have in that area two railways, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National, running east and west, and with branch lines running north and south; we have two main highways running east and west, and two highways running north and south; substantial telephone service has also been established, and there are five hospitals in that area. The question of population throughout that area is a tragic one, and in that connection I should like to read from a report tabled in this house on September 10 of last year from P.F.R.A., which has this to say regarding the Red Deer river diversion scheme.

It will provide settlement, permanent homes and means of livelihood for 7,500 families in a section of western Canada from which over 90 per cent of the original settlers were forced by drought; it resettles an area now practically depopulated; the area will support between 30,000 and 40,000 people. It will provide irrigation for approximately 500,000 acres of land suitable for irrigation. This land is not now in production and is largely publicly-owned. It will rehabilitate 24 urban communities now practically depopulated from the years of drought.

Then regarding labour requirements:

Estimated labour requirements: The actual construction of the works will employ 1,500 men steadily for eighteen months. This does not include indirect labour required in the preparation of materials, cement, lumber, equipment and miscellaneous supplies, nor that required in servicing the purchasing power of these men and their families.

The area to which I have referred lies within a square of approximately 7,000 square miles. It is bounded on the south by the Red Deer river, on the east by the Saskatchewan boundary, on the north by a line running east and west through the town of Castor, south of township 38, and on the west by a line running north and south through the town of Hanna in range 14. This area was settled chiefly between the years 1909 and 1918. Settlement at that time was encouraged by colonization companies, railway companies and certain government officials, and that encouragement was given in spite of the fact that the government had been warned time and again by prominent engineers that that land was not suitable for settlement.

For instance, reference has been made to Captain Palliser, who, in 1860, warned that a certain area within the so-called Palliser triangle was not suitable for settlement. It is true that a great deal of the land in that triangle has proved satisfactory, but on the other hand the record of the land lying in the south central part of the triangle fully substantiates the warnings issued by Captain Palliser at that time. That includes the area to which I am referring to-day.

In addition to Palliser, we had warnings from a number of men such as Doctor Hector, Professor John Macoun and Professor James Mavor. Warnings were issued from time to time by various engineers and surveyors who had been working through that area from 1870 on until the time of settlement in 1909.

The consequences of settlement in that area have been extremely tragic, as shown in the report from which I have just quoted, when it says that over ninety per cent of the population had to move out owing to drought. The effects of droughts were not as devastating in the earlier days of settlement because in the first place there were fairly heavy rains in 1915 and 1916, and unfortunately the crops grown during those two years encouraged more people to come in. Moreover, there was plenty of range land. The land had not been fenced and the farmers were able to run their stock on the open range instead of confining it to half-section areas such as they may have obtained from the dominion government. In addition to that, there was an almost unlimited amount of work available for the farmers, who could work on their land for a certain length of time and then go and work on the construction of branch railway lines that were being constructed at that time through those areas.

However, conditions changed rapidly. Continued drought and soil drifting made it impossible for many farmers to continue to farm their land, because as soon as they started to cultivate it the dry winds began to blow the land away. As soon as farmers fenced their farms off in half-section lots they found that, owing to the dryness of the land, it took over forty acres of pasture to feed one head of stock. Of course a man with 320 acres cannot carry many head of stock if the land can pasture only one head to forty acres. Eight head of stock would not provide a living for any man, so that these farmers could not make a living out of live stock when they had only 320 acres of dry land to pasture them on.

The situation that developed in that area is graphically illustrated in a report on the rehabilitation of the drought areas of Alberta, issued in 1935 by the Department of Agriculture. This shows what happened in that area during those years:

With the coming of the railways, settlement poured into the short grass plains. From 1911 onward, the rancher who had previously occupied this area was progressively crowded out, and by 1920 settlement was almost complete. Bumper crops and high prices in 1915 and 1916, had removed the last remaining misgivings on the part of those who were afraid of the short grass plains. Roads, telephones, schools, churches and social services of all kinds were demanded and provided—the whole superstructure, literally built on stalks of gold and wheat, in a foundation of shifting sand. Then came 1917, 1918, 1921 and 1922—drought, discouragement and despair—the covered wagon and the settler on the move again like wild geese in the spring going north. Another lease of life, good crops in 1926, 1927 and 1928—then drought again, followed by wholesale abandonment—40 per cent, 50 per cent, 60 per cent, and 80 per cent in some districts. The burden of taxation necessary to maintain necessary services bearing heavier and heavier on the settlers who remained. Finally it became difficult to operate schools, to maintain roads. Telephone lines were abandoned by the hundreds of miles. Life became more primitive and intolerable through lack of natural community life. Such is the history of the greater portion of Palliser's triangle—one of the greatest mistakes that national policy ever made.

As a consequence of so many farmers leaving that area, the rest of the farmers who remained were able to make a better living because they had more land upon which to run their stock, though I would again point out

that when it takes forty acres to pasture one head of stock a man would need to have from 2,000 to 3,000 acres to carry fifty or sixty head of stock if he wanted to make a decent living. As pointed out in that report, the history of the whole area has been a tragic one. People came to the district in their youth full of ambition and hope for the future, some with a small amount of capital, although, generally speaking, they did not bring much capital with them. They slaved and toiled for many years. They cleared the rocks away and broke the sod, only to see the land blow away in dust storms and the soil drifted up under the fences; and as they fenced their pastures and the grass was eaten down to the ground, the stock began to eat right down into the roots. The result was that even pasture land, never cultivated, started to drift, a thing which it is hard to imagine in areas where moisture is more abundant. Having fought these conditions for a number of years, as the report points out, over 90 per cent of these settlers moved out. They left the area, having lost in many cases their health, their ambition and whatever capital they may have had. Although a drive through that area to-day reveals a tragic picture, it is not as tragic as it would have been about ten years ago because then one would have seen many abandoned homesteads with windows boarded up, whereas to-day most of them have been torn down or taken away. The only evidence that at one time that land had been settled is furnished by the spectacle of rocks that have been cleared from the land and piled in rows, north and south and east and west, representing many long years of toil on the part of these farmers, who eventually had to move owing to the extreme drought.

I should like again to say how much the farmers who stayed in that area have been helped under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act and the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act. The Prairie Farm Assistance Act gave them a kind of drought relief and made it possible for them to exist. The Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act made it possible for them to store up water for their stock in dug-outs. Unfortunately, in that area the run-off from snow is so uncertain that in many years these dug-outs dry up and the farmers are not able to use the pasture that the dug-out is supposed to water. The construction of the Red Deer diversion scheme would change the whole picture. The pastures would be provided with water on a permanent basis. To a great extent irrigation would provide insurance against crop failure, and the farmers would be able to increase the size of their herds knowing full well that they would have the water to water them and the feed from the irrigated land to feed them in times of dry years.

The cost of getting the water from the Red Deer river to Hamilton lake would be $6,700,000. It would probably cost a similar amount to get the water from Hamilton lake on to the land. That work would be done by the provincial governments, the municipalities, and the federal government working together; but the cost of getting the water from the Red Deer to Hamilton lake should be borne by the federal government as a national undertaking because it is of direct benefit to the whole of the dominion of Canada. The financial cost of constructing this project would be small as compared with the losses incurred in the area since settlement. In the past, millions of dollars have been lost in that area, partly as a result of the heavy expenditures for drought relief, partly as a result of the loss of revenue due to crop failure and partly, of course, as a result of the loss of markets in so far as eastern Canada is concerned.

This afternoon the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) said that moneys will be made available for a number of these projects from vote No. 606 of $10,000,000. He included the Red Deer scheme, but he made it clear that this money is not for the purpose of starting construction on the projects but rather for cost of engineers' work in checking these surveys. I hope that it will be possible for the federal government actually to start construction work on this and other projects in western Canada at the earliest possible date. I know it is felt that the government should not start projects of this kind until unemployment increases. On the other hand, if the work could be carried out now, by the time the slump arrives, which most people fear may come in two or three years from now—and of which they were warned by the governor of the Bank of Canada—and if those projects were completed we would have available land for around thirty thousand people. These people would be on a self-sustaining basis. If, on the other hand, we wait until the slump comes along we can provide employment on this scheme for around 1,500 men. But if the job was completed we would have additional homesteads for around thirty thousand people. I do not think any time should be lost in starting to carry out the project at an early date.

This is just one example of the utilization of the waters from the watershed of the Saskatchewan river. I am strongly in favour, and this group strongly favours the conservation

and utilization of the watersheds of the Rocky mountains as suggested by the hon. member for Davenport.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): At the commencement may I pay my tribute to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) for the interest that he has taken over the years in western development. He is one of those members of parliament who have contributed much to the welfare of this country. To-day, after several years of advocating the necessity of irrigation and power development in western Canada, many who previously scoffed at the necessity of such works being undertaken are giving support to the ideas that have been his for all those years.

In the constituency of Lake Centre the attitude of the large majority of the people is one of high commendation and appreciation for the work and activities of the hon. member for Davenport.

May I first of all deal with the motion itself? The motion provides for a request to the government to take into immediate consideration the advisability of introducing legislation to set up a permanent interprovincial board or commission on which the three prairie provinces and the dominion would have equal representation. In other words, this resolution requests the government to set up a board or commission under the chairmanship of a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or some other qualified person, to conduct investigations and make studies of the most feasible and economic means for the conservation and utilization of the eastern watershed, and particularly the watershed of the Saskatchewan river.

I am one of those who support this resolution because of the necessity of something being done as provided for in the resolution, but at the same time I maintain the stand I have taken at all times, that judges ought not to serve on royal commissions. I am sure that this resolution will receive the support of members on all sides of the house. In point of fact, if this resolution were carried into effect it would implement the recommendations of the advisory committee on reconstruction, which made its final report on September 24, 1943, the report in question being one by a subcommittee on the conservation and development of natural resources. This subcommittee was set up to study the natural resources of Canada, particularly water and power, with a view to providing employment after the cessation of hostilities, and also for the purpose of recommending long-term policies necessary to safeguard these resources. The main resources which have to be safeguarded are the resources of water with a view to conserving moisture, developing power and assuring irrigation. I am going to refer to some portions of this report so that the minister in replying may be able to give to the house and to the country some information as to the extent to which the recommendations have been implemented.

On page 6 of the report the recommendation is made that:

> An early decision should be reached as to the sharing of costs as between federal and provincial authorities in implementing the policies herein recommended, or such as may be adopted. This can only be done by conference between the authorities concerned. The longer-term programmes of conservation, of research, and of surveys may be considered to be properly the responsibility of the federal government.

I should like the minister to advise the house and the country to what extent this recommendation has been carried into effect, and in particular what decisions have been arrived at as to the sharing of costs as between federal and provincial authorities.

With reference to the resolution in question, I find the following recommendations with respect to water and power resources an page 15 of the report:

> A. The provision of immediate post-war employment.
>
> B. A long-term, or continuous policy, to assist to assist in the use and control of water on the basis of sound conservation.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) referred to the fact that over a long period of years western Canada, and in particular Saskatchewan and southern Alberta, has been subject to recurrent droughts. He mentioned the Palliser expedition. I had an opportunity of discussing that expedition on a number of occasions with John Moberley of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, who died some years ago at the age of almost one hundred years. He was the water boy and last survivor of the Palliser expedition. He particularly emphasized that during that expedition their greatest fear was not death from starvation but from lack of water. He told me that on one occasion Palliser had stated that this area never would be settled. That was also the view of the then leaders of the Roman Catholic church and in particular of the archbishop, Tache, who in 1867 after crossing this area expressed the belief that it would never be suitable for agriculture. The report to which I am referring deals with this situation. At page 16 it says:

In the great plains region of western Canada, and in central British Columbia, many areas have insufficient precipitation for the successful pursuit of agriculture. Irrigation in these areas is necessary, and the conservation, control and distribution of both surface and underground water supplies is of vital importance. The use of the rivers of the great plains region in Canada raises both interprovincial and international problems.

After setting out the necessity for water storage and irrigation projects in the drought areas being proceeded with under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act it indicates what should be followed in the matter of a long-term policy:

The continuation and systematic extension of basic water resources investigations by the dominion water and power bureau in collaboration with the provinces . . .

Then on page 18 it recommends what the hon. member for Davenport has included in this resolution, namely the setting up of a permanent board or commission. This is the recommendation:

The setting up of a western provinces water board to include representatives of the dominion and the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba for the purpose of advising the respective governments on the most equitable and advantageous use of the limited water supplies in the great plains region of Canada.

Therefore, sir, I am sure that from all parts of this house will come support for this resolution in its present form. It asks for no expenditure of money at this time, but it does ask for immediate consideration of a problem that will be recurrent in the years to come, namely the problem of drought. It asks that necessary measures be taken to ensure that never again shall we in Saskatchewan and Alberta pass through the conditions so ably and vividly described this afternoon by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, conditions which could have been avoided if parliaments, realizing that recurrent droughts do take place in western Canada, had carried out a system of public works of irrigation to the end that, instead of the devastation that prevailed between 1930 and 1939, there would have been a degree of production which would have done away with the necessity of providing money for direct and indirect relief in those provinces.

I realize that something has been done; but too little has been done. This afternoon the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) referred to the fact that some portion of the $10,000,000 which is to be voted may be used for this purpose; in other words, that the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act administration may use some portion of this vote to carry out survey and engineering works. These works are to be undertaken for three purposes; first, to secure and assure employment; second, in the larger field, to protect western Canada from the effects of recurrent droughts, and, finally, to assure the development of power and irrigation projects. I am particularly interested in what has been done because of the fact that, as has been mentioned by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, in the centre of my constituency is the largest lake in central Saskatchewan. It was a navigable lake which was utilized for the transportation of wheat from central, eastern and middle western Saskatchewan down its entire length and ultimately on to the C.P.R. main line, thence to the markets of eastern Canada. Today that lake is in grave danger of drying up. Between April, 1944, and October, 1945, its depth decreased by two feet. Its shore areas are becoming infested with weeds. This lake is worth preserving as a reservoir for conserving and distributing moisture, through irrigation, along the Qu'Appelle valley. It is worth preserving for the production of fish. It is worth preserving as the finest sanctuary for wild bird life to be found anywhere in central Saskatchewan. Finally, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar suggests, it is worth preserving as a playground, having on its shores some of the largest resorts in Saskatchewan.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): And the finest duck shooting in the west.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Apparently all my hon. friends know how really important this lake is and how necessary it is that something be done for its preservation.

Mr. STIRLING: What is its name?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is called Long lake. Last year and the year before I brought to the attention of the house and the country the necessity of doing something. Some mention was made by the hon. member for Davenport of one of the schemes for the irrigation of central Saskatchewan and the supplying of water from the Saskatchewan river for the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina by way of Elbow, thereby permitting through the necessary development the transfer of millions of gallons of water down through Beaver lake and thence into the Qu'Appelle valley, thereby ensuring the preservation of this lake by maintaining a reasonable level throughout the year. Speaking on this matter last year, I emphasized the necessity of public works being undertaken which would be self-liquidating. I am going to refer to that in a moment, because I was very much impressed with what was said in that regard by the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution. I

pointed out that as far as this lake was concerned there was no place in Saskatchewan where the expenditure of money would pay greater dividends in enjoyment, in the preservation of an agricultural area, in the conservation of bird life and the development of irrigation by the diversion of the surplus waters of the South Saskatchewan river.

There are those who say that to-day is not the time for public works or expenditures. There are others who say that we should wait a little longer. I brought these matters up last November when the estimates of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier) were before the committee, and he quite frankly stated that the matter was not within his jurisdiction, but that it came within that of the Minister of Agriculture, being a matter which could be dealt with under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

I do not want to see the expenditure of large sums of money for public works unless the works undertaken are to be reasonably self-liquidating. I have before me two alternative plans for irrigation in Saskatchewan. According to the consulting engineer under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, both these plans, one involving the expenditure of $28 million and the other of $39 million, would be self-liquidating. One must keep this fact in mind, aside altogether from the further fact that these developments would serve areas which year by year would yield crops where, in the past, from year to year during the draught periods the same areas yielded nothing but drought, grasshoppers and all manner of difficulties. And, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar has pointed out, the debt piled up from year to year.

These projects are necessary in the interests of the survival of Saskatchewan. They will ensure employment to-day. I am not one who from time to time comes before the government and, while preaching the necessity for retrenchment, at the same time asks for large expenditures which would not be self-liquidating or beneficial. I believe a reduction in taxation must come immediately if industry in this country is to provide the jobs so necessary for our returning men, and for those who have been discharged in recent months from munitions factories and other war industry in general.

I was much disturbed the other day upon reading the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) in this connection. He placed before the country a most dangerous doctrine in a speech he delivered in answer to a conference which met here, namely, the delegation from the Canadian and Catholic Federation of Labour, protesting against the loan being made to Great Britain. He stated that it had taken him a whole month to understand the necessity for this loan. Then, as reported in the press, he said:

> If the loan was not granted the Canadian government might be forced into the position of having to cut off family allowance payments, which now total between $200 million and $250 million annually, and it might also have to default in the payment of interest on victory bonds.

If those statements were made—and they have not been denied by the minister—they represent the expression of a dangerous viewpoint at a time like this.

I am not one who wants to add to the clamour for works which will not be self-liquidating. But if that statement be true, and if the minister meant what he said, then the financial position of this country is very serious. Those who are answerable for it are the members of the government who, in recent years, have gone out of their way to secure the support of the country by making promises for expenditures far beyond those which should have been made, having regard to present conditions. I am not referring to war expenditures, either, not in any sense of the word.

Is it not strange that one minister says we are in a terrible condition, when only the other day the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann) said at a banquet in his honour that conditions were so fine in Canada he expected income taxation would be cut by 50 per cent at this session?

Mr. CHEVRIER: He said expenditures, not taxation.

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull): He did not say taxation.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I did not hear what the interruptions were—they came from so many sources.

Mr. CLAXTON: They were all the same.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, for once the cabinet is in agreement—if they were all the same. I would not ask the government to make these expenditures unless they would be self-liquidating, unless they would bring benefit by way of extra and assured crop production. Therefore I have no hesitation in asking not only that the committee be set up, as requested in the resolution, but that immediately the government proceed with the necessary work to make sure that millions of acres of Saskatchewan and Alberta will be irrigated, thereby ensuring more employment and greater production, and a return to prosperity which, through drought and other conditions, will periodically be denied in years to come.

I believe that, to be justified, expenditures to-day must assure an increase in economic production. We hear talk about the necessity of retrenchment and we have the Minister of Justice making a statement such as I have quoted. Yet we have such unnecessary expenditures as some $5 million on propaganda agencies; and another of the estimates to come before the house will be for a sum of $300,000 to renew the national registration, something which is totally unnecessary in peace time, justifiable as it was in time of war.

I should like to see set up the committee recommended by the advisory board on reconstruction. Let them take evidence on projects which will be self-liquidating, which will assure greater production, and maintain economic unity in western Canada and elsewhere. Then let them proceed with construction, thereby insuring immediate employment and prosperity in that western country.

I shall not speak longer at this time, more than to say that I support the resolution because I believe it is necessary. I am one who has never seen that division between east and west about which we hear so much.

In concluding, I should like again to pay tribute to the hon. member for Davenport, who represents a constituency in eastern Canada. By his work he has riveted the eyes of eastern Canada on the needs of the west; he has thereby assured the realization by eastern industry of the necessity for prosperity on the prairies.

For the future of our western country I feel that hon. members on all sides of the house could do no better than support the resolution; and if recommendations are made by the committee, the government should carry those recommendations into effect.

Mr. H. R. ARGUE (Wood Mountain): I, too, rise with other hon. members to support the resolution. I believe I speak under a great handicap this afternoon, because I follow front-benchers from most of the parties. However, I believe back-benchers have come into their own at this session.

I wish to congratulate the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier) who was responsible for the better lighting facilities that have been provided so that the back-benchers are much better seen than even members of the cabinet. I think that is all to the good.

I am glad an eastern member saw fit to introduce this resolution. If we have learned anything in the past few years it is that the prosperity of any one section of Canada depends upon the prosperity of the rest of the country. If by providing proper irrigation facilities for the prairie area we can increase its prosperity, that prosperity will not remain confined but will overflow to all parts of Canada.

The prairie area is the proper place for irrigation to begin because the rainfall there is less than twelve inches annually. The soil is inherently productive and it responds readily to the application of water. There are recurring periods of drought in the area. If there is one thing that irrigation can do it is to increase the supplies of grain and fodder so that in years of drought there will be sufficient reserves in the area to maintain foundation numbers of live stock and help to maintain the annual marketings of live stock products.

When we were going through the depression years of the thirties many people began to wonder whether the area enclosed by the Palliser triangle should have been settled or not. But after having seen the production that has come out of that area in the last few years I think any doubts there may have been have been erased. The great agricultural production that we have seen in the last five or six years has been due in no small part to the production that came from the area. It contributed much to the supplying of food that was used to sustain Britain and the allied armies so that we were able to bring the war to a successful conclusion.

However, we should not be lulled into false optimism by the good crops that have been obtained in the last five or six years. We should not forget the times that we saw in the thirties. I should like to read a quotation from Doctor George Britnell, head of the economic department of the university of Saskatchewan. Speaking of a trip made through that province in 1934, he said:

> We entered Saskatchewan at Antler, and from there to Stoughton, a distance of more than fifty miles, we passed through a landscape of almost incredible desolation. The land was as lifeless as ashes, and for miles there was scarcely a growing thing to be seen. Gaunt cattle and horses, with little save their skins to cover their bones, stalked about the denuded acres weakly seeking to crop the French weed, which with malign persistence seemed to be maintaining some sickly growth.

I do not think the importance of the drought in those areas should be overemphasized. There have been recurring periods of drought in the prairie area, but those periods have occurred only infrequently. From 1838 to 1848 there was a period of drought when the prairie grass burned and the native live stock had to leave the area. From 1885 to 1895 was another period of

severe drought when the settlers had to get out of the area. From 1929 to 1938 was another period of drought.

We thus see that on the average every fifty years there are ten years in which the crop yield is less than average. All the hardship and misery that we saw during the thirties cannot be laid at the door of lack of moisture. In 1937 there was an almost complete failure. In 1929, 1931, 1933, 1934 and 1936 the crops averaged about half of normal. In 1930 and 1932 there were crops near average. The years 1935 and 1938 were years of poor yield, but the poor yield was due, not to lack of moisture, but rather to a rust epidemic. Much of the misery during the thirties was caused, not by lack of crops, but by lack of prices. If we are to maintain prosperity in that area we must attack the problem from two angles. We must make certain that production can be maintained, and when production is maintained we must make certain that decent prices are paid the producers.

When we observe that drought occurs rather infrequently I think we should realize that the solution is to make certain that there are reserves of feed and grain so that we can maintain the live stock, and so that the acres on which the crop has failed can be sown again and marketings throughout the years maintained at something close to normal.

After the first session of this parliament I travelled through the ranching area in my constituency in the middle of winter. The ranchers had a poor crop of hay last year but they had expected a customarily mild winter. However, the winter was quite severe. Snow that fell last fall remained all winter, and large numbers of live stock which had been put on the land for winter grazing died because of a lack of feed. There was from one to two feet of snow and the live stock were not able to get sufficient feed to keep alive.

I do not think anyone needs to be told how important meat production is. The production of foodstuffs will always be important. Throughout the years we should maintain sufficient reserves of feed that live stock will not be lost through starvation. When an irrigation programme is undertaken the production from that land should be set aside to as great an extent as possible in the form of reserves, in feed banks, so that the farmers surrounding that irrigation project will have a reserve of feed which will go a long way to maintaining prosperity for them for all time. Irrigation would mean continuous marketing from that area.

It would mean that never again would we see people facing hardship and misery; that never again would we see live stock starving and staggering; that never again would we see valuable animals sold for canners and cutters because there was not sufficient feed to put flesh on their bones; that never again would we see feed for live stock shipped in from the east, which, to say the least, is an expensive procedure.

I notice that the resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of introducing legislation during this session to set up a permanent interprovincial board . . .

Then it goes on to say that the purpose of the board would be:

> . . . to conduct investigations and make studies of the most feasible and economic means for the conservation and utilization of the eastern watershed of the Rocky mountains, particularly the watershed of the Saskatchewan river.

I consider that the resolution is worded in much too timid and feeble language. If it would have been within the rules of the house to word it much more strongly, I believe the mover would have been quite willing to do that. What we need at this time is to urge the government to get on with a comprehensive programme of irrigation. Too long has this house been considering the advisability of undertaking measures that are essential to the well-being of our people. For the last ten years surveys have been made under the P.F.R.A.; those surveys show without a question of doubt that large irrigation projects are feasible, and I believe that the government should take the word of their own officials and proceed with an adequate programme.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), speaking in the house this afternoon, said that the St. Mary's river project was one on which work would be done immediately and that the amount allocated to this project would be three-quarters of a million dollars. At that rate, as the project according to the officials requires some $13,700,000 to complete, it will take at least eighteen years to complete it. Surely that is a little too slow.

This year the vote for the P.F.R.A. is $3,000,000; last year it was $2,000,000. I am sure that members on all sides of the house will be glad to see that the vote has been increased. In 1935, when the act was first implemented, the appropriation was three-quarters of a million dollars. In 1938-39 the appropriation was stepped up to $3,500,000. But now, in the first year of peace, at a time when there are a quarter of a million unemployed

in Canada and no immediate hope of their being employed, surely half a million dollars less than the appropriation for 1938-39 is just not good enough.

Mr. George Spence, an official of the P.F.R.A., estimates that irrigation projects totalling some $111,000,000 could be undertaken. In that estimate wage rates are calculated at forty cents an hour. Surely, when surveys are being made by government officials, the rate of wages should not be as low as forty cents an hour. The government should not be niggardly in the sums of money it appropriates to be paid for the hard labour of working people. If the wage rate were increased, perhaps the project would cost $135,000,000.

I notice by the auditor general's report of last year that some $1,180,000 was spent by P.F.R.A. for water development, and of that amount $525,000 was spent on buildings and land. I suggest to the government that all the buildings and all the lands in the world will not irrigate a single acre of land. At the rate the government is proceeding with its irrigation programme it would take well over a hundred years to complete those projects which its officials say are feasible.

It is estimated that 3,000,000 acres of land be placed under irrigation. In terms of production that might mean an additional 75,000,000 bushels of wheat, or an additional 6,000,000 hogs, or an additional 10,000,000 tons of feed annually. I would suggest that the government is more concerned with the dangers it sees in what it might term overproduction than with supplying jobs and with ensuring the prosperity of the people of Canada.

I have before me this evening's Ottawa *Journal* and I notice that an UNRRA official, Mr. Sidney Rittenberg, says that famine is so critical, particularly in Honan province that,

> . . . children look like old men, with shrunken, emaciated bodies and swollen stomachs.
>
> The countryside looks as if it had been shaved clean. All grass, weeds, foliage and bark from trees have been grabbed for food.
>
> Seven million persons are reported starving in Honan province alone.

Surely it would have been a great boon to the people of Canada and to the people who are starving in so many nations of the world today if during the 1930's the then governments had been far-sighted enough to have planned and implemented an adequate irrigation project. Then we might have had 75,000,000 bushels of wheat which might have kept alive another ten to twenty million souls. Surely in the future we should keep that experience in mind. I do not think there is ever a danger of overproduction so long as there is one undernourished person in Canada, or for that matter one undernourished person anywhere in the world.

Our veterans at this time are looking for land. If they take up land under the Veterans Land Act they will get $4,800 worth of land, which in almost every case would be dry-farming land. That amount of money in the dry area will not buy more than 160 acres of land, and only mediocre land. But had three million acres of land been irrigated, it would provide 30,000 veterans with 100 acres of irrigated land apiece. It would provide irrigated farms for almost all the veterans who are looking for land in western Canada under the Veterans Land Act. Surely the government should take that into consideration and develop irrigation as a means of rehabilitating the veterans.

In conclusion, I suggest it is time that the government got away from taking into consideration or thinking over the advisability of an irrigation programme. Certainly the reports of all government officials show that a large irrigation programme is feasible, and if the government would enter into a long-term plan for agriculture, a plan for increasing production, which can come from irrigated lands, we would make certain that all the farmers of all western Canada would all the time have sufficient feed and grain to maintain their farming operations.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution which has been proposed by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol), may I congratulate him not only on having brought forward this important motion but on the excellent work he has done in this direction over a long period of years. The resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of introducing legislation during this session to set up a permanent interprovincial board or commisison on which the three prairie provinces and the dominion would have equal representation under the chairmanship of a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or some other qualified person, to conduct investigations and make studies of the most feasible and economic means for the conservation and utilization of the eastern watershed of the Rocky mountains, particularly the watershed of the Saskatchewan river.

I am sure that hon. members in all parts of the house will agree with the principle of the resolution, which asks that a careful investigation be made into this subject. As was pointed out by my colleague, the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), the reconstruction committee gave long study to the whole question during the session of 1943. At that time they considered the matter in connection with the problems of reconstruction and made a recommendation in the report which they submitted following their investigation. I would join with the hon. member in requesting the minister, when he replies, to tell us what has been done with respect to that recommendation and whether any arrangements have been negotiated between the federal authorities on the one hand, and, on the other, the various provinces concerned.

I was born and brought up within the Palliser triangle and I have farmed there for the past twenty-five years. I also had the privilege of serving on the advisory committee under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act for a number of years before coming to this house, and I have witnessed great changes in scientific agriculture, in methods of tillage and cultivation, in soil conservation and the development of rust-resisting cereals, improvement in the production of live stock, and many other similar questions; but certainly the most important of all these matters has been water development and conservation.

You cannot produce foodstuffs of any kind in this country without water; water is the most essential element in any production of foodstuffs. The reclamation possibilities, under proper development and conservation of water, are immense, a fact which has been pretty well proven by the efforts that have been made under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act. Those who have been administering that legislation since its inception in 1935 can substantiate this.

Possibly there has not been accomplished under the board quite as much as many of us would have liked to see, but one thing that has been achieved is this: They have established what can be done as a result of the conservation of water. As was pointed out this afternoon, when we realize what quantities of water are wasted every spring from the various streams and rivers, we realize how much can be accomplished by the proper control of these streams for the promotion of agricultural production throughout the year.

May I refer to a pamphlet entitled, "P.F.R.A. and their Record of Achievement", which was issued in 1943. From 1935 to 1943 a great deal was accomplished; but since then, owing to the war effort, the achievements have been more or less nullified. At page 55 of the pamphlet reference is made to the work accomplished under P.F.R.A. From the inauguration of the programme in 1935 to March 31, 1943, the water development work that has been accomplished has included the maintenance of water supply to take care of 50,000 acres of irrigated land and existing projects; repairs have been carried out, and so on. It lists the number carried out, and states that the amount spent up to that date for water development and conservation alone was $2,124,722. Much more than that was spent in connection with community pastures, reforestation, regrassing and other matters of that kind.

This afternoon I listened to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) telling about the difficulties which the people of the three prairie provinces passed through in the early thirties. I experienced all the conditions as he portrayed them. Southern Saskatchewan suffered more severely than any other part of those provinces as a result of the drought at that time. One could drive for days and not see any vegetation whatever. There was no water to be seen anywhere, and one marvelled how the women and children on those farms existed at all during that period. The corner I lived in, in southwestern Manitoba, was on the fringe of that area.

When we remember what those people had produced in years prior to that period and contrast it with their privations during those years, I do not think anyone would object to a survey, and even to a considerable expenditure of money, for the purpose of finding out what can be made possible through proper water conservation, so as to conserve the run-off from the large rivers coming from the mountains. Someone mentioned a lake this afternoon. I remember driving along lake Johnstone, south of Moose Jaw, during those dry years. The lake was perfectly dry, not a drop of water being at the bottom.

On all hands people boast of our great agricultural production during the war years, and I do not think it would have been possible had it not been for what had been accomplished in the prairie provinces under P.F.R.A. Development and conservation made it possible for many people to maintain live stock, to produce dairy products, to cultivate fine vegetable gardens for themselves where previously in average years they had been unable to do anything of the sort.

It is difficult to estimate in dollars and cents how much extra we were able to produce for the war effort, as far as foodstuffs are concerned, as a result of the work done by that board throughout the prairies. I remem-

ber reading in the fall of 1943, in a magazine called *Canadian Business,* an article pointing out the trend that had been observed in western Canada. The writer of that article stated that in the early twenties seventy per cent of the farmers' income was from wheat and cereal products and that position had been reversed so that less than forty per cent of their income was now obtained from that source.

I maintain that the greatest part of the change-over was made possible by the efforts of those operating under P.F.R.A. in large areas of those three provinces in connection with the development of water, regrassing, and community pastures. We were simply experimenting and the expenditure was not large—a very few million dollars, as had been pointed out. If such results could be obtained there, I am sure that our potentialities along those lines are still considerable.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) stated this afternoon that, apart from the vote this year of $3,000,000, an amount of $10,000,000 was to be made available through the Department of Reconstruction for survey work along these lines. The other day I read an article, under the date of April 5, by Doctor Archibald, director of experimental farms in Canada. He, along with the deputy minister of agriculture, Doctor Barton, had more to do with directing the efforts of the prairie farm rehabilitation work in the prairie provinces than anybody else. In his address at Guelph the other day he referred to the fact that $110 million were to be spent on some project in the prairie provinces in the near future. I am not sure what it is. That is quite a large sum of money the department is to spend.

I support this resolution wholeheartedly. While we have accomplished this fine piece of work in the prairie provinces, it is practically nothing when compared with what our neighbours to the south have done. This afternoon the hon. member for Davenport, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and others told of the magnificent achievements with respect to water conservation and irrigation in certain parts of the United States. That has been done. In to-day's *Christian Science Monitor,* a Boston paper, I noticed a full page devoted to this type of work. The heading is "Flood wall at Kansas City paces vast drive to tame Missouri river." It goes on to point out that the sum of $7 billion has been set aside for this work, and that $1,500 million is to be spent on the Missouri river. It will affect some ten states and bring about irrigation and improvement of agricultural productivity in the states concerned. If they can do that in the United States surely it should be an example to this country as to what we must do in the interests of our own people, and more especially in the interests of world food production.

Throughout history the majority of the people of the world have been undernourished. To-day we hear much of world government and international agreements. If this is to become a fact, then we in this country have great possibilities and responsibilities to produce much more food than we have ever done in the past. Therefore I think this resolution is most timely and we would be neglecting our duty if all quarters of the house did not support it. We should see that a thorough investigation is carried out. Like the hon. members who spoke this afternoon, I believe that at this time all large expenditures of public money should be self-liquidating. It is a matter of surveying. I am satisfied that it would be self-liquidating. A few million dollars is a lot of money, but in comparison with government expenditures to-day very little has been spent on P.F.R.A. It has returned many times the amount to the citizens of western Canada and to this nation as a whole. I am pleased to have the opportunity of endorsing this resolution which, I am sure, will be accepted in all corners of the house.

Mr. A. L. SMITH (Calgary West): Just to prove that there is nothing political in this matter, I rise as a representative of our party in Alberta to support my old friend who knows every rock in the Mackenzie river and every blade of grass grown out there. I hold in my hand a clipping from the East Central Irrigation Association which quotes Herbert Hoover, one-time president of the United States, as saying that every drop of water that runs to the sea without rendering a commercial return is a public waste. Perhaps we can all agree that Mr. Hoover has at last said something that is really worth while.

We shall be told something about the expenditure of money, and I have no doubt of the position of those of us who criticize the government for overexpenditures and then in the next breath urge them to spend something more. I appreciate that position to the fullest, but I may be permitted to criticize and to doubt the wisdom of the way in which they spend other people's money. It has got abroad in this country, through the various information agencies which rude people occasionally suggest are propaganda agencies, that there is a feeling that they may be tainted just a little bit with the government's idea and that they might assist them in remaining where they are.

I, of course, know nothing about that. I am quite sure the ministers would not consciously do that, but perhaps some of the chaps who work for them know where their bread is buttered and occasionally they may slip into political propaganda. That is gentle criticism.

On the large question of sectionalism which has so often been raised, I wish to say that in a portion of western Canada we are seeking to have this government, in conjunction with the provincial governments, undertake a large project. Therefore I immediately say to my hon. friends who come from Ontario and Quebec that what we are seeking is a few canals. We want these canals to carry water in order that we may raise food. You have your canals here to carry bottoms. Ontario did not pay for them. Quebec is not going to pay for the St. Lawrence waterways. The point I am anxious to make, whether I succeed or not, is that because of the geographic location of an enterprise it cannot just immediately be said that it was done to help one province or two provinces or one area. In my judgment, what my old and hon. friend—and when I say "old" I mean I have known him a long time—the member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) said was well put. If improvements were brought about out in that country this would spread. Take the little Lethbridge Northern. I see the hon. gentleman writing at his desk who knows much more about it than I do. But what has happened there? They have a wonderful show going; they have sugar refineries and, in the last few years a canning factory. I do not care where hon. members live, they cannot buy canned vegetables that will even compare with those that are canned right now in Lethbridge. All that is the result of irrigating some land and making it productive.

I do not know how many hon. members have visited the town of Brooks. I am quite sure many of us do not even know that it exists. I give the house my word for this, there are no finer homes, there are no more healthy or contented people throughout Canada than those who live in that irrigated area. What strikes one so forcibly is this. You go about three miles south of Brooks, turn right and then you strike the main canal which comes from the dam at Bassano. There you have on one side of the road gardens blooming like the rose. Another fifteen miles away you come to the area of Scandia and Rainier, a small area. There is not enough grass growing there on fifty acres to support a sheep, let alone a cow or steer that someone mentioned a moment ago.

What are these lands that we are seeking to do something with? Take an area out there where we have some land that is most unusual. The hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Wylie) is not in his seat at the moment; perhaps he knew I was going to say all these things; but it got so dry out there at one time some years ago that after the farmers had sold their fence posts in order to get the last dollar they could, the city council of Medicine Hat got a rainmaker by the name of Hatfield. He built a thing that looked like an oil derrick, although it was not so high. Up there he lit a fire and brewed some kind of witch's stew; I do not know what it was. He was paid on the basis of an inch and a half of rain or nothing. He lit this pot—I think he was just cooking himself a cup of coffee or something of the kind—but in any event they had a wonderful rain. Those hon. members who read *Time* magazine will know that Hatfield is still going. Down in San Diego a short time ago, when they had that young world's fair and the country was dry, they hired him and he guaranteed two inches of rain. They got seven inches and everybody in San Diego was flooded out. Then they had to pay him again to get it to stop. Of course he had nothing to do with it, but I tell that story for this reason. When people are driven to such straits that they will hire a charmer to try to induce a little bit of rain, conditions are serious. I have lived in that section of the country for a long time, and am familiar with the constituency of Acadia, from whose hon. member we heard this afternoon. I used to go there to shoot partridge.

Mr. JOHNSTON: That was a pleasure trip.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): It was. Incidentally I may tell my farmer friends that partridge live on weed seeds; they do not eat your grain. But matters got so bad there that even the weeds would not grow and there were no partridge; that is why I stopped going to the hon. member's constituency. I was there quite often, however, and I did see this more than once. I would see a man and his wife and kids driving out behind a team, the harness held together with hay wire. If they were lucky, in the back end of the wagon they had a cow tied. They used a hay-rack because they could put on it all their kitchen stuff and bits of furniture; and they were going to some other place. Why? Because of lack of moisture.

I am anxious that one scheme be undertaken, and we have heard that a beginning is to be made in connection with the Red Deer

river development. I do not think the hon. member for Davenport occupied all the time of the engineers when he was in western Canada recently; perhaps it would be better to say that they occupied all his time, but in any event these same men tell me that from that development, which includes a 150-foot dam, we can get enough power to electrify all the farms in that part of the country. Let us be practical; let us see where our money is going. We gave out relief in large sums in that area, and as someone has so well said we got nothing from it except a number of angry people. I am quite sure the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) would appreciate that if he were here, because he gave them all this dough; then everybody voted against him and threw out his outfit, so that it is difficult to buy votes in that way. I like the direct method; $2, and nobody says anything about it.

In any event, we have spent all this money and we have received nothing from it. With respect, sir, I say that in that arid land when they have rain they raise wonderful crops. I have seen them grow sixty bushels of wheat to the acre around Medicine Hat, and I am not using a bit of imagination. The land is tremendously fertile if only it can get some moisture. As the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) put it, it needs just that other inch. I think he is wrong; I have a record of the moisture every year from 1933 to 1946. And I believe we need more than another inch; certainly that is so in a bad year.

What happens when you get an irrigation system out there? Practically no wheat is grown at Brooks to-day. It becomes a specialized business; seed crops, peas, beans, small fruits and that sort of thing. I mean it is not going to increase the thing of which we have most, and I agree that there should be no difficulty about that. It becomes a specialized show. We will not interfere with your markets here, because we cannot ship these products that far. No matter how good we are, we just cannot overcome the north shore of lake Superior. I see the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) is here; probably he is going to tell me more about coal before this session is finished, but he knows there are transportation difficulties. In all seriousness, I say that we in this house should regard this as a national problem, as it is. The Ontario canals were national problems. All we want is canals. We will use them for a different purpose; but will anyone tell me that we in the west got any benefit from the canals in eastern Canada? Of course we did not, but we did not complain; we figured it was in the interests of the country that this should be done. So that all we are asking is a few canals which will generally add to the wealth of Canada, as I am quite sure the little bits of ditches here in the east have done.

[Mr. A. L. Smith.]

Now a word as to money. I do not know anything about money; that is, about cost, and in that respect I like the terms of the resolution, which asks that a complete examination of the picture should be made.

I cannot sit down without giving the house a history of irrigation in our province. The Canadian Pacific railway had both the eastern irrigation scheme and the western scheme, coming from the Bow river. They spent millions of dollars and then gave it all away; houses, horses, machinery, ditches—one conduit over two miles long, just east of the town of Brooks—land and everything else including $450,000 as working capital. They gave it all away in order to get out of it. Why? Their irrigation fee was 50 cents an acre. They have some good men in that district. They took hold of the thing, raised the fee to $1 an acre, and then got tough. As everyone knows, nobody will pay the government or the Canadian Pacific railway anything if they can possibly avoid doing so. That just seems to be true throughout the length and breadth of this country; and nobody paid the C.P.R. So that they found themselves supporting this thing with tremendous losses every year. I believe the district took it over about five or six years ago. Their ditches are clean; their roads are good, and instead of working capital of $450,000 to-day they have working capital of well over $1,000,000. That shows what can be done if the people who are there take an interest in the picture.

At the session before last of the Alberta legislature a similar group took over the western district, which is immediately east of Calgary, in around Strathmore and Gleichen. The C.P.R. gave them the same amount of money. They could not give them the land, because they did not own it any longer, but even in one short year they are making a success of that business. The Lethbridge Northern, as hon. members know, is a government-supported affair, and it seems to me that when we have operation by governments or railroads we get into trouble. But if we can have local management of these things they can be made successful and, as my hon. friend has told us, they can become self-liquidating propositions. Why, in the eastern irrigation district they grow fruit; they grow anything there.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, having talked about four times longer than I intended to, I am still in favour of the resolution.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, having spent many years in the west, in both Manitoba and Saskatchewan, I would have no trouble whatever in occupying forty minutes in describing the good derived from plenty of moisture over certain parts of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta. However, I do not think I am intruding when I say that moisture is no more necessary for growing crops than is good food and lots of milk for growing boys.

Therefore I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of congratulating Your Honour on providing a free meal for our page boys once each sitting day in addition to a drink of good wholesome milk at 4.30 in the afternoon. This is most commendable; and if Your Honour continues doing this sort of thing for our page boys, it will be a fine bonus for them. On behalf of those for whom I might speak may I commend Mr. Speaker's action, and his treatment of these page boys, who are the best boys in Canada to-day.

Mr. E. B. McKAY (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this resolution I wish first to congratulate the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) to whom all westerners owe a great deal. All of us appreciate his efforts to educate the public of Canada to the very great need for irrigation in western Canada.

I particularly wish to thank the hon. member for the map indicating the Saskatchewan river power, navigation and irrigation rehabilitation scheme which he has proposed.

A large part of the constituency of Weyburn, which I have the good fortune to represent, is embraced in this project, for it includes the Soo line district, as well as the Regina plains and Arcola line areas. In this region are located the Souris river, Long and Wascana creeks; and may I say that this is one of the most productive areas in the whole of Saskatchewan.

Most western people are interested in irrigation, for the greatest natural hazards in the southern portions of Saskatchewan and Alberta are the fairly frequent and all too regular cycles of drought. According to records, droughts occurred during the periods 1838-48, 1885-95 and 1929-38. It appears that drought is widespread in the prairie provinces every thirty years or so and extends over a decade with a varying degree of intensity. The worst year which the western agriculturist has experienced was 1937. That year half the population of Saskatchewan was forced to accept government relief and the whole situation savoured of a national calamity. On that occasion the federal authorities came to the aid of provincial governments in the west, and kind-hearted folk from all parts of Canada dispatched trainloads of food and clothing to aid the stricken people of the plains.

On that occasion live stock were slaughtered by the thousands because of lack of water and the scarcity of fodder with which to feed them.

Fine herds of cattle were marketed for $8 and $10 a head. Other thousands were transported east and west of the prairies where fodder was available. Trainloads of grain and other fodder were shipped to the west at great expense to the public to keep alive the relatively few remaining animals the people were permitted to retain on the farm. I believe this catastrophe could have been averted had a programme of water conservation been embarked upon years ago. A programme embracing the construction of small dams, dug-outs, and small irrigation projects would have provided water for live stock and the much needed fodder for their sustenance.

Such a scheme, together with larger irrigation projects as envisaged by the resolution before the house, while incurring the initial outlay of considerable sums of money would lend stability to western agriculture and create a prosperous farming population, so necessary to the prosperity of the whole national economy.

Everyone agrees that irrigation on a large scale requires detailed planning in engineering and an exhaustive study of the economic aspects involved. I believe, if this is done, that irrigation of the western prairies will be found to be economically sound and a profitable investment.

Anyone who has inspected the 500,000 acres of irrigated land in Alberta will recognize the great material advantages accruing from such development.

Irrigated land supports from nine to ten times as many people there as do the dry farming areas surrounding those projects.

There are 4,500 prosperous farmers in the district, making for a steadying influence on Alberta's economy. Over a ten-year period the average wheat production exceeded dry area yield by almost twelve bushels an acre. If we assume that this whole irrigated area produced nothing but wheat that would mean almost $7 million worth of new wealth for Alberta every year. But other crops are produced in this region, all of which produce more per acre than wheat. For instance,

eleven per cent of the sugar production of Canada comes from sugar beets produced in this area.

Irrigation is necessary for the economic stabilization of the western provinces. In order to achieve a well-balanced and stable economy there must be diversification of industry.

The whole matter of irrigation must be approached from the national viewpoint, since Canadian prosperity and well-being are impossible while a large area of the prairies is subject to the wide fluctuations of income caused by repeated crop failures induced by drought. A stabilized western economy would create a steady market for eastern manufactured commodities. The establishment of secondary industries for the processing of primary products from the farm would create more wealth in the west and for Canada. They would employ many workers who must of necessity consume primary products and the goods from Canadian factories. Without irrigation and its attendant hydro development many such industries could not be established.

In closing, may I enumerate some of the major benefits that would result from western irrigation:

(1) It would permit a greater range of diversified crop production and an increase in live stock population.

(2) It would tend to stabilize crop production and would ensure against total crop failure.

(3) Stability of farm tenure would be established with a higher standard of living.

(4) A broad, sound base for industrial development would be set up.

(5) Electric power for industry and rural electrification would be created.

(6) There would be established a source of stable revenue for the municipal, provincial and federal governments of the country.

I shall support the resolution.

Hon. J. A. GLEN (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the motion before the house moved by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of introducing legislation during this session to set up a permanent interprovincial board or commission on which the three prairie provinces and the dominion would have equal representation under the chairmanship of a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or some other qualified person, to conduct investigations and make studies of the most feasible and economic means for the conservation and utilization of the eastern watershed of the Rocky mountains, particularly the watershed of the Saskatchewan river.

[Mr. McKay.]

The contents of this resolution have been discussed many times in this house, always under the auspices of the hon. gentleman. He has now, I think, gained for the proposal he has announced in this house during many years support which I am sure must be gratifying to him, and I congratulate him upon the method and determination with which he has continued his fight for water for the prairie provinces, although, being an eastern member, he is not so politically identified with those particular provinces. I like to think of him as a very close friend, not as a member of a constituency but as a citizen of Canada, knowing that in what he now proposes in his motion that is now before the house he is dealing with a matter that will have an effect upon the economic life of all Canada and not upon any particular constituency.

In this proposal he is asking for the setting up of a commission, and I should like to deal with the history of the transactions that have taken place since the natural resources were transferred to the province of Alberta in 1930. I was asked a question in the house by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) and also by another hon. member as to what the government had done in the light of the reports that had come from the committee. The hon. member for Davenport divided his motion into two parts.

In the first instance, he spoke of the conservation of water and dealt more particularly with conditions in Saskatchewan. The hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) also followed the same line as far as Alberta was concerned. In the second place, the hon. member for Davenport dealt with it from the point of view of the watershed on the eastern slopes of the Rocky mountains. There are two different proposals, both related to each other but both similar, although easily distinguished.

With regard to the first of these, I may say that the rivers of the prairie provinces are interprovincial or international in character. Every important stream in those provinces is shared by another province, by the northwest territories or by the states that are immediately over the border. From the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains the main sources of water flow easterly across the three provinces and northerly to the northwest territories, and the boundaries of those political divisions bear no relation to the physical characteristics of the areas which they include.

Prior to 1930 all these waters were administered by the dominion, which greatly simplified all questions of use and control. From the first settlements on the prairie up to that

date a large number of water rights were granted by the Department of the Interior with an almost complete absence of litigation between interests claiming conflicting rights, and no questions arose as between one province and another. Since the transfer of the natural resources, four jurisdictions—the dominion and the three provinces—administer these same waters. While up to the present no serious difficulties have arisen, minor questions having been settled in an amicable manner, it does not follow that the need for planning and apportionment has lessened by the lapse of time. The contrary is true.

Following the transfer of the natural resources there came a long period of depression when there was no incentive for new undertakings. This was partly overcome by the activities of the prairie farm rehabilitation administration. It is interesting and, I am sure, gratifying to all members of the house to hear the praise that has been lavished upon the work of the prairie farm rehabilitation administration. I am sure that will encourage them to carry on even in a larger degree than they have done hitherto.

Changed conditions are favourable for new developments, many of which have been planned and some have already been authorized. Never before have the use and conservation of the prairie water supply been so needed. I doubt if there are two things more needed in the Dominion of Canada than, first, water, and then, oil. This department has been endeavouring as best it can with all the facilities and resources at its command to find both.

This department is satisfied that a board or authority of some kind is necessary to assist and advise in the administration of all interprovincial waters and that the dominion is entitled to representation on such a board as the administrator of the northwest territories, as being responsible for international boundary waters and by reason of its operations under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act.

Action to set up a board representative of the three prairie provinces and the dominion which would examine and report upon the most effective use or control of waters common to two or more of the parties was begun as soon as the agreement for the transfer from the dominion to the provinces of resources, including water resources, was completed in 1930. It was intended that this agreement, which was drawn and which was submitted to the provinces, should become effective about the same time as the transfer agreements. For this purpose negotiations were entered into with the provincial premiers and a draft agreement to establish a western provinces water board was prepared by this department. That was accepted by the provinces and signed by the three premiers under date of the 24th October, 1930. For some reason there were some clauses in it which seemed to operate unfairly against the dominion, and Justice, at that time being consulted, were not in favour of the agreement as drawn.

It was not until 1937 that the province of Manitoba began to make inquiries with regard to the rehabilitation plans for the western drought areas which called for taking water from interprovincial streams, such as the South Saskatchewan river, and which it was feared might affect future power developments within the province. Consideration was sought for the establishment of such a board to anticipate the problems which might arise and thereby avoid possible disputes relating to interprovincial streams.

The then minister, the Hon. Mr. Crerar, replied on April 16, 1937, that he was in favour of such a board; and that it would prove of very great value for the purpose intended. He said that he was in favour of carrying on the negotiations with respect to the formation of the board and that he would be glad to communicate with the other provinces in due course. A few days later he wrote to the ministers in charge of water resources in Alberta and Saskatchewan suggesting that the agreement of 1930 be brought up to date—I am speaking of 1937 now—and the objectives of the board and the proposed method of operations be discussed between the responsible technical officers.

Hon. Mr. Kerr, the natural resources minister of Saskatchewan, immediately replied as favouring the board and referred to the recent amendment to the water rights act, 1931, which authorized him as minister to enter into agreements with the other provinces and the dominion for the establishment of a board to control the use of interprovincial waters. The other ministers stated that they were prepared to give the proposal careful consideration.

A new agreement was drawn, prepared by this department and submitted to the three provincial ministers concerned. The new draft proposed an arrangement much simpler than the previous one. Instead of an agreement between governments, it was to be an agreement between the ministers responsible for the administration of water resources in the four areas, and was to be advisory only. I have the substance of the agreement here, but I do not think I need trouble the house with the terms of it except to say that the

rights of the dominion were protected. The powers of the advisory board were set out clearly and in detail.

The basic principle underlying the formation of the board was that it would be a technical board consisting of the officers responsible for the detailed administration of water resources in each of the jurisdictions affected and reporting to the ministers in executive control of these resources.

The new draft was accepted by Mr. Kerr for Saskatchewan on June 30, 1937, and by Mr. McDiarmid for Manitoba on October 8 of the same year, but the Alberta minister declined to take action, although pressed to do so by the Alberta director of water resources.

The matter was again brought to the attention of the Alberta minister, now the Hon. Mr. MacMillan, by the acting deputy minister of this department on August 11, 1941. Mr. MacMillan replied on January 2, 1942, to the effect that his province did not see the need of such a board on the grounds that Saskatchewan was the only province that could be affected by rights granted by Alberta and that so far the authorities in Saskatchewan had not intimated that they wished to discuss any questions. There was a further exchange of letters shortly after, but Mr. MacMillan remained unconvinced.

There was no further action at that time, but the approaching end of the war brought a renewed interest throughout the west in large-scale projects for irrigation and power. During 1944, boards of trade at Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Perdue in Saskatchewan, and Drumheller and Craigmile in Alberta passed resolutions asking the Department of Mines and Resources to set up a water board for the prairie provinces:

> . . . whose duty it would be, among others, to assemble all the available stream flow data of western rivers and establish such new stations as may be required to get a complete record of the river discharge throughout the whole western drainage area, and to determine the most feasible and economical water power and irrigation projects that would make the best use of all the available drainage water, with the object of advising the various governments concerned of the possibilities of the area.

The establishment of such a board has also been endorsed by the dominion subcommittee on agriculture and combined resources set up in connection with the reconstruction programme of the dominion-provincial conference.

In consequence of these large-scale irrigation and other projects proposed as a post-war measure of rehabilitation, the department again wrote to Mr. MacMillan on June 13, 1944, suggesting that if, in view of this changed situation, Mr. MacMillan was agreeable to having a board constituted under section 64 of the Alberta Water Resources Act, which provides appropriate authority, the minister would be glad to review the matter with the responsible ministers of Saskatchewan and Manitoba who had previously expressed their approval.

There is no reply to this letter on file, and so far as the dominion is concerned the matter rests at this stage.

Within a few months after the minister's last letter to Mr. MacMillan, the provinces took action without reference to the dominion. At a meeting held at Saskatoon on September 21, 1944, it was decided by Hon. N. E. Tanner, Alberta minister of lands and mines, Hon. J. H. Phelps, Saskatchewan minister of natural resources, and Hon. J. S. McDiarmid, Manitoba minister of mines and natural resources, to establish a water board representative of the three prairie provinces under an agreement along the lines of that prepared by this department in 1937.

At the time of this meeting it was the understanding of those present that the board should be advisory only and should have no jurisdiction in the matter of allocating water rights with respect to interprovincial watersheds as between the three provinces concerned.

Some time elapsed before the formal agreement was completed, this being dated December 7, 1945. The present representatives on the board are, for Alberta, Mr. Ben Russell, director of water resources; for Saskatchewan, Mr. G. N. Munro, chief engineer, water rights branch; and for Manitoba, Mr. D. M. Stephens, deputy minister of mines and natural resources.

Arrangements have been made for an organization meeting of the board to be held at Saskatoon on April 1 and 2. Questions relating to procedure as well as with regard to specific problems to which the board might devote immediate attention will probably be decided upon at that time.

It is understood that when the decision was made to set up the board the dominion was not asked to participate on account of objection by the representative of Alberta, but those from the other two provinces felt that, while it would be desirable to have the dominion interest in water resources represented, there would be a considerable advantage in having the work begun on a provincial basis.

That is the position so far as the conservation of water in Saskatchewan is concerned. An advisory board has been formed representing the three provinces, with no representation of the dominion upon it, and for that

reason, as I said before, that is where the dominion goes out of the picture as at this stage.

The motion that is before the house aks for the setting up of an interprovincial board. I suggest that we as a dominion cannot set up through this house a board which is going to take over the jurisidiction of either of the three provinces and that any board that is set up must be with the consent and approval of the three provinces. For that reason I suggest that that part of the hon. member's motion has already been met by the three provinces, which have made their choice of an advisory board.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is the minister not overlooking the fact that, the Saskatchewan river being a navigable river, none of the three provinces has any jurisdiction over its water except for power purposes and that the board they set up has not functioned? My information is that it is not going to function and that they would be very glad to have the dominion cooperate in the manner suggested in the motion with equal representation of the prairie provinces and the dominion on the board.

Mr. GLEN: I am not overlooking the fact that the dominion government is deeply concerned in all that pertains to this matter because it is an economic matter affecting the provinces, which are equally interested and are anxious to share in the conservation of the water in those three provinces. I do not think that the hon. member would suggest that we should set up a commission now just because the Saskatchewan river may be a navigable river; that because of that fact we should take upon ourselves the setting up of a commission which would advise the three provinces without their having some say in the setting up of that commission.

Mr. MacNICOL: Each province would name the same number of representatives to the board and have equal representation with the dominion. You cannot do anything else.

Mr. GLEN: A board has been set up by three provinces and the dominion is not represented on it at the present moment. Therefore the proposal in the motion of the hon. member for the appointment of a commission would, if it were carried out, be overriding the wishes of the provinces, which have already set up their own commission.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister does not seem to realize that the board which has been set up acts only in an advisory capacity to the provinces themselves. It has no jurisdiction over a navigable river.

Mr. GLEN: I have already said that. I have also stated that when the agreement was being prepared by the dominion with the provinces the commission was to be of an advisory character, without any executive power.

The hon. member then addressed himself to the question of the protection of the forests on the east slope of the Rocky mountains. Here again I must give a little of the history of the forestry of the eastern slope.

The Rocky mountains forest reserve was established in 1911, at which time the dominion government through the dominion forest service of the Department of the Interior inaugurated a development policy of administration and protection, which continued until the transfer of the resources late in 1930. Complete control of all the natural resources within the boundaries of the forest reserve was vested in the forest service. These included fire protection, timber disposal, grazing uses, rental of surface rights, and mining claims, permits to hunters and trappers for the erection of cabins and many other miscellaneous uses.

While administration of hunting and fishing was a function of the province, a measure of control was exercised by the dominion forest officers through the requirement for travel permits; in fact, during periods of high fire hazards large sections of this area were closed to hunting and travel.

The total area of the east slope reserves as of 1930 was 13,786 square miles, but certain proposed additional areas were under consideration. When the province of Alberta took over these areas were added and the total area of provincial forest reserves on the east slope now stands at 14,266 square miles.

That land was divided into five units under the dominion. When the province took it over they made it into three and then began their jurisdiction to protect these forests. Unfortunately, the experience of the province was that the losses were much greater than they had been under the dominion government, the reason being that they had not the money necessary to provide that forest protection at that time.

Communications were exchanged between the province and the dominion with regard to the taking over of the east slope of the Rockies by the dominion, and in the first instance a letter was written on December 10, 1937, by the then provincial minister, Mr. N. E. Tanner, of which I have here a copy, dealing with the whole matter:

When in Ottawa recently my colleague—the Hon. Solon Low, provincial treasurer—had intended to discuss with you the matter of our

forest reserves situate on the east slope of the Rocky mountains, but owing to your absence, also that of Doctor Camsell, he mentioned the subject to the department and I am writing at some length so that you may more fully understand our attitude.

As you are aware these reserves are considerably important when consideration is being given to the rehabilitation of the drought areas, as all our large rivers, with the exception of the Peace, have their source in the forest reserves.

While these waters are of importance to Alberta, they flow through our neighbouring province of Saskatchewan into Manitoba, and we feel that Alberta is entitled to some consideration in maintaining the organization established during the administration of the resources by the Department of the Interior. Such assistance might conceivably be along the lines of the Clarke-McNary legislation in the United States of America, with which no doubt your department is very well acquainted.

I understand that in the year 1924 the President of the United States of America gave his approval to "an act to provide for forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," and in so doing the President and congress established on a statutory basis a fundamental forest policy for the United States . . .

You will readily appreciate that if the province were to discontinue this service we might anticipate a serious depletion of the forest cover within a few years, and the passing of this protection would have a considerable effect on the distribution of water throughout the following years.

So long as the east slope of the Rocky mountains is well timbered the periodic run-off will be well controlled by nature, but with the loss of the timber we could expect periods of high water in the early spring and the water courses practically, if not, dry, in the summer and fall seasons.

The importance of the east slope watershed has been recognized in publications that have been issued by various governmental departments, as the agricultural development depends for its success, to a large extent, on a dependable water supply for domestic use, power and especially, for irrigation projects.

Your department will have given these matters their earnest consideration in dealing with the rehabilitation programme for the drought areas, and the information as to stream measurements is a matter of record in your department; this work having been continued as a federal service under an arrangement with the province.

All of these facts must have been recognized by Canada when considering the transfer of the natural resources to the three western provinces as the draft agreement of January, 1926, reserved to Canada the crown lands included in the Rocky mountain forest reserve, so that these lands might continue to be administered by the government of Canada for the purposes of Canada.

It is understood that the preliminary drafts of the agreement finally made in December, 1929, had continued this reservation, but for some unknown reason, this section was withdrawn from the agreement as completed.

Were the government of Canada to feel that it could not consider making a grant to Alberta along the lines of the Clarke-McNary legislation, would it be possible to consider having these areas again vested in Canada for administration?

That letter was written on December 10, 1937. There was further correspondence with the then minister with regard to forest protection, and a letter written on February 16, 1938, reads:

Dear Mr. Crerar:

Consideration has been given to your letter of the 29th ultimo, on the subject of our discussion relative to the forest reserves situate on the east slope of the Rocky mountains, and may I again emphasize that Alberta has, since the transfer of the resources, expended a large sum in maintaining a staff on these reserves.

We freely admit, however, that an adequate protective service has not been furnished at any time since the province took control, although more money has been expended each year than essential for the welfare of Alberta.

This expenditure, we can no longer justify under existing financial conditions, and it is our proposal to immediately curtail this service as in justice to our people we cannot continue an expenditure in the interests of our neighbouring province.

On the other hand, I think that I should draw to your attention once more the fact that greater protection is necessary in this area in order to maintain a more equitable flow of water through the streams having their origin there.

It seems to me that ay such expenditure made by the federal government in this respect would be much less than the saving which would be possible in the drought area as a result of this protection.

Our great concern is, although we realize the importance and necessity of protection in the interests of the timber, adjoining parks, and especially the watershed, we find it necessary to reduce our staff and protection. With this in mind I felt that it would be only right for me to advise your government before any such curtailing of service was made effective.

The question of minerals underlying these lands should not cloud the issue as their administration has no bearing on the protective features. In fact, this was fully acknowledged in the draft agreements that were the subject of negotiation before the resources were actually transferred to Alberta for administration.

Later on, the discussion was renewed with regard to the taking over of the projects, and the then minister, Mr. Crerar, wrote a letter to Mr. Tanner under date of August 18, 1943, as follows:

We are considering projects that might be included in a scheme of post-war development. For many reasons, which it is unnecessary to recapitulate in this letter because you are thoroughly familiar with them, I believe it is of importance that steps should be taken to more adequately protect the east slopes of the Rocky mountains in Alberta. These are in the main included in provincial forest reserves. This is a project that would provide much useful employment.

We had some correspondence on this subject in 1938 and it was mentioned by the Honourable Mr. Maynard at the forestry conference with provincial ministers last May. I would refer you to my letter of January 29, 1938. The only

difference of opinion that developed in our correspondence was concerning the under-rights. I can assure you that there is an appreciation of the position of the province in this respect. Provided that an agreement can be reached whereby the development of mining and oil rights is not allowed to jeopardize the effective administration of the area for the purposes for which the dominion might take over responsibility, I would be prepared to recommend the acceptance of your view as to the retention of under-rights by the province. I would like to have confirmation from you of the fact that your government is still prepared to turn over the surface rights and the resources thereon in order that the watershed protection functions of the area may be conserved to the general advantage of Canada. If an agreement can be reached by our respective governments, plans for the protection of the area could be got under way at once and put into effect immediately the war ends.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): What were those rights—"under-rights" or "surface rights"?

Mr. GLEN: Under-rights. He is speaking there of minerals, ore particularly.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Under-rights?

Mr. GLEN: Yes.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): What are they?

Mr. GLEN: As opposed to surface rights.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Minerals.

Mr. GLEN: I continue:

It is therefore desirable that we decide upon the details of the arrangement in the meantime.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) T. A. Crerar.

That was written on August 18, 1943. Then on September 29, 1943, Mr. Tanner replied as follows:

I regret that so much time has elapsed in answering your letter of the 18th ultimo.

I have spent some time in discussing the subject of your letter with the officers of the department, in an endeavour to get a clear picture of all that is involved, so that I might present it to the government for consideration. I have also asked our subcommittee on natural resources, which is a part of the post-war reconstruction committee, to give me their views on this matter. I hope to be able to advise you further in the near future.

I might say that I am very desirous of being able to work out some satisfactory arrangement whereby the east slope of the Rocky mountains in this province can be given the attention which it deserves, with the cost of administration equitably borne by those concerned.

It will be remembered that in the first letter I read they were prepared to turn back the eastern slopes of the Rocky mountains to the government, but now they are willing to enter into some arrangement. On December 11, 1943, a letter was written by the then minister, Mr. Crerar, to Mr. Tanner, which reads as follows:

Re protection of forests on east slopes of the Rocky mountains

Following the discussion with Premier Manning, yourself and your deputy minister, Mr. Harvie, in my office, I undertook to write you again on this subject. Evidently the provincial government would prefer to continue the administration of the area, but considers that because of the benefits which undoubtetdly accrue to Saskatchewan and Manitoba from the maintenance of adequate forest cover on the east slopes the dominion should provide the funds for forest protection.

I endeavoured to set forth the difficulties of such a course from the dominion standpoint and repeated the offer which I made to you recently that I would recommend to the government taking over the administration of the east slopes of the Rockies, subject to the province retaining control of the under-rights.

As we were concluding our discussion the idea of constituting a commission or board representative of both dominion and provincial governments to manage the east slopes in the best interests of all concerned was suggested. Our view is that if the dominion is to put up all the money for the protection of these slopes then the dominion should have control of the area and be free to conduct the administration in such a manner as to ensure the results desired. My proposal meets the conditions on which your government was willing to transfer the lands in 1938 and I hope that you will not consider that I am unreasonable in urging settlement of the matter on this basis if I can secure the concurrence of our government and the approval of parliament.

The dominion now has the responsibility for the protection of the forests in the large park areas lying immediately to the west. It would seem reasonable to expect, therefore, that the two areas could be more efficiently and economically administered by one department rather than having two different administrations with the resulting duplication and overlapping of service. As I mentioned to you the dominion does not expect to make a profit on administering the forest resources. If the time should ever arrive when the amount received in revenues should exceed the dominion's total expenditures, then we would be willing to turn over the surplus to the province.

We did not discuss the length of time the area should be under special control. While I feel it should be for a long period of years, if it would be helpful to your government in reaching a decision, I would be prepared to recommend that at the end of twenty-five years the situation might be reviewed in the light of the circumstances then existing. That is, if an agreement were reached between the two governments along the lines of our proposal some years ago, it would not mean that the area for all time to come would be removed permanently from provincial administration. I do feel, however, that any arrangement that is made should continue for at least twenty-five years in order to secure satisfactory and permanent results from the expenditures that will have to be made.

I shall be glad to hear further from you on this subject at your early convenience.

Again on October 26, 1944, Mr. Crerar wrote Mr. Tanner as follows:

Following our conference last winter, I wrote you under date of the 11th December, 1943, respecting the possibility of entering into arrangements with your province for the better protection of the watershed forests of the east slopes of the Rocky mountains.

As you know, this is a matter of more than local importance, affecting as it does agricultural and power problems in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, as well as of Alberta. In some quarters the view is held that the national interest demands the assumption of a measure of permanent responsibility by the dominion, and that this is a question that should be actively dealt with as an important element in the reconstruction planning. I should be very pleased indeed to have the present views of your government on the proposals I have placed before you.

In reply, this letter of December 20, 1944, was received from Mr. Tanner:

Dear Mr. Crerar:

Re: protection of forests on the east slope of the Rocky mountains

Following our discussion in Ottawa on the 6th instant. I agreed to write you setting out as clearly as possible what I thought our programme should be regarding the above question. In doing this I shall set it out under separate points:

1. The department of lands and mines and the Alberta government recognize the need of assisting forest fire prevention on all forested areas in the province, built to the most modern and efficient standard.

2. As the east slope lies within the province of Alberta no other province is so intimately involved with the regulatory functions of forests in respect to water conservation. The stability of irrigation farming, of the beet sugar and canning industry, and of ranching, as well as water supplies for rural and urban settlement, is founded upon the constancy of stream flow and water level, largely dependent upon the condition of the watershed forest. The future of the forest industries is also dependent upon the continuance of forest growth.

3. Alberta does not favour divided jurisdiction in the handling of any of the natural resources. The province opposes the administration of any portion of her forest domain by a forest service conducting its operations from the federal seat of government. Any such form of control is in our view dilatory in method and not always efficient.

4. While opposed to the transfer of any portion of Alberta's forest area to dominion management, we feel that inasmuch as such watersheds affect the welfare of important areas beyond the provincial boundaries, it is the dominion government's responsibility to assist financially in the protection and management of the east slope watersheds.

5. Providing the dominion government is prepared to give this financial assistance, Alberta is willing to give full effect to a forest protection and forest management plan, which would be in the interests of all parts of the dominion affected. The province is prepared to engage any technical experienced competent engineer which a comprehensive plan of protection and management might require.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but he has already spoken for forty minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carry on.

Mr. GLEN: Thank you. I continue with the letter:

6. In order to satisfy the dominion government that any financial assistance given would be used on a programme of control and management which would be in the best interests of Alberta and the other provinces affected, we would favour the setting up of an advisory board on which the federal government would have a representative. This board would recommend a programme which might extend over a period of from five to twenty-five years, such programme to be approved by both governments, and a division of the costs agreed upon. The Alberta government would then accept full responsibility for putting into effect the programme as recommended by the advisory board, and approved by the dominion, with the understanding that each year as the work is done according to the programme the dominion government would pay its share of the costs as agreed upon.

7. The viewpoint of the Alberta government is that the forest resources of the province call for a long-term policy assuring of full maintenance under all conditions, and in keeping with the best known engineering standards, and we are convinced that all advantages by any plan which may be proposed, can be secured by all administration being retained by the provincial government.

8. We believe that as a result of such an elaborate programme greater revenue might be obtained from this area, and, therefore, during the term of this agreement the Alberta government would be prepared to make available to the dominion government its proportionate share of such increased revenue.

I shall appreciate hearing from you in the very near future as to how far you are prepared to go in a programme of this kind.

That is the situation as far as the east slope of the Rocky mountains is concerned. The province of Alberta desires, and has so indicated, to have complete control of the administration. It asks financial assistance from the dominion government, to be expended by the province and accounted for through the board. Nothing further was done at that time, but as far as the dominion is concerned we have now followed it up in the dominion government proposals to the dominion-provincial conference. On page 24, paragraph 4. under the heading, "Activities for which the dominion is fully responsible or is prepared to consider assuming full responsibility by suitable arrangements with the provincial governments wherever necessary," I find this:

4. Development and conservation of resources which are interprovincial in nature or have important interprovincial or regional effects:

(i) protection of regional watersheds; e.g., east slope of Rocky mountains;
(ii) integrated development of interprovincial river valley systems;
(iii) protection of migratory wild life;
(iv) agriculture; e.g., control of plant diseases.

That is the position of the dominion government at the moment. The matter has been the subject of the correspondence which I have read. The provinces have decided to form their own advisory board, which is now functioning. The dominion has not been asked to become a member of that board. As far as the forested area on the east slope of the Rocky mountains is concerned the province takes the position that it will not yield its jurisdiction over that area; but in view of the fact that the conservation of the forests is of value to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba in connection with the conservation of water, the province feels that the dominion should share the financial burden. The dominion has gone further now and placed its proposals before the dominion-provincial conference. There it is stated that this will be the subject of arrangement and agreement with the provinces concerned. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the dominion can do no more at this moment. They are fully seized with the utter desirability of some scheme being planned and carried into effect whereby the forests on the east slopes of the Rockies may be protected and water may be conserved to the advantage of Manitoba and Saskatchewan; and they are exercised that these things should be done at the earliest possible moment.

I am grateful to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) for having brought this matter before the house. I suggest that the substance of the motion he has moved has already been implemented, as far as the provinces are concerned, by the appointment of the advisory board. I suggest to him also that in the circumstances it would be presuming on the part of the dominion government to impose a body on each of the three provinces without even being asked or without their approval. In the meantime an offer has been made by the dominion, which will be considered at the conference which is to take place on April 25, when some definite plan must be entered into for the conservation of the water and the forests. I can assure the hon. member that when in his motion he speaks of "immediate consideration", these matters are being given daily consideration. Something will have to be done, because at the present time the situation is unsatisfactory from all points of view. At an early date a plan must be evolved under which the forests on the east slope of the Rockies will be protected and water will be conserved so that the other provinces may get the benefit. Therefore I suggest to the hon. member that, having given the house an opportunity to express its viewpoint with regard to irrigation and other matters which will have to be considered, he has done a very great service, but in the light of what I have said I suggest that the hon. gentleman should withdraw the motion.

Mr. E. G. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate. I regret that I was unable to hear the whole speech of the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen), but I take it that he was speaking on technical grounds against the motion now before the house and suggesting some other plan by which these measures might be made effective. Since I represent a portion of Saskatchewan which is very much interested in this irrigation project, I think I should have something to say

In the first place, I feel it is tremendously important that at this time some responsibility should be assumed by the federal government in connection with a large-scale irrigation project such as that outlined by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol). To-day, simply because of the failure of past governments to formulate plans and develop these irrigation projects, we are scraping our bins right at a time when the whole world is hungry, when we have millions of people starving. As I said last session, I am firmly of opinion that here in Canada we should establish the principle of the ever-normal granary. During the latter part of the war we were spending something like $400,000,000 a month for war purposes; and I submit that if we could do that for war, we can do it for peace. Some hon. members to my right have spoken in favour of this resolution. I do not know how they are going to bring it into harmony with large-scale production after we get back to peace-time economy. I can only say that this programme would be in complete conformity with the position taken by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation; that is, planned production for use.

I should like to direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that this great Palliser triangle which is under consideration here in connection with irrigation is considered to be the bread-basket of Canada.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): If I may ask a question, what did my hon. friend mean by harmonizing our suggestions with large-scale production? I did not quite get that.

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): In the past when we have had plenty, when our granaries have been bursting with wheat when our corrals have been filled with live stock, under the private enterprise system we have always had depressed prices and poverty among our farm people. What we want is a planned economy under which we shall produce and still have fair prices for the farm people. We are concerned with all the peoples of the world, all the hungry throughout the world. As the leader of this group said last session, nations march when they are hungry. So that to-day, when we are trying to formulate plans respecting the united nations organization, it is our duty to produce as much as we can. The greatest natural hazard we have in connection with agricultural production is that of drought. In the southern part of the province from which I come I have seen conditions, for several years, under which our people, due to the vagaries of the economic system, prices going up and down, and because of drought conditions have been forced to go to other parts of the dominion or the province. Therefore I say this is a project which, for only technical reasons, should not be thrown back into the lap of the province, but should be accepted as a responsibility of the federal government.

The irrigation project would come down from Regina to Moose Jaw, and right down through Estevan, in my constituency. We already have a project under P.F.R.A. through which from Estevan to Dead lake we can irrigate around 3,000 acres of land. Then, from Estevan to the international boundary there is another 3,000 acres which can be irrigated.

We are endeavouring to enter upon a scheme in that area whereby we can open that land for settlement by veterans, as a result of which they can go back to irrigated land and enjoy some stability in farming. Surely this is a worthwhile undertaking. Any larger scheme running down from the Saskatchewan river, through Moose Jaw and Regina, supplying those cities with water, and servicing a large acreage of land, would add tremendously to the security of those people.

A survey respecting industrial development within the province was made and handed to the present provincial government. In the survey it is stated that it was not feasible to enter into large-scale uses of chemurgy within the province, because so often in the history of the province we have had small crops. However, if we had a scheme such as this, under which in each year we could be assured of a certain crop, the project would be feasible. When one remembers that in 1937 and 1938 we had to go as far east as Quebec and as far west as British Columbia to get fodder, when we had to ship in seed and feed, and put our farming people in that section of the province under a debt-load for seed grain which was not settled until this year, one realizes the necessity for such a scheme. In those times the people suffered greatly. They had to sell their live stock, their foundation herds, and at ruinous prices.

I believe all hon. members ought to insist that this matter be put to a vote, and that the house go on record as being in favour of it. This would give a lead to the dominion-provincial conference, and the country would know where we stand.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I desire first to congratulate the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) upon placing the resolution on the order paper so that the house might discuss at length the whole question of irrigation. I believe, however, that as we face a vote it is necessary to be very careful to read the resolution, and to understand what it says. It calls for the setting up of a board, or for the passing of legislation under which the dominion government would set up a board.

Practically all hon. members who have discussed the resolution have not discussed that problem at all. Rather they have addressed themselves to the question as to the advisability of establishing an irrigation scheme. I take it there is no hon. member in the house who has any objection whatsoever to the development of an irrigation scheme.

When the minister replied, in his usual analytical fashion he directed the attention of the house to the request contained in the resolution, namely that of setting up a board. He pointed out, further, that parliament has no authority to set up such a board. He was not discussing the question as to whether the government or he were in favour of developing an irrigation scheme. Neither was he opposed in any way to the general idea of protecting our forest areas on the eastern slopes of the Rocky mountains.

Consequently the minister is entirely in accord with the arguments which have been advanced by all hon. members who have discussed the resolution, all of which tended to establish the idea that we should develop an irrigation scheme throughout the three prairie provinces, and thereby protect the forests. I rather got the impression that the last speaker had not grasped the distinction between the two matters involved in the

resolution. I would ask that we concentrate out attention again on the real meaning of the resolution.

I agree with the minister; I think his analysis of the situation is beyond reproach. He has brought us right up to the position we now occupy in Canada, and has shown exactly—

Mr. MacNICOL: I am afraid the hon. member, like the minister, is wholly astray on the resolution. It asks for consideration, and the minister appears to be afraid of consideration. So does the hon. member. But I am going to see that there is a vote on it, anyway.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I can only reassert definitely what I have already said—and the hon. member for Davenport will set me right, if I am wrong—that the idea behind the resolution is the advisability of setting up a committee.

Mr. MacNICOL: "Consideration".

Mr. COLDWELL: "Consideration" of the advisability.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is just a diplomatic way of saying the same thing.

Mr. MacNICOL: Oh, no, it is not.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Let us read it. I hope we shall not go astray in this matter and become confused. It states:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of introducing legislation during this session to set up a permanent interprovincial board or commission—

Mr. MacNICOL: Is the hon. member afraid of consideration of that?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am not saying whether I am afraid or not. I am just trying to get it clear, so that we shall all know what we are talking and voting about. And it continues:

> —on which the three prairie provinces and the dominion would have equal representation under the chairmanship of a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or some other qualified person, to conduct investigations and make studies of the most feasible and economic means for the conservation and utilization of the eastern watershed of the Rocky mountains, particularly the watershed of the Saskatchewan river.

I suggest once again, in all seriousness, and with all sincerity, to the hon. member for Davenport, that the whole gist of the resolution is that we should set up a committee, or commission. That is an altogether different matter from embarking upon an irrigation scheme or embarking upon a scheme for protecting our forest areas on the eastern slopes of the Rocky mountains. Let me repeat once more that practically every hon. member who has discussed this resolution has approached it as though it meant the introduction of an irrigation scheme.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Showed the need for a commission.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Showed the need for bringing in an irrigation scheme. There is no member of the C.C.F. or of any other party in this house who cares a button whether or not you have a commission so long as you get irrigation. It is irrigation you want, is it not? If you can get the forests protected you do not care by what technique it is accomplished, whether there is a commission or whether there is not, or whether the dominion has anything to do with it at all.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Which side are you on?

Mr. BLACKMORE: First I want to be sure just exactly what we are talking about. That must be known before anybody can tell what side he is on. As far as irrigation is concerned, I favour one hundred per cent the ideals of the hon. member for Davenport. Certainly there should be established throughout the three prairie provinces an elaborate and extensive irrigation system by which we could use all the water which falls on the eastern slopes of the Rocky mountains for the improvement of conditions in the three prairie provinces. I do not think there is an hon. member in this house who does not believe that. I certainly believe it.

Furthermore, I agree entirely with the approach of the hon. member for Davenport in the matter of protecting our Rocky mountain slopes. They have been neglected far too long. Not only must we protect the forests that are now there, we must embark upon an extensive programme of reforesting those slopes. I live right close to those slopes where I can see them every day when I am home. I have been in the mountains and I have seen how fires have devastated the forests. I know how serious the matter is, and no one in Canada is more enthusiastic than I about protecting the forests. But when it comes to voting that we must set up a commission to do this, that is an entirely different matter.

This resolution calls for the setting up of a commission. Let us see if we all agree on this matter. It calls for having the dominion government obtruding itself to a certain extent into affairs which particularly and specially belong to the provinces. I am not sure that any hon. member would vote for that principle. The minister was very wise in the stand he took on this matter. Surely, if the British North America Act has any meaning at all,

the provinces must have control over their resources and their property and civil rights. It is proposed to have the dominion government take action which would in effect mean the abrogating of provincial rights to a certain extent.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Did the P.F.R.A. intrude itself?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): You do not want it to operate in Alberta?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I hope we shall not have a lot of foolishness going on. If the hon. member for Calgary West will make sure he sees it squarely, there will be no difficulty. In connection with the P.F.R.A. I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that that is merely a scheme under which money is spent by the dominion government for the development of certain water facilities anywhere in the provinces. It has nothing to do with the taking away of any provincial jurisdiction over their waters or forests. This resolution proposes the setting up of a commission by this parliament—

Mr. CAMPBELL: What for?

Mr. BLACKMORE: The important language in it is that it proposes to set up a commission.

Mr. MacNICOL: It only asks consideration.

Mr. BLACKMORE: To deal with a matter which is of purely provincial concern.

Mr. CAMPBELL: To conduct an investigation.

Mr. BLACKMORE: In my opinion the provinces have taken exactly the right stand. They have taken the initiative and have met together. They recognized that this is a matter of provincial concern; they met to consider the problem and they have established their own board.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Which will need funds from the dominion government.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is right. I think the minister indicated clearly that the next step would be that that provincial board would ask the dominion government to sit in.

I think I have made my position with respect to the resolution quite clear, and I shall turn now for a few minutes to discuss the aspects of the resolution which all hon. members up to the present time have been discussing, namely, the desirability of developing a great irrigation system and the desirability of protecting our forest areas at the head waters of our rivers.

It is well that the members of the house should know something of the efforts that Alberta has put forth up to the present time in connection with the development of irrigation. There are one or two hon. members who have indicated that they are ready to accuse Alberta of not cooperating. I trust they will not get any such ideas as that in their minds because there is no more cooperative province in the dominion than Alberta. The Hon. T. A. Crerar rose in his place two or three times and testified to that effect even while these negotiations were going on. But the people in charge of Alberta have to be watching the interests of the people of Alberta for the next hundred years.

I am not sure that I understood exactly what the minister read and I know he will put me right if I have not interpreted it correctly. Was it not the proposal of the dominion at one time that the dominion would advance money to take care of the forests if the province of Alberta would give the dominion the under-rights. What did that mean? It meant that the dominion was prepared to advance money to help protect the forests if the province of Alberta would permit the dominion to have control over the coal under the forests, over the iron under the forests and over the gold under the forests—over the under-rights. If that is not the meaning of under-rights, then what is it?

Mr. GLEN: The province is to get the under-rights.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Was that involved?

Mr. GLEN: That was the suggestion which was made, that the province would get the under-rights.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That would not be so objectionable. I do not wish to cause any unhappiness at all, but one of the difficulties the provinces have faced, and especially Alberta, is a tendency on the part of certain dominion officials to try to get more control over provincial affairs than they ought to have under the British North America Act. The province is prepared to recognize the dominion in its field and has always been so prepared, but it is also prepared to protect the people of Alberta in their field.

May I turn from that aspect of the question because I do not wish to spend time on it. I should like to point out just what Alberta has done already with respect to irrigation. There are four major projects which have been built with provincial guarantees. These projects are the Lethbridge Northern irrigation district, undertaken in 1919, with a total irrigable acreage of 93,000 acres; the United Irrigation

district, undertaken in 1919, with a total irrigable acreage of 34,166 acres; the New West irrigation district, undertaken in July, 1922, with an irrigable acreage of 4,563 acres; the Little Bow irrigation district, undertaken in March, 1922, with a total irrigable acreage of 3,093 acres. These projects are of considerable size, particularly the Lethbridge Northern and the United irrigation districts, and the amount of money involved is large. This indicates quite clearly that the province of Alberta has been prepared to do its share in connection with the development of this great irrigation scheme and has been so for a great many years.

The province of Alberta has eight other irrigation projects, some of them of considerable size. These were all undertaken by private enterprise. They are the Canadian Pacific railway western section, undertaken in 1903, with 218,980 acres; the Canadian Pacific railway eastern section undertaken in 1903, with 250,000 acres; the Canada Land and Irrigation company, undertaken in 1908, with 130,000 acres; the A. R. and I. company, undertaken in 1899, with 100,000 acres; the Raymond irrigation district, undertaken in 1925, with 15,130 acres; the Magrath irrigation district, [illegible] acres; the Mountain View irrigation district undertaken in 1923, with 3,500; the Taber irrigation district, undertaken in 1917, with 21,499 acres. All together these irrigation districts total 880,906 acres. These are projects which have been established in Alberta and most of which are in operation right now.

There are in Alberta approximately 2,300,000 acres that could yet be brought under irrigation. They could be brought under irrigation in two ways, first of all by possible extensions where ditches have been built but have not been operated. We have two projects of that sort, the Eastern irrigation district, with 100,000 acres, and the Canada Land and Irrigation company, with 150,000 acres, or a total of 250,000 acres. What I am referring to now are extensions of schemes that are now in operation.

We have, in addition, projects which have been surveyed but which have not been constructed. One is the Lethbridge Southeastern, with 415,000 acres; the South Macleod, with 50,000 acres; Champion, with 50,000 acres; Retlaw-Lomond, with 115,000 acres; small projects, 25,000 acres; North Saskatchewan (William Pearce) project, 1,400,000 acres, or a total of 2,055,000 acres.

I think all members will realize, therefore, that Alberta is in irrigation right up to the ears. So that we must be deeply interested in this matter. We know what irrigation projects cost and we know their value.

There is another aspect of this question which I think is of interest to the house. From page 64 of "The case for Alberta", I quote:

> The total amount which the province has expended upon these projects and for which it remains liable under its guarantees, including future interest, is $16,921,728.39, made up as follows: total net outlay Lethbridge Northern, $6,410,821.98; total outlay other three districts, $473,259.34; remaining liability under guarantee, $4,911,772.07; future interest, $5,125,875.

Mr. CAMPBELL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the hon. member is not speaking to the resolution, which calls for:

> . . . a permanent interprovincial board or commission . . . to conduct investigations and make studies of the most feasible and economic means for the conservation and utilization of the eastern watershed of the Rocky mountains.

It does not say anything about Alberta irrigation.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I grant that the hon. member's point is well taken, but I would point out to him that, under his argument, every speech which has been delivered here this afternoon except the speech of the minister has been out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: If some other members who have taken part in this discussion were out of order, that is no reason for the hon. member himself being out of order. I would ask him to speak on the motion.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask for your ruling on this point. I am quite prepared to abide by your ruling, but in this discussion a very wide latitude has been allowed, which in my judgment was the right thing to do. The hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) spent the whole of his time in discussing the William Pearce project.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. member not to discuss the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. BLACKMORE: All I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is for your ruling on the point I raised.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to speak on the motion which is before the house.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will proceed with what I was going to say.

I should like to outline the general situation with respect to my own constituency

as it bears on the subject-matter of this resolution as it was interpreted by the hon. member for Davenport. There are in southern Alberta wide areas of land which are rich and easy to work, and relatively near to railways and schools. This land has nearly all been settled and brought under cultivation. The rainfall in this area is usually too scanty, and crop failures are therefore common. The climate is well adapted to growing sugar beets, canning crops, peas, beans, corn, tomatoes and all kinds of vegetables. It is also well adapted to the production of alfalfa and other hay crops and all kinds of grain. It is one of the greatest potential food-producing areas in this dominion. All that it requires is more water.

There are in my constituency four major irrigation projects. They are the Lethbridge-Colddale district, the Raymond irrigation district, the Magrath irrigation district and the Taber irrigation district, comprising altogether 120,000 acres. These projects are irrigated from the St. Mary's river through a canal built early in the century, from 1899 to 1901. Most years there is too little water in the canals of these four projects. The result is that in July, August and September, just when the water is most needed, there is a falling off and frequently there is an acute shortage of water, especially if the snowfall in the mountains has not been adequate during the previous winter, or if there has been hot weather melting the snow rapidly in the early weeks of the year. We have known at least forty per cent too little water in the ditches right at a time when growing was most important.

In the St. Mary's river there is at the present time not a reservoir in which water can be stored and from which the water in the ditches can be supplemented. There is considerable water in Alberta if only we could store it and have it available. There is enough water in four rivers in my constituency to supply all the area in that constituency and some of the area in other constituencies, particularly Medicine Hat. There are four rivers, namely, Waterton, Belly, St. Mary's and Milk, all in southwestern Alberta. From these rivers there is available for use in irrigation 795,700 acre feet of water. This quantity, allowing for losses from evaporation and seepage, would supply the needs of 465,000 acres of land. There is a particular matter of urgency in connection with this area. The St. Mary's and Milk rivers are both so nearly international streams that the United States has a claim to a share of the water. Back in 1901 the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company began to build a canal from which the Magrath, Raymond and Lethbridge areas are now watered. Then a reclamation act was passed by the congress of the United States in 1902. The St. Mary's and Milk rivers project in Montana was authorized in 1903, and there were protests from citizens on both sides of the line, those on one side fearing that the people on the other side would get more than their share.

In consequence, a boundary waters treaty was made on January 11, 1909, in which, under article VI, there was set up an international joint commission to deal with the boundary waters. This provided for an apportionment of waters between the two countries under the direction of the commission. In the final act of the international joint commission on October 4, 1921, definite rules were laid down for dividing the water between Canada and the United States. In accordance with the final act, Canada, between 1922 and 1940, would receive annually from the St. Mary's and Milk rivers 403,200 acre-feet of water, and the United States, 324,100 acre-feet.

During the years from 1922 to 1940 and since, Canada has wasted and is now wasting 55 per cent of her share of the St. Mary's and 95 per cent of her share of the Milk river. This is extremely serious for two reasons. First, there is loss of production and of human values, and, second, there is danger of our losing our right to this water. It is recognized that a country must make beneficial use of water if it is to retain its right thereto. Canada for twenty-five years has neglected to make such beneficial use of her share of this water.

Realization of this fact will make it clear to hon. members why the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) is very wisely planning to begin active work on the construction of the St. Mary's river project this year. It is in order to protect our right to the water, and I wish to commend him very highly and to express to him once more the gratitude of my constituents for his promptness in going forward with this work immediately upon the cessation of the war.

Meanwhile, what has the United States been doing with her share? The United States authorized her St. Mary's and Milk river project in 1903 and began work in 1906, completing it in 1920. She has built the Sherbourne reservoir, capable of storing 66,000 acre-feet near the head of the St. Mary's, and a diversion canal from the St. Mary's to the Milk river to carry into the Milk the United States share of the St. Mary's. Then, near the Milk river she has constructed the Fresno reservoir,

capable of storing 126,000 acre-feet and the Nelson river reservoir, capable of storing 66,800 acre-feet.

It is estimated that the United States is now equipped to handle her share and ours as well, and all her share of the water is being beneficially used. She has great need for much more than she has available, and she is finding irrigation profitable, as has been pointed out several times in the debate to-day. Thus again hon. members can see why the Minister of Agriculture has taken particular care to go forward with the construction of this project as expeditiously as possible.

The dam which we need to construct in Canada in order to show our good faith is what is known as the St. Mary's river dam. This dam is situated at Spring Coulee in my constituency. Its capacity will be 270,000 acre-feet. Into it can be diverted water from the Waterton river and the Belly river. Once this dam is constructed, once this reservoir is being used, there will be no occasion for anyone from the United States to establish the idea that Canada is not making beneficial use of her water. Thus the minister is proceeding with construction of the St. Mary's river dam. From the St. Mary's river dam, water can be carried to supply all the present projects to which I have referred and to the seven other reservoirs in the district, and all these together will store enough water to supply the needs of all the present irrigation projects, and 345,000 acres of land which have not yet been brought under water.

Consequently this dam is of extremely great importance. The minister has told us to-day that $750,000 is to be spent on this dam this year. The total cost of the dam will be in the neighbourhood of $4,000,000. The reason why $750,000 is to be spent this year rather than the whole amount is that the dam cannot be built any faster. That is indicated by the apportionment of that sum of $750,000, which is about all that can be spent this year. In the second year the reservoir and outlet canals can be built at a cost of $2,250,000. Hon. members might therefore expect next year that the amount of money which will be set aside for the construction of the St. Mary's river dam will be $2,250,000. In the third year the reservoir, canal enlargement and distribution system would be built according to plan. This cost will be something over $2,250,000, estimated at pre-war prices.

There are four reasons, then, why we should go forward with this particular project as rapidly as we possibly can. The first one is the food situation; the second one is the possible war needs, for apparently we are not yet through with wars; the third one is the rehabilitation of our boys, and finally, once more, the protection of our share of the water from the St Mary's and Milk rivers.

May I refer for just a moment to the general resolution? At the outset of my remarks I pointed out that the resolution does not really call for the construction of the great irrigation system, although unquestionably it is the construction of the great irrigation system which is near to the heart of the hon. member for Davenport. I honour him greatly because of his deep interest and activity with respect to the popularization of the idea of constructing this great irrigation scheme. Since he spoke this afternoon, there has come into my hands the map of the whole area to which he referred. I wish to congratulate him again on that map. Many things are shown in detail. To my mind it is a splendid conception. I heartily support the idea. As a resident of Alberta, as a member for Alberta, let me say to the house that we in Alberta have no desire to have more of the water than is our share. We desire to see the other provinces have the advantage of water. We believe there is pleny of water in these rivers flowing down from the eastern slopes of the Rocky mountains to supply the needs of all three provinces. The hon. member for Davenport expressed that idea this afternoon. From what studies I have been able to make I feel that I am justified in agreeing with him that there is plenty of water.

The next idea that was near to his heart, and which he made quite clear to the house, was that of protecting the forests on the slopes of the mountains. This must be done. Once more I am heartily in accord with that idea. I believe, of course, that dominion money must go into the protection of those forests, for the simple reason that one province simply cannot take care of the great problem which is involved in looking after those areas. All anyone needs to do is to look at a map, look at the Rocky mountains as they skirt the western boundary of Alberta, estimate the tremendous length of those mountains, estimate the amount of money which would have to be spent in order to have suitable precautions made ready to act in emergencies, such as fire hazards. Anyone can recognize that no one province in this dominion would be in a position to discharge the financial responsibilities involved. There simply must be assistance from the dominion government. This does not mean that Alberta should surrender any of her rights under the British North America Act, any of her resources or any of her property and civil rights. It does mean that assistance must

come from the other provinces to protect the resource which is of vital interest to all the people of Canada.

I now find myself in a difficult position. I have to repeat once more that I favour completely the establishment of an elaborate, far-reaching thorough-going irrigation system throughout the three prairie provinces, and I favour the protection of the forests on the eastern slopes of the Rocky mountains. But I cannot say that I favour the idea of the dominion government passing a law to set up a commission to do what this resolution calls for. There is no objection to having a committee study the situation. I think there is no danger in the wording. In that respect may I read it again. This commission is to be set up to conduct investigations and make studies of the most feasible and economic means for the conservation and utilization of the eastern watershed of the Rocky mountains, particularly the watershed of the Saskatchewan river. So far as I can see, there can be no objection to that if this committee has no power or authority to rule with respect to the use of the water. However, I believe the minister's point was well taken when he indicated quite clearly that it is not the proper function of the dominion government to take the initiative in this matter, especially since the provinces themselves, through their representatives, have met and proceeded to do the work which is envisaged by this resolution.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): I desire to say a few words on this resolution. First of all, may I commend the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) for bringing the resolution before the house. He is one of those members who have, in the words of the man on the street, what is called a roving commission. He has taken it upon himself to interest himself in parts of Canada other than his own particular riding. Perhaps he may have a little more time and may be a little better fixed financially than many other hon. members to do this, and then he is not easily intimidated with respect to going into other members' ridings and investigating what is going on there.

On various occasions the hon. member has introduced most commendable resolutions. In commending him to-night I wish at the same time to say something on the principle of the resolution. It may seem strange that one from British Columbia should rise at this late stage of the debate and deal with a resolution which refers particularly to the watershed of the Saskatchewan river. It is no more strange than the hon. member for Davenport introducing it.

As I say, I intend to deal with the resolution itself. In that regard I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), who in his opening remarks drew the attention of the house to the fact that this resolution might infringe upon provincial rights.

I know there are many members in the house who do not view the infringement of provincial rights by the dominion as seriously as I do. Ever since 1939 when the dominion took over all the powers of the country many municipal and provincial governments have been set aside. As a matter of fact, in many instances provincial governments have been nothing more than glorified municipal councils, at least for the past six years. People have become so accustomed to the dominion government handling their affairs that their eyes turn to Ottawa. If their chickens do not lay, it must be the fault of the dominion government. If there is trouble at home, it must be the fault of the dominion government. On every occasion the provincial governments will be found looking to Ottawa for assistance and help. I view that tendency with alarm. I view as one who lives some three thousand miles from Ottawa viewing with alarm the centralization of power in Ottawa. I would advise members of parliament to give a little more thought to asking the dominion government to do everything within their province or within their municipality. Bit by bit power is being concentrated in the city of Ottawa, and I say the time is not yet ripe, in the interests of the welfare of the people, that all power should be centralized here.

I listened with a great deal of attention while the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen) read the voluminous correspondence which has passed between the dominion government and certain provincial premiers, in which the discussion centred around the eastern watershed and the taking off of trees from the mountain-tops. The removal of the trees from both heights of land and from the mountains as well has done irreparable damage to farm land not only close to the Rocky mountains but in the other western provinces as well. In the province from which I come there was a time when the forests in the Fraser valley held the water right through the growing season. In those years the farmers had not the difficulties they have experienced since. The rain that fell in the winter and spring was held in the soil for months, generally speaking, and percolated very slowly to the creeks and rivers. Once the timber was cut off, however, the rain which fell in the winter and spring ran right off, of course

causing floods during the spring season. Something else was caused in the summer time, however; a dryness resulted which has affected the growing of crops for many long years.

I remember an incident which occurred in 1932 or 1933, when under the administration of that day men were put to work cutting trees off the mountains in a district called Lillooet. The only purpose in having those men cut the trees from the mountain-tops and mountain-side was to keep the snow from hanging, although those men might have been given other and more useful work, because Lillooet is a gold centre and men were and still are making anywhere from $2 to $16 a day panning gold. But taking off that timber did irreparable damage to the district of Lillooet, and the same thing occurred in the Fraser district.

I should like to have seen a resolution of this kind broadened, not to ask the dominion government to take over irrigation projects but merely to ask it to make a survey and advise the provinces as to what should be done in regard to irrigation. Something has been said about planned economy; I believe I heard one speaker mention that this evening. From my knowledge of the prairies I believe I am correct in saying that, at the most, irrigation would affect but a fraction of the prairie land. Out of some sixty or sixty-five million acres of land, of which some twenty or thirty millions are in the prairie belt, I doubt if more than two or three million acres at the most could be brought under irrigation. It is all very well to talk about producing more food, about planned economy, and so on, and to place before the people a picture in which the whole prairie district will be helped out by some great water scheme. But for the benefit of the farmers on the prairies and some hon. members who advocate this scheme, after some practical experience I am going to predict that when that type of farming comes to the prairies many who are looking forward to it may not care to farm under it.

With irrigation you have to farm with a shovel. The irrigation ditches are all put down; but once you start irrigation you cannot just sit on your fanny and pray that the Lord will bring some rain, or send for a Hatfield to bring rain. You cannot do that any more. Once you get into irrigation you have really to work; and after a man has sat on his fanny for ten or fifteen years on the prairies, once he has to get hold of a shovel and work all day going out through the rows of trees or out among his crops he may not like it. Yet if he does not do that the water system will not be worth anything at all; I do not think any hon. member will dispute that. I know a district in the middle of British Columbia where a certain type of farmer has taken up the growing of apples and other crops under irrigation. Those farmers have gone into that district because they are not afraid of work, and because they know what they have to put up with. But I am thinking of those who have long sat looking to the clouds or to the dominion government or to a Hatfield to bring them what they need, and I am just wondering how they will like it after these irrigation schemes are put into effect. I am not too sure that they will take kindly to it. I know that many who come from the prairies to British Columbia find farming there just a little tougher than they found it in Saskatchewan, Alberta or Manitoba, although perhaps when we get into the new era that may be changed.

My main purpose in rising, Mr. Speaker, was to draw the attention of hon. members to the principles at stake in this proposal, and to advise hon. members to view with care putting into the hands of the dominion government powers which properly should belong to the provincial governments.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, with all respect to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) I should like to call your attention and that of the house to the fact that this resolution indicates no feasible conclusion. It suggests that a board or commission should be appointed to investigate and make studies, but then it does not provide what shall be done with the information they get. Are they to carry out that investigation and make those studies just for their own amusement or their own information? It does not provide that they shall report to the government or any department of the government. Why should this house want to create an institution like that, to do nothing that will be in the public interest? As far as the resolution goes, if they get any information they may keep it to themselves. I should think the hon. gentleman and other hon. members would agree that the Department of Mines and Resources has on its staff enough engineers and experts to make such an examination and report to that department. Then, if the minister chose he could report to the house and action could be taken. As I say, however, with all respect to the hon. member for Davenport I cannot see any advantage in putting through a resolution like this.

Mr. J. M. DECHENE (Athabaska): As I rose, Mr. Speaker, I was advised not to speak too long. I shall govern myself according to

my own thoughts, however, no matter where the counsel comes from. I did not intend to speak at all, as a matter of fact, but I hesitate to let this resolution go to a vote without saying a word, after hearing the correspondence read by the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen). I am somewhat in the same position as the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore); I must admit that I was quite prepared to give full support to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol).

This is a question that has agitated the minds of the people of the west for a great many years. I believe it is fifty-four years ago this month that as a boy, travelling on the slow train through the western plains, I wondered after hours and hours of travel, not seeing even a shack anywhere throughout this vast area, why it was all this wonderful land lay idle. To me, coming from the province of Quebec, where we had such hard work chopping the trees and clearing sufficient to build a shack in the lake St. John area when we first went there, this was strange. I wondered why we went for mile after mile after mile, and did not stop and pick up some of this fine prairie land which seemed to lie there in the sun waiting for someone to plough it up, and tear its bosom for crops.

One settler, hearing my comment and my amazement, asked me, "Do you see any trees across this plain?" I said that I did not. He said, "There are a few places, as you can see even in the ditches along the railway tracks, where the depth of this black soil reaches down two or three or four feet; the richest soil under the sun. Why is it that no trees grow?" Then he said, "If it rained here every year we would have a forest. The reason why settlers are not stopping here is that they do not get rainfall. It may rain for a year or two and then there will be three or four years of drought. The result is that the settlers go farther west and farther north." This lesson stayed in my mind.

Those of us in Alberta of the political persuasion to which I belong have had another lesson in connection with the Lethbridge Northern which was mentioned by the hon. member across the way. It was the Liberal party in Alberta, led at that time by a man who later became Minister of the Interior in this house, one who was highly esteemed and liked by everyone, the Hon. Charles Stewart. This happened under his leadership, and I well remember almost every word that was said in the debate. After a great deal of agitation throughout the southern part of the province the plan as submitted to the government under the Lethbridge-Northern scheme was accepted. The people who had organized thte Lethbridge-Northern irrigation district came to the house and strongly supported the project, almost demanding that it be accepted.

What was wanted then was a guarantee of the debentures of the Lethbridge-Northern district by the provincial government. As the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackburn) has said, this involved a large sum of money. Eventually the house became convinced that it ought to accede to the request so ably presented and so urgently supported. The result was that the Liberal government of that day did guarantee the debentures which enabled the formation of the Lethbridge-Northern district, and permitted it to begin operations.

We were well-paid for it politically! At the election following the guarantee of the debentures of Alberta for a sum which I now forget —but it was a considerable sum of money—the Liberal party did not win one seat in any of the seats involved in and around that district. I believe the one exception was the Bow valley. We lost Lethbridge, we lost Macleod, we lost Empress, we lost Taber—we lost them all, except the Bow valley.

So that I say to the hon. member for Davenport that I hope the Conservative party does not receive the same treatment for his actions, if he succeeds in getting the attention he hopes to get and the support he hopes to get from the government of Canada and from the western provinces.

The situation was discussed by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), and also by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith), who always speaks in a most interesting fashion. I think he is one of the most pleasant speakers in the house. The sense of humour he injects into his speeches makes them most agreeable to listen to.

Those hon. members mentioned the possibility of the farmers taking over the eastern irrigation district. I was in the Alberta legislature when the bill was passed enabling the farmers to take over from the Canadian Pacific railway. When they say that the farmers are carrying on successfully, they forget one important matter. The main point is that the Canadian Pacific had to give the land away, because they were unable to carry it any longer. It was said this afternoon and this evening that nobody ever pays the Canadian Pacific and the government if that can be avoided. Perhaps that is true.

However, the main reason was that in ordinary times and under normal conditions the rates they had to charge for water and for the lease of the land were such that only a very few of the most efficient farmers

could make any profit on their operations. When the Canadian Pacific, without the return of a single dollar, gave away millions of dollars worth of property; when they gave up dams and gave up ditches; when they gave the land and everything free, the farmers were able to take it over without spending a dollar or assuming any obligations whatsoever. They had no interest to meet, no amount to lay aside for amortization, or anything of that kind.

Of course it was easy to make a success of it, provided that they got crops—which they did. The farmers of those districts, I admit, have administered their business well. As described so eloquently by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and the hon. member for Calgary West, the area involved is a bit of paradise on earth; certainly it is one of the finest places one could visit in western Canada. It is almost a show place, and when one travels through this irrigated district he sees that it produces fruits and vegetables and many other crops in great abundance.

Surely we are not going to ask the people of Canada to-day to assume the obligations that the Canadian Pacific railway tried to assume and tried to carry on for years. We are not going to ask the people of Canada to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, and then give the land away to somebody else. The taxpayers in Quebec, the maritime provinces and Ontario are entitled to have some say in the disposition of land and the cost of investigations. They should know something about the cost of reforestation, and how it is to be done.

Before we embark upon a proposition of this magnitude, most careful consideration must be given as to how we are to meet the expenditure of money. We must consider how the farmers we hope to place on the land will meet the indebtedness that will be created by the cost of the land, of the water, and of all the works required to build a vast project of that kind.

May I congratulate the hon. member for Davenport upon the able manner in which he has presented the resolution? I know the sincerity of his convictions as to what we ought to do for the people who have settled on this land which, through years of drought, has been found to be arid, and who are faced with sufferings and discouragement such as have been so ably described by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar.

I thank the hon. member for reminding me of that grand old chief who had such a vision in this matter. I do not think the hon. member mentioned it, but I think he had in mind a meeting held in Edmonton in 1910, which I attended. Across the street from where the grand old man of Liberalism was speaking was a banner on the balcony of a hotel reading, "Come back, Laurier, by the river route." He did not, because in 1911, although western Canada supported his policy, he was overwhelmingly defeated in eastern Canada, and men with his vision did not come into this house to carry on what he had envisaged and what has been so ably described by the hon. member for Davenport.

Before I came into the house to-night to hear what the minister had to say, whose remarks brought me to my feet, I was reading a letter which I had just received from a personal friend in Athabaska. He asked me why it was that I did not take advantage of the fact that the French language is one of the official languages of this country. He wanted to know why in the few times I have had the honour to address this august assembly I had never used that language. With the permission of the house, and in the hope that the hon. member for Davenport has in his years of travel learned sufficient French to be able to follow me. I shall finish my address in my mother tongue.

(Translation):

Mr. Speaker, I admit that it is not without some hesitation that I rise to-night to discuss the highly important matter which the hon. member for Davenport has brought forward in his own inimitable style, and with his enlightened patriotism, his devotion to the cause of hapless people, among whom he includes especially the residents of the prairies.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it had not been my intention to speak to-night; therefore I am doing my best with the conviction that I am fulfilling a duty, since I am the only liberal representative of the Alberta farmers, in voicing my opinion on a matter as important as this one; it is important not only for the western but also for the eastern provinces which with us will have to assume the financial responsibility in this connection, and also, because one must pay for anything purchased, not only in Alberta but in all other provinces, for I cannot see any possibility of living without having anything to pay.

In Alberta, we have the privilege to hear a gospel which teaches that there are certain means of spending money without any cost being involved. But up to the present, it has been absolutely impossible to convince the balance of the country of the value of this doctrine. It must not be forgotten, in the course of a debate on a project the cost of

which is variously estimated at 100, 200, 300 and even $400 million, that this house is perfectly entitled to discuss such an important question for at least a whole day.

I am not one of those who waste their time in discussions on what the east could do for the west and vice versa. I know too well the good understanding that exists among our people to waste time in such idle talk. A lot is said that is jocularly but I know that in Montreal, Toronto and even in the maritime provinces, our conditions are perfectly well known. I realize the vast sums of money that were expended to open the western prairies, where I live, but I also know that they have created considerable wealth in return, to an amount which certainly balances the expenditures involved.

I well remember, Mr. Speaker, that in normal times—and I hope they will return—I well remember that the topic of the day in the month of August boiled down, for western farmers as well as for the rest of the country, to wondering about the crop out west. Would the prairie provinces have a bumper crop? The Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg newspapers and those of other cities as well sent reporters and experts to gauge the crop prospects out west. Factories in our industrial centres anxiously awaited reports on the wheat crop of western farmers. Would we reap one hundred, two hundred or three hundred million bushels of wheat? That was the topic of the day, Mr. Speaker, because western farmers, who operate on a large scale, supply with funds the factories as well as wholesale and retail dealers of the central and eastern provinces.

Sometimes I incline to think that the western farmer is to a certain extent a spendthrift. Then, let us stop discussing projects as extensive as the one which has been proposed by the hon. member for Davenport, who considers it rather as from a local issue, while I view it as having a national character. I was saying, in the course of the remarks I made in English, that about fifty-four years ago this month, I was travelling with my father and a neighbour who were chatting on the train that was moving slowly across the great western plains. Those plains looked extensive to us, outsiders, who were from the Lake St. John district, where, as you all know, the plains do not cover very great stretches—when I was a boy, I remember that our small pasture seemed very near the house. Needless to say how astonished I was when I saw those great plains which seemed to extend so far in the distance, that we could not think we would ever reach the end: It was then that I asked my companion: "How is it that these lands are not all under cultivation?" Why are those plains not already peopled all over? Why do the wheat fields not stretch as far as the eye can reach? That is what happens to-day in the irrigated areas or where the rainfall is plentiful. And my old companion answered right back: "Well, my friend, do you see any trees in these plains?" "As a matter of fact, I do not". "Well, that is because we have no rain. The soil is so fertile that if the Good Lord watered it occasionally with a bit of His beneficial rain, these plains would be covered with forests. The lack of timber in these vast areas is due to the lack of rain."

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Talk it out.

(Text):

Mr. DECHENE: I heard the hon. member, and with the permission of the house I shall revert to the other language, of which I happen to know a little, in order to answer his remark. He does not seem to understand the rule. Surely the hon. member knows that the rule which provides that private members' motions shall be discussed only on certain days was not put there just for fun. He knows it was placed there because of a need. He knows that in this parliament and in the legislatures of Canada the government is the body which governs. That rule was placed there so that the private members of this house, as in any other legislature in a British parliament, may bring before parliament the question that he wishes to bring to the attention of the people. A member from British Columbia, for instance, may bring before the house a matter in which he is interested, but a member from Nova Scotia who is not conversant with the matter requires time to study it. It takes time for public opinion to be seized of the matter and for the press to discuss it. We can conceive of a member of a certain group arriving at a certain conclusion before the matter comes before parliament but—

An hon. MEMBER: Why not let the house settle it?

Mr. DECHENE: I was replying to the question that had been asked by my hon. friend over there, a question that could have been asked only by a man who does not understand the rules. To say, "talk it out," shows an ignorance of the rules that one would not expect of a member who has been in the house all the years he has been here.

(Translation):

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall proceed in the language I was using when my hon. friend interrupted me.

I wish to insist anew on the deforestation of the eastern slopes of the Rocky mountains. To my mind, this is the most important part

of the resolution now before the house. Indeed, as the eastern slope of the Rockies is stripped of its vegetation, and as the snowfields, which were so beneficial to us in past years, recede, water gets scarcer in the western prairies, the velocity of our rivers decreases, humidity gradually disappears everywhere. As a result, the dry regions of the western provinces increase in area, except, possibly, in Manitoba. This is a vital problem which will command our serious attention at some future time, but, of course, it cannot be considered with a province that will not cooperate. In my opinion, the hon. member for Davenport should have sought first of all, with his customary courtesy, an interview with the leaders of the Alberta government in order to ascertain whether the latter were prepared to cooperate with the dominion government in carrying out such a measure. But as the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen) has shown by means of the correspondence exchange with the leaders of that province, they are not prepared to cooperate in carrying out the work essential to the project which was so ably introduced by the hon. member for Davenport.

As I stated a moment ago, rainfall is getting more and more scanty from year to year in the northern section of Alberta, of Saskatchewan right up to my own district in the vicinity of Cold lake. There lies the vital problem which prompts me to join with the hon. members who have spoken on this matter in asking the whole house to consider very seriously this matter of irrigation in that part of the western provinces. We must act now, but not in the manner suggested in the resolution. In fact, I do not think it wise to insist on such a vote being taken, when the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), who represents his party in the house to-night, is apparently unable to make up his mind. This matter should be submitted in such a way that the house could unanimously support a resolution which should be endorsed by hon. members in every section of the house.

As I said a moment ago in English, the province of Alberta is carrying on a rather costly experiment in the way of irrigation—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I wonder if the hon. member is complying with the rules and if he really speaks to the question before the house.

Mr. DECHENE: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was discussing the two points mentioned in the resolution submitted by my hon. friend. I shall give the French version of it, if I may be permitted to do so, because the translation we have does not convey exactly the same meaning as the original. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for having called my attention to the rules of the house. If I broke those rules, I beg your forgiveness. The resolution is worded as follows:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into immediate consideration the advisability of introducing legislation during this session to set up a permanent interprovincial board or commission . . .

The province of Alberta is therefore included.

. . . on which the three prairie provinces and the dominion . . .

Again the province of Alberta is included.

. . . would have equal representation under the chairmanship of a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or some other qualified person, to conduct investigations and make studies of the most feasible and economic means for the conservation and utilization of the eastern watershed of the Rocky mountains, particularly the watershed of the Saskatchewan river.

Mr. Speaker, I was just discussing that point. I was saying that some of this water flows in the plain, gradually reaches to the northlands and even further. This water, however, does not flow with the same abundance as in the southern areas of the prairies, but . . .

(Text):

Mr. McCUAIG: If I may ask the hon. member a question, why will he not let the people's representatives vote on this question?

Mr. DECHENE: I have no idea whatsoever how the people that I am supposed to live with would vote on this question. I am speaking as J. M. Dechene, M.P. for Athabaska. I have been in this house for some years, and my hon. friend, when he has been here longer, will know that I speak my own views in my own language in my own way and that I am not governed by anybody else.

(Translation):

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much having been unable to complete my last sentence as it was the most important point to which I wished to refer to-night. However, it is eleven o'clock and as I do not wish to break the rules of the house, move the adjournment of the debate.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member moves the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. DECHENE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as it is eleven o'clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Mr. Dechene the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, April 9, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CHANGE IN PERSONNEL OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the name of Mr. A. E. Robinson (Bruce) be substituted for that of Mr. Bruce on the committee on veterans affairs.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

CREDIT TO FRANCE UNDER EXPORT CREDITS INSURANCE ACT

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I should like to make a brief announcement in which I believe the house will be interested.

An agreement with the government of France was signed early this afternoon, under which Canada will provide to France a credit of $242,500,000 to enable France to make purchases in Canada. The amount and terms of this credit were agreed upon last September by M. Jean Monnet and myself, with the approval of our two governments, and they were made public later in the autumn.

The credit bears interest at three per cent and is repayable in thirty annual instalments, commencing at the end of 1947 and running until the end of 1976. The agreement was signed by the French ambassador on behalf of his government, and myself on behalf of the government of Canada.

This is much the largest of all our credits under the Export Credits Insurance Act. I am sure that members of the house, as well as the government, will welcome this agreement and the effective cooperation of Canadians in assisting in the reconstruction of this great allied nation with whom we have such close ties of friendship and historical association.

Mr. BRACKEN: I wonder if the minister could inform the house what the total is of all credits already extended to countries other than Britain.

Mr. ILSLEY: I will make a statement giving that total when I introduce the resolution relating to the United Kingdom loan, which I hope will be on Thursday.

EXPORT ACT AMENDMENT

REPEAL OF SECTIONS 5 AND 6—EXPORT OF WILDFOWL

Hon. J. A. GLEN (Minister of Mines and Resources) moved the first reading of bill No. 14 (from the Senate) to amend the Export Act.

[Mr. Dechene.]

He said: The purpose of the bill is to eliminate certain overlapping with the Game Export Act and to assist the administration of provincial game regulations. Owing to changed conditions the provisions of sections 5 and 6 of the Export Act have become undesirable. They prevent non-resident sportsmen from taking home with them woodcock, partridge or prairie fowl lawfully killed by them in Canada. This bill really is founded upon a resolution which was passed at the ninth conference of provincial and dominion wild life officials held at Ottawa on April 6 and 7, 1942, requesting that sections 5 and 6 of the Export Act be repealed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

EXPLOSIVES ACT

AMENDMENTS TO MEET PRESENT-DAY REQUIREMENTS

Hon. J. A. GLEN (Minister of Mines and Resources) moved the first reading of bill No. 16 (from the Senate) respecting the manufacture, testing, sale, storage and importation of explosives.

He said: The Explosives Act, which is chapter 31 of the statutes of 1914, was passed by parliament on June 12, 1914, and has not been changed in any respect since 1920, the year in which it was proclaimed, save for the general revision of Canadian statutes of 1927. It is based on the British explosives act, 1875. The purpose of this bill is to bring the statute into line with present-day requirements and to remedy defects that have been revealed by practical experience in its administration.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PRECEDENCE FOR GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ON MONDAYS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That on and after Wednesday the 10th April next to the end of the session, government notices of motion and government orders shall have precedence on Wednesdays over all business except the introduction of bills, questions by members and notices of motion for the production of papers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when I asked the Clerk to put this notice of motion on the order paper I had not realized that the house will be adjourning on Wednesday of next week, which is the 17th, over the Easter recess. I should like to point out to hon. members that on Thursday of this week we shall have been here for four weeks, and that up to the present there has been very little consideration

of government measures. The Secretary of State has a bill respecting citizenship which has not yet been given second reading. As the Minister of Finance has indicated, he is ready to proceed on Thursday with the bill respecting the loan to the United Kingdom. Apart from these measures nothing in the way of government business has been accomplished thus far, unless my little bill on the external affairs department could be regarded as such.

If I had thought of the Easter adjournment coming next week I would have worded the motion to read that on and after Monday, April 15 next to the end of the session, government notices of motion, government orders and so on shall have precedence on Mondays over all business except the introduction of bills, questions by members and notices of motion for the production of papers. If the house would allow me to amend the motion in that way, I would appeal very strongly to hon. members to accept the amendment and allow the motion as so amended to carry. I do this without any desire to deprive hon. members of their opportunities but rather in an attempt to assist the entire house to get through its business. If we continue discussing the resolutions of private members during the next couple of weeks we shall have no government business under way until some time after the Easter recess, and then hon. members will begin to regret that they have taken so long in the discussion of private members' resolutions to the exclusion of government business. For that reason I would ask the house to allow me to amend the motion by striking out the words "Wednesday, the 10th" and substituting therefor the words "Monday, the 15th."

Mr. STIRLING: And later on the word "Monday" will have to be substituted for "Wednesday."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment is that the words "Wednesday the 10th" be struck out and the words "Monday the 15th" substituted therefor, and that in the third line the word "Wednesdays" be struck out and the word "Mondays" substituted therefor.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): The rules of the house provide that certain days of the week be allowed for the business of private members. All the private members have done has been to utilize the time thus placed at their disposal. If now the government wishes to take more of that time for its own business, I am sure we shall all look at the request with an open mind. However, I would offer two suggestions to the government. If Monday, a private members' day with afternoon and evening sittings, is taken for government business, as I expect it will be, I would respectfully suggest that Wednesday with only an afternoon sitting be continued as a private members' day rather longer in the session than otherwise would be done. My second suggestion is that the government might expedite its own business by allowing us to get to a vote on some of these private measures before eleven o'clock at night.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I think the request is reasonable, but I agree with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) that if Monday is taken away we should continue for a while at least to have Wednesday for private members. I think the matter should be adjusted in that way.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I too believe the request is quite reasonable. After all, the house wants to finish its business some time before August.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may tell my hon. friend that his suggestion will meet with the approval of the government. I think after a little while the house itself will be only too ready to take Wednesday, so we may well leave the question of Wednesday to be taken up a little later on. I thank hon. members for their cooperation in this matter.

Mr. BRACKEN: What about my second proposal?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The second proposal refers to the capacity of the government to stop anyone from speaking when he gets a chance. I am afraid that is a power which cannot be exercised on any side of the house.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

CANADIAN FORCES

PERMANENT FORCE ESTABLISHMENTS—ARMY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence, notice of which I have given. When can the men in the forces, particularly those in the interim forces, expect to receive an announcement regarding the permanent force establishments? The delay in the announcement is causing difficulties for those who are anxious about future employment.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): As my hon. friend knows, my colleague the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Gibson) and I announced last October the approximate size of the three

armed forces. In January, following a conference with district officers commanding, and senior officers at national defence headquarters at Ottawa I gave the press a statement in which I indicated that so far as the army is concerned the active force will comprise a field unit, composed of a brigade group, which will be representative of all arms, and the remainder of the force will consist of headquarters staff; personnel to assist in the training and administration of the reserve force, research and development, and the units required for the maintenance of the Alaska highway, and the like.

I had not contemplated making any further detailed announcement as to the establishments in the immediate future. As the house knows, committees have been sitting to consider the question of pay and allowances and pension provision for post-war services, and I expect to make an announcement concerning this within the course of the next few days.

SERVICEMAN HELD UNDER P.C. 6577

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Justice. Have any instructions been given that Mr. McCloy in Winnipeg is to be released from custody under which he is held under P.C. 6577, and has the order in council in question been set aside?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I shall have to take the hon. member's question as a notice, and make inquiries. As soon as I have ascertained the facts I shall give an answer.

TIMBER

CONDITIONS AFFECTING EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. E. LENNARD (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Reconstruction. Has the government considered lifting the embargo on timber exports to the United States, as hinted in a recent press dispatch?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Mr. Speaker, there is no embargo on timber exports to the United States. A certain proportion of the cut is exported by agreement between the timber authorities of the two countries. From removal of the control two results would follow: there would be an immediate increase in the price of lumber to the Canadian user by from $20 to $30 a thousand, or alternately there would be no lumber for Canadian users. The present control will be continued. There is no change contemplated.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

WINNIPEG NEWSPAPERS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. What additional steps are being taken by the Department of Labour to settle the dispute between the Winnipeg newspapers and members of the typographical union?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I thank the hon. member for having given me notice of the question. I have already appointed a second commissioner in an effort to bring the parties together. I hope to settle the dispute.

REQUIREMENTS OF MANITOBA SUGAR BEET PRODUCERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM BRYCE (Selkirk): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour, of which I have given notice. Will the minister give assurance to the beet growers in the Red River valley that the necessary labour will be available for the increased production contemplated this year?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I wish to thank my hon. friend for having given notice of his question. The federal department of labour, along with provincial agricultural authorities, sugar beet growers and sugar companies, have been giving special attention to the matter referred to by the hon. member. I cannot give any absolute assurance, in view of the very tight labour situation in agriculture to-day, and the fact since V-J day that we have not had the power of direction. I think, however, the hon. member may rest assured that we shall overcome the difficulties this year, as we have done in the past, ever since I have been head of the department.

HOUSING

TORONTO—UTILIZATION OF GENERAL ENGINEERING PLANTS FOR SHELTER PURPOSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Reconstruction. Have any arrangements been made

with the city of Toronto with regard to utilizing the buildings of the General Engineering company on Dawes road for shelter purposes? If not, if matters are simply being investigated, could the minister speed up those investigations so that these buildings can be used for shelter? The situation is desperate.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I have no information about the situation, but I shall make inquiries and try to give an answer.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

The house resumed from Friday, April 5, consideration of the motion of Mr. Martin for the second reading of bill No. 7, respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens.

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, at different times during the debate my thoughts have gone back some nineteen years to a scene in a classroom at Osgoode Hall Law School when the class was studying private international law. In the lectures on the subject of the Canadian Naturalization Act I am sure one young man in that class would have been interested indeed if he could have foreseen that some nineteen years later he would be introducing in this House of Commons a citizenship bill. The student of nineteen years ago is the Secretary of State to-day. And had I been able to foresee the future I should have been surprised to know that the student who then sat two seats away from the man who is now Secretary of State would now be rising to support the principle of the bill introduced by the Secretary of State.

Some things have been said in the debate which I think will be deplored by those who love our country and feel that it can become great only to the extent to which it is united. From time to time during the course of the debate there has been evidence of a bitter spirit. There has been evidence of hair-splitting and narrow legalism. I hope in what I have to say to-day I may be able to contribute something toward better understanding.

There are strong reasons which make it perfectly obvious that we must have in this country to-day a citizenship act. We must have Canadian citizenship. To put it on one ground, if you like: there are important technical reasons why there must be a proper definition of Canadian citizenship. At the present time we have the Naturalization Act, the Canadian Nationals Act, and the Immigration Act. All of them touch some aspect of the problem of citizenship, some aspect of the status of Canadians living within this country. In some respects they are contradictory. In fact, our present legislation in this respect is something of a hodge-podge. It is high time that it was reexamined with a view to codification of the provisions which relate to citizenship. There are also important reasons, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the status of Canadian citizens in their private capacity. One need mention only one or two—the status of married women, and the status of children born outside Canada to Canadian parents, to point to subjects where there are great weaknesses in existing legislation. There is need for clarification and codification.

But there are greater and broader reasons than these why Canadian citizenship should be the subject of legislative enactment at this time. The first and principal one, in the face of all the facts, is the necessity for contributing something in legislative form that will be effectual in the creation of Canadian unity. I agree with what has been said by some who preceded me in the debate, that this bill alone will not create Canadian unity. But given sympathetic application and given sympathetic treatment now by the house I think the bill is capable of making some contribution toward national unity.

In the second place, this bill does hold out the hope that, given sympathetic and effective administration, it will have the effect of creating in the minds of Canadians a greater appreciation of the value of citizenship and of the rights which flow from it. We have lost much in this country because we have not put a sufficient price and value upon citizenship. We have taken our rights as citizens far too much for granted. We have only to look at the example of the United States to see what can be accomplished in creating in the minds of citizens, by proper rules and ceremonies and by education, an appreciation of the fundamental value of citizenship. Citizenship in the United States has been a great unifying factor; it can be made so in this country. I support the bill on general principles because I believe that if it is enacted and is given sympathetic administration it will contribute something to the desirable end of national unity.

Before I leave this subject may I say just this word about ceremony. I am glad that provision has been made in section 38 of the bill for appropriate ceremonies to attend the granting of certificates of citizenship in order that applicants may be duly impressed with

the advantages of Canadian citizenship. This is all to the good. There is a growing need of it at the present time.

I should like to refer now to an article which appeared in the Toronto *Evening Telegram* of April 1, 1946, describing some proceedings in the naturalization court in that city. It reads in part:

> Queen's husband Mr. King bars German's citizenship
>
> Alfred Alpert, factory worker, was smart enough to get out of Germany in 1939 ahead of the nazis, but he's still a little muddled about world figures.
>
> "Mr. King is king of the British empire," he told Judge Denton in naturalization court when seventy-eight new Canadians took the oath of allegiance to the crown. "Where does the King live?" the judge asked: "The King is in Ottawa," replied Alpert, who arrived in England in June, 1939, was at Kitchener camp and Isle of Man camp and migrated to Canada in July, 1940.
>
> "I admit it's a bit confusing," said Judge Denton. "Where does the queen live, then?"
>
> "She lives in England."
>
> "What is her name?"—"Queen Elizabeth."
>
> "What is the king's name?" Alpert was stymied. Judge Denton gave him a hint: "The queen's husband," he explained, "what is his name?"
>
> "His name is Mackenzie King," Alpert replied.

There is a great need of giving to those who come to this country to make it their home an opportunity, which perhaps has not been fully provided for them in the land from which they come, to learn what citizenship means, to learn what the rights and the responsibilities of citizenship mean in a country like ours. I think as a nation we have hitherto failed deplorably in this respect. This is an age of adult education, but we in this country have not realized the great need of affording opportunities for adult education to those who come from other lands to make Canada their home. We have often treated as foreigners those new Canadians, who have come here with the full permission of the laws of this country to make it their home. To me that is a denial of the fundamental principle of Canadian citizenship. Once people are admitted to this country, once they become citizens, no lines should be drawn, racial or otherwise, which will have the effect of discriminating between different classes of citizens.

Due regard must be had in the future, far more than has been had in the past, to the duty of providing to those who come to this country to make it their home the opportunity to learn of all that is involved in Canadian citizenship, and there should be impressed upon all applicants for citizenship a due regard not only for the rights but also for the responsibilities of citizenship.

I think it is worthy of the attention of this house that we should consider now the true significance of Canadian citizenship. Canadian citizenship involves an assertion of our rights as equal individuals before the law, and before the electoral law, to determine as we will the destiny of this country. We owe much to those who have gone before us and who have provided for us the privileges of this Canadian citizenship. If there was more regard for the sacrifices of those who have gone before us, there would be a higher appreciation of the privileges of citizenship in Canada. Think of the contribution made to the developing concept of Canadian citizenship by Macdonald, Cartier, Laurier and Sir Robert Borden. Think of the contribution made to that expanding significance of Canadian citizenship when in the time of Sir Robert Borden this country, by the hand of a minister of Canada representing His Majesty the King, signed the treaty of peace in 1919. It was a great step in our national development.

We need to have more pride in Canada. We need a greater sense of achievement on the part of our country and our people—and when I say "our people" I mean all our people. We are not yet adequately conscious of being Canadians. This country is finding its soul, a soul born of sacrifice. I for one am an optimist for Canada. I can see nothing to circumscribe or limit the future of this country except the extent of our faith in it and our faith in ourselves under God's guidance.

It is not all clear sailing in this country to develop a sense of citizenship. Let us be quite frank. We have had a problem created by race and it is a difficult problem. It has led to a hyphenation of Canadianism which I say it is the duty of every citizen of this country to fight. We must put aside this idea of a hyphenated Canadianism which will not fit into a worthy conception of Canadian citizenship or Canadian unity. Those who exalt race above Canadian unity or Canadian citizenship do a great disservice to Canada.

We know perfectly well that so far as the great races of this country are concerned, racial purity is a biological myth. There has been a mingling of the races in Canada, and there will continue to be. A couple of years ago the premier of the province of Ontario, Hon. George Drew, addressing an audience composed largely of new Canadians, said that in the veins of his two children was mingled the blood of seven races. I daresay there are

many of us in this chamber who can say that we have in our veins the blood of several races at least.

If in approaching this question of the relationship between race and nationality, unity and a common Canadian citizenship, we realize that unity does not demand uniformity, and that we are operating under a constitution which gives certain rights to our brothers whose maternal language is the French language; if we approach the problem with good-will and understanding and sympathy, there is no reason why there cannot be a true sense of Canadian unity.

There is a work of reconciliation to be done in this country. We saw the need of it in this house in the debates of last Thursday and Friday. It seems to me that that work of reconciliation must begin here in Ottawa. Whoever seeks to exploit racial differences for political advantage commits a crime against Canada, against Canadian unity and against our proper sense of Canadian citizenship.

If we know each other better there will be far less danger of suspicion and distrust. Canadians must know each other better. That is a duty that rests upon us all. In the light of the necessity of creating in Canada a deep sense of national unity there must be no thought of pitting aggressive minorities and aggresive majorities against one another. We have to put first the interests of Canada as the whole of Canada, as a nation.

As the hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret) said in his speech in the house last Thursday, historically those who first held the title "Canadiens" were persons born in this country of French descent. It is a title which we are all proud to possess. I ask hon. members to recognize that it is not a contribution to Canadian unity to have a member of this house say: I have a superior claim to this title. It is now the proud possession of all of us and we should all be big enough to admit that our rights to it are now complete and equal.

The two great races in this country owe debts to each other which they do not, it seems to me, adequately realize. Reference was made in some of the earlier speeches in this debate to the articles of capitulation which were signed after the fall of Quebec in 1759, and after the fall of Montreal in 1760, followed by the Quebec Act of 1774, the constitutional act of 1791, the Act of Union of 1840 and finally the British North America Act itself. It is a plain fact of history that had Canada not become British when it did, it would later have become American. Those whose mother tongue is English may equally well be reminded that but for the loyalty of the Canadiens, and had guarantees not been extended to those whose mother tongue was French, Canada would not have been retained for the British crown at the time of the American revolution but would have become American.

These two races owe a debt to each other which they can never adequately repay. Let us therefore in all common sense and justice recognize it, and let us be conscious of a sense of obligation to each other. I believe that will promote better understanding and a greater appreciation of each other.

We hear talk from time to time of language rights. This question of language was fully settled in the British North America Act, by section 133. It is our duty to refute, wherever and whenever we hear it, the talk of those who say that the national fabric of this country is weakened by there being two official languages. It is not so. Those who follow that line whittle and hack away at the foundation of confederation, because without section 133 confederation would never have been brought about, and without it confederation to-day could not continue.

I want to say a word with respect to one passage on bilingualism in the speech of the hon. member for Outremont—and I approach this as one who has the desire and hope to improve what little facility he possesses in the French language. I think no one will promote bilingualism in this country by scolding those who speak the English language for not having acquired any facility in French. It may be that the hon. member for Outremont did not intend to rail against those who have not acquired that facility. I think on sober reflection he will appreciate that that is not the way in which better understanding can be brought about between the two great races in this country. We must concentrate above all else on understanding each other, and with tolerance and good will any problems attendant on the question which the hon. member for Outremont raised are, I think, capable of solution.

Two sections of this bill, which are essential in the light of the principle of the measure have occupied the attention of some who have preceded me in the debate. I refer to section 26 and section 10. Without a careful examination of the provisions of these two sections the principle of the bill cannot be adequately debated. I wish to say a word with regard to section 26, particularly in view of the interpretation put upon it on Friday last by the hon. member for Outremont and the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Pinard).

Section 26 provides that a Canadian citizen is a British subject. The parliament of Canada could not enact any contrary legislation unless Canada renounced her allegiance to His Majesty the King. Whether that section is in the bill or not we shall continue to be subjects of the king. Let no one be under any illusion in that respect.

When I heard those two hon. members on Friday last speak of section 26 as being ambiguous, I asked myself what could be plainer. The section consists of seven words:

A Canadian citizen is a British subject.

That is simply declaratory of the law. It will be the law, it must be the law, as long as we are subjects of the king. I detected in the remarks of those two hon. members the suggestion that to be a British subject means to be subject to the jurisdiction of the imperial parliament at Westminster. It is not so. Ever since the statute of Westminster in 1932, the imperial parliament has renounced all legislative power over Canada except so far as this parliament consents, so there can no longer be any justification for talk in this country of any of its citizens being subject to the laws enacted at Westminster. We are completely autonomous; nothing further is needed to achieve autonomy for Canada.

The hon. member for Outremont went on to say that so far as he is concerned His Majesty the King must divest himself of certain titles before Canadian citizens should be content to be his subjects. He said that we must change the provisions of this bill and must say, in effect, that to be a Canadian citizen is to be a Canadian subject of His Majesty the King of Canada. We had statements such as this from the hon. member, as he is reported at page 595 of *Hansard:*

. . . but my king and the British king are not legally the same; they are not the same entity. And this the statute of Westminster implicitly recognizes.

That statement is false to law, to fact, to sense. The hon. member for Outremont said that that was in accord with the statute of Westminster. He will not find in the statute of Westminster one word which says that the British king, the king of Great Britain and the king of Canada, are not the same legal entity. What is more, if he will examine the declaration which came from the imperial conference in 1926, which was the foundation upon which the statute of Westminster was built in 1932, he will find these words, referring to the component countries of the commonwealth:

They are autonomous communities within the British empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their internal or domestic affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the crown—

Note that, Mr. Speaker—united by a common allegiance to the crown:

—and fully associated as members of the British commonwealth.

It is inherent in the association that now exists between the component members of the British commonwealth that the crown is one entity, one crown, one and indivisible. That common crown is the one entity which binds all parts of this commonwealth of equal partners. It is not only the greatest binding force amongst the members of the commonwealth: it is in fact the greatest binding force in Canada—our common allegiance to His Majesty the King. We should abandon a lot of silly ideas and silly talk about inferiority and subordination. There is no justification in fact or in law or in sense for such arguments. But some members go on fighting battles that were fought and won many, many years ago. They are not helping the cause of Canadian unity. There was no idea of inferiority on the part of Sir John A. Macdonald or on the part of Sir Wilfrid Laurier or on the part of Sir Robert Borden in their relations with the British Colonial Office and the Dominions Office—far from it. Our allegiance to His Majesty the King, which we share with all parts of this commonwealth and empire is the greatest binding force in Canada.

What are we invited to do by those who would reject section 26? Without the fact on which section 26 is built you would not have Canadian unity, you could not build a Canadian citizenship. But the hon. member for Outremont and the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville, as well as some other hon. members, say: Oh, take that section out of the bill; we have to have that changed. Do you think for one minute that you can unite Canadian citizens on the basis of rejecting the idea of a common crown for the commonwealth? You will never do it—never.

Let us examine for a moment what is involved in the ideas put forward by these hon. members. They say: We want to reject the idea of being British subjects—as though there was something servile in the title. The term means only this, those who owe allegiance to the king, to the crown. That, and no other, is the significance of the term "British subject". Those who say: We are grown up, we do not want to be British subjects any longer, are, in effect, asking Canadians to forfeit a gener-

ous measure of their own birthright, one of the greatest privileges provided for free men in the world to-day.

If we reject the concept of being British subjects it will mean that we shall renounce privileges such as those I shall now mention. When our citizens go to the United Kingdom to take up residence they go on a footing of equality with all other citizens of the United Kingdom. They qualify for the franchise in the same length of time—I think it is six months—as any other resident of that country. It means that a Canadian going to Australia to take up residence there enjoys, because he is a British subject, all the rights of citizens of that country, and he qualifies for the franchise just as any other citizen of that country does in a period of six months. A British subject going from Canada to New Zealand steps into that land on a footing of equality with all citizens of New Zealand and qualifies for the franchise in one year. A British subject going from Canada to South Africa enjoys all the privileges of citizenship and qualifies for the franchise, in two years if he is a native-born British subject, and in five years if he is a foreign-born naturalized British subject.

We are told, however, that Ireland is the example we should follow. Are we going to accept the course taken by Eire in 1935 as an example for Canada? Reference was made to the Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act of 1935, and the Aliens Act passed by that country in the same year, by which it is provided that citizens of Eire will no longer be British subjects. But I think it is well that the house should know that the Aliens Exemption Order of 1935 provides for the exemption of Canadians and persons from other parts of the British commonwealth, from that principle, so that British subjects are now dealt with by Eire on a basis of reciprocity.

I have referred to some advantages which Canadians enjoy in going to other parts of the commonwealth. We must not overlook at the same time the advantage of our association with the commonwealth in terms of protection and in terms of the status which it gives us in the world. Could we ever hope to enjoy the position in the world and the respect in which the world holds us to-day if we stood alone, if we sought to proceed as some hon. members who spoke on Friday suggest we should do, and renounce our right and title as British subjects? These hon. members invite Canadians to the renunciation of great rights and privileges. If Canadian citizenship is to be bought at the price of a renunciation of the rights which we as British subjects enjoy in all parts of the world, we shall be paying too great a price for it. It is a price we do not need to pay, and this bill by section 26 provides that Canadians shall not be called upon to pay that price for Canadian citizenship.

I wish to say a word now about section 10 of the bill. I have said something already about the advantages which accrue to Canadians by reason of the fact that they are British subjects. What about a little reciprocity? What about the lot of British subjects from other parts of the commonwealth who come to Canada, as the land of their choice, to make this country their home? What does section 10 say about them? It says in effect that those who come from other parts of the commonwealth—British subjects, trained in citizenship, in no way inferior to ourselves in their appreciation of the rights and duties of citizenship—are to be treated, with one solitary and inconsequential exception, as though they were aliens. That is the effect of section 10 of this bill as it stands to-day; they are put on a basis of equality with aliens. What does it mean? Examine the provisions of section 10. What are the requirements of applicants for Canadian citizenship?

Mr. MARTIN: I rise to a point of order. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but he will realize that the rules of the house are designed to permit statement or discussion only of the principle of the bill on second reading. The hon. member is now proceeding to a discussion of section 10. I have no doubt that what he says will be of great value, but there is no opportunity of discussion and explanation in reply, and consequently, because of the importance of the bill, wrong impressions may get out because of what one might call unilateral statements. It is contrary to the rules of the house for an hon. member on second reading to discuss a section of the bill. My only reason for rising is that I had to do so the other night in the case of the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Jaenicke), and I feel I must, as one who is leading the house at this time, take the same attitude in regard to the hon. member. There will be ample opportunity to discuss the section when we reach it. There is no chance now of the hon. gentleman and myself engaging in explanations of it, and I think he should postpone to the committee stage the discussion of section by section.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Speaker, before you give your ruling I would like to point out that a very important principle of this bill is contained in section 10, to which the hon. member has been referring, and if this is the

time to discuss the principles of the bill, I suggest that he be not denied the right to do so. He can do it in any event by not referring specifically to the number of the section. And it does contain a principle of this bill.

Mr. BROOKS: The main principle.

Mr. BRACKEN: One of the main principles; and I respectfully suggest that he should not be denied the opportunity to discuss it here.

Mr. LESAGE: I wonder if the point of order does not go to the principle of the bill. If the hon. member wants to prove to the house that citizens coming from other parts of the commonwealth are more likely to acquire a Canadian mind than people coming from other parts of the world, I think the house is anxious to have this proven—proven against the historical background.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to you, as I have had to do on two other occasions, that the minister himself, in making his speech on the second reading of this bill, dealt with section 10, and said there was not anything in it worth worrying about.

Mr. MARTIN: I did not mention the section.

Mr. GREEN: Well, in effect that is what he said, and every time he gets a little worried about remarks made about some part of the bill he gets up and raises this point of order. Every speech made thus far on the second reading has contained some reference to one or other of the sections. For example, the member for Outremont and the member for Chambly-Rouville spoke on section 26, and the minister allowed them to go ahead without raising any point.

Mr. MARTIN: I certainly did.

Mr. GREEN: I suggest that he is wide of the mark now when he tries to stop the member for Eglinton.

Mr. SPEAKER: Last week I took occasion to draw the attention of hon. members to Beauchesne, third edition, page 228, paragraph 656, which states that on the motion for the second reading it is out of order to discuss clauses of the bill. On each occasion on which a member was called to order it was stated that he was discussing a clause that was of particular importance and which it was necessary to consider at the moment. Hon. members, I am sure, will understand that it is the duty of the Speaker to point out to any member who has the floor, when it is necessary to do so, that a particular standing order requires that this or that shall be done. The Speaker has no alternative; he must draw the attention of hon. members to the rules as they stand. On the second reading of a bill hon. members must confine themselves to the principle. I realize that an hon. member may find it necessary occasionally to refer to particular sections, and he may do so without discussing each clause of the bill. It is extremely difficult to keep the discussion in conformity with the rules of the house, and I have no doubt that hon. members on both sides appreciate the importance of this rule which requires that discussion at this stage be confined to the principle of the bill. I would ask the hon. member to be good enough to observe the rule.

Mr. FLEMING: I have no intention whatever of discussing the details of section 10, Mr. Speaker. I did discuss section 26 at some length and what I have to say with reference to section 10 has to do with its effect in relation to the principle of the bill. In this connection I should like to refer to what was said by the hon. member for Outremont, at page 596 of *Hansard*. He was referring to the fact that, as he says, one of the reasons for disunity in Canada is in part this, that British subjects coming to Canada have been able to acquire rights of citizenship here without being subjected to the same requirements as aliens. The hon. member said:

> I cannot help but think, Mr. Speaker, that the different treatment accorded to these as against the other immigrants has something to do with the lack of complete Canadian unity.

Obviously the hon. member can in this respect give whole-hearted support to the bill, because the bill does put the British subject, coming from other parts of the commonwealth, in the same position as an alien coming from any section of the globe—except in one respect; he is absolved from the mere detail of filing a declaration of intention. He must do everything else that the alien is required to do. He must prove his lawful entry; he must prove five years' residence in Canada; he must prove good character and an adequate knowledge of either English or French; he must prove that he has an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship, and his intention to take up permanent residence. In other words, he has to go through precisely the same procedure, in all respects, to supply the same proof and adhere to the same rules as an alien from any foreign land. That shocks me. Surely the purpose of requiring five years' residence is that we may train people in our conception of liberty and freedom so that they may take their place within the democracy of our con-

ception. Do we need to put a British subject, with all his background, with all his present possession of everything that we have in the way of citizenship and knowledge of democratic processes, in the humiliating position of having to conform to the same procedure precisely and to observe the same rules as the alien? It is a humiliation which this bill seeks to heap upon British subjects from other parts of the commonwealth. I do not think that is a basis upon which we shall build the national unity which we so much desire. We must work for unity and understanding; it will not be possible for us to do so on that basis. People coming from other parts of the commonwealth, if they are qualified to be good citizens, must not be placed in that invidious position.

We have a great heritage, and we should value it as Canadians. We should value it far more than it has been valued in the past. We must have a sense of indebtedness to the past, to those who have gone before us, if we are to have an adequate appreciation of our privileges to-day and our opportunities in the future of this country. But there must be great vision in Canada, a vision of unity of all citizens from coast to coast, marching shoulder to shoulder and working for Canada. Without vision the people perish. There must be a great national vision which encompasses the high place of Canada in the world and among the self-governing nations of the British commonwealth.

In what I am about to say now, Mr. Speaker, in your mother tongue, I am not attempting to do anything smart or superficial. I am simply attempting to offer, in a spirit of good will, a gesture, a desire for understanding, an indication of my willingness as one member of the house—I am sure this is true of all members—to approach our common Canadian problems with sympathy and understanding. I hope you will bear with me. I may tell you that I have not been too successful in practising conversation in French with the comely young ladies who take such good care of us in the parliamentary dining-room; such is my facility in the language that when one morning recently I ordered porridge—upon which I may say I was raised—I was served scrambled eggs! Maybe what you are about to hear is a scrambled-eggs version of the French language. Nevertheless here it is.

(Translation):

The consideration of this bill affords to this house an opportunity to give Canadian citizenship the full importance it deserves and to dispel all doubts as to its meaning. This citizenship is our pride and it constitutes our privilege and our priceless heritage.

We all love our country. Certainly no one among us would exchange his title of Canadian for that of a citizen of any other country in the world.

Our Canadian citizenship links us together with bonds of unity and equality, from whatever province we come and whatever be the race or language of our fathers.

Too often, unfortunately, racial considerations and prejudices have been allowed to obscure the meaning of our Canadian citizenship.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FLEMING: As Canadians, we should constantly endeavour to emphasize those things that are common to all of us and that form our common heritage. It seems to me that we could strengthen our bonds of unity in Canada by avoiding the use of a hyphen when defining our citizenship. We should be proud and happy to call ourselves simply "Canadians".

On June 6, 1943, speaking in Kingston, my leader, Mr. John Bracken, made the following statement:

> Sir John Macdonald's first consideration was Canada—not French-speaking Canada, not English-speaking Canada, but Canada, a Canadian Canada. And we to-day must have no less high an ideal. Let us look upon all our citizens, of whatever racial extractions, as Canadians. Let us have less of hyphenated Canadianism. Our new citizens don't want it, and we don't. In the United States they do not speak of President Roosevelt as a Dutch-American, nor Mr. Willkie as a German-American, nor of Mayor LaGuardia as an Italian-American. They are Americans. Let us in Canada be Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to make a few personal observations. I am descended from Irish forbears. Am I, for that reason, an Irish-Canadian? I am also of Scottish stock. Does that make me a Scottish-Canadian? Some of my ancestors were Englishmen. Should I therefore be termed an English-Canadian? My lineage can also be traced back to French forbears. My grandfather told me, when I was a boy, that one of my ancestors had fought under the Marquis de Montcalm on the plains of Abraham. Does that make me a French-Canadian? Then, what am I? Am I a French-Canadian, a Scottish-Canadian, an English-Canadian, or an Irish-Canadian? Mr. Speaker, I wish to consider myself simply as a Canadian.

The various races I have just mentioned, as well as others, have made a splendid contribution to the building up of this country and to the enrichment of our national heritage. This heritage can surpass all others in richness owing to the diversity of our origins.

Our citizenship will be all the more precious if we are ready to unite and work for Canada in a spirit of cooperation, mutual respect and equality.

The party to which I belong has made the following statement:

We recall, with pride and gratitude, that our party rose to greatness through a fruitful partnership between two great races, English and French. We affirm our belief that the two cultures are part and parcel of our future development and that Canada's true greatness depends on sympathy and understanding between these two original races and all other races that have come to join in the building of our country.

Realizing the inherent greatness of Canada as a nation and recognizing the strength that can come only from unity and purpose, we believe that all the peoples of Canada should unite in fostering a common pride in Canadian achievement and institutions and a common loyalty to our ancestral traditions of equality, justice and toleration, and should seek, with due regard for constitutional rights, to achieve that profound sense of the importance of national interests which will ensure harmony and cooperation and that future for our country which was the aim of the Fathers of Confederation.

(Text):

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MARTIN: I am sure the sense of the house is that the hon. gentleman should be allowed to continue.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very sorry to have interrupted the hon. gentleman, but if he has unanimous consent he may continue.

(Translation):

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Speaker I shall have concluded within a minute.

Let us then endeavour with more energy than ever to strengthen our dear Canada by linking ourselves with bonds of unity and equality. Let us be proud of our title "Canadian citizen".

(Text):

Mr. D. A. CROLL (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) on the splendid speech he made. I am sure we particularly enjoyed the latter part of it. I wish also to join with other hon. members in congratulating the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin), first on having sponsored this bill and second on piloting it through the house, as I am sure he will. I feel certain the house will approve the bill in principle. We may differ as to some of the details, and when the time comes for third reading I shall certainly make myself heard. When the hon. gentleman introduced the bill in the house I believe he concluded his remarks by saying that when this bill finally passes everyone in Canada who is covered by it will be able to say, "I am a Canadian." May I say to him that for his imagination, his application and his thoroughness there are many of us in Canada who will say of him that he is a great Canadian.

The bill now before the house has been received by the great majority of Canadians with a large measure of indifference. They will now be Canadians and British subjects rather than British subjects and Canadians; so what? That has been the response of the majority of the people who will be affected by this bill, and every man, woman and child in Canada will be affected by it. It is very much like the recurrent debates on the national flag. Maybe we shall have one; maybe we shall not have one. Perhaps it should have the union jack in one corner, perhaps the fleur-de-lis on the fly; perhaps stripes, or perhaps the maple leaf. I understand that already we have had 1,800 submissions of designs. I should have thought we would have 18,000. Again I say that the majority of the people in Canada who are affected by the problem, and whose flag this will be, are consumed with apathy over the whole question. Maybe we shall have the old red ensign; maybe we shall have a crest with the maple leaf. So what? I was impressed by the fact that even newspapers which are attempting to whip up a little enthusiasm for one design or another design, or for no design at all, merely the union jack, had to throw in a pretty girl, with shapely legs, her skirts hiked well up above her knees, in order that the picture might be good enough to interest people in the flag.

With all due deference, Mr. Speaker, I would mention one group of citizens in this country to whom the question of citizenship and the question of a national flag are of the deepest concern, who are fascinated by this bill, and whose hearts, from sheer joy, miss a beat at its implications. They are those who are not charter members of this Canadian organization, like my French-speaking friends; they are not those of Anglo-Saxon stock, like so many others of my friends; they are not those whose birthright gave them every freedom and privilege this country of ours can offer. No, sir; when I mention some of those to whom these questions of citizenship and national flag are so important, I mean those who had to save and struggle and endure hardship to achieve the status which is so casually accepted by our brethren. I mean the new Canadians—and in saying that, I mean 20·2 per cent of the population of Canada. I mean also that one-fifth of our population which can hold its head as high as any other when anyone raises the question of loyalty to Canada.

I am one of them. For forty-one years of my forty-six I have lived in this country, have enjoyed liberties and opportunities it has given me, I have gladly allowed myself to become assimilated into its community. What little service it has allowed me to give, I have proudly given. Yet I remain a new Canadian. I am not a native-born; I am a naturalized citizen. Behind me remains, and occasionally I hear, the reminder of those cold years when, from the wrong side of the tracks, this new Canadian could only look across enviously at the warmly-lighted windows of those who enjoyed Canadian birthright and who so casually accepted the high privileges which were theirs from the cradle on.

That, if I may say so, has been the shocking thing so far as most of us are concerned. We have come, in the main, from lands of oppression, hunger and fear; we, or our fathers, have struggled mightily to assemble the little bit which was needed for that which we sought—the opportunity to be accepted on our abilities, not on the basis of the class or group to which birth has assigned us; freedom of education and opportunity for ourselves and our children; a land and a democracy which would engage our hearts and loyalty as never could those downtrodden acres we were leaving.

We have not come, in the main, from some dark European morass where learning and culture never flowered. It was not ignorance that led us to reject our homes and our friends and the countries of our birth—and out of all lands to which we might have gone, to choose Canada. We, or our fathers, were actuated by those same impulses which, one or two or three centuries earlier, had led the forebears of hon. members, whether they speak English or French, to make this same venturesome, sometimes desperate, move from an old world to a new, to escape from drudgery without hope of security, hunger born of social injustice, religious faith without the freedom to practise it, democratic idealism ruthlessly suppressed by the despot.

And we did not imagine that we were exchanging this for streets of gold and untold wealth when we asked admission to Canada. We knew only that here was a land where a man could call his soul his own, and with hard work could see that his sons and daughters had a better start in life than he, and, with a bit of extra luck, could approach old age in dignity and security. So we made our choice, and gambled our lives and those of our families—and by and large we won. Not without pain were the deep-grown roots of generations wrenched from the familiar soil; but mercifully soon, we found, new roots were taking hold in new, far more nourishing clay than ever we had known. We settled fairly easily, at least the younger of us did, into the new scene as gradually the old one faded. We became, in our own thinking, Canadians in all but citizenship, and we were eager for the day when that final proof of right and liberty would be added. That day is near at hand.

Canada was giving us a new life—what had we to give Canada? We brought to her our brawn and our skill; new Canadians helped till the unbroken soil and build the factories and dig the ditches. They sought to contribute to the new land the best of the national cultures they brought from the old. Was that enough? No; for there remained loyalty. Those of you who know the new Canadian will know that he has been inclined to attach to his Canadianism, to his loyalty to his adoptive country, that same fanaticism which the proselyte shows toward his adoptive faith. To him the title of citizen is something to be proudly worn, a recognition of his own love for this new country of his, an earnest of his determination to serve it—to serve it and to die for it if need be. There is no one of us who has returned from this latest war who does not carry with him the remembrance of the young men with non-Anglo-Saxon, non-Gallic names who lie beneath the temporary markers in the shallow, roadside graves of a half-dozen fronts.

That has been the concrete response of the new Canadian to that inward urge toward an expression of gratitude to his country. That has been the response of most—but I would never suggest it has been the response of all. There have been those whose loyalty has wavered, who have imagined, in their confusion and in their woolly thinking, that there is a higher loyalty than that to Canada; who have not rated their acquired citizenship on so exalted a level as most of us have placed it. Recently we have been shocked to our very roots when we have had to face up to unpleasant realities which upset our comfortable and complacent thoughts and habits. There is no need to be alarmed. There is no point in hysteria, and there is no reason for losing our perspective. We have been tough with our enemies from without. We only need apply the rule of law in order to be tough with our enemies from within. That is what the law is for. But may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a degree of blame must be shouldered by ourselves as well as by others.

How dearly does the Canadian born citizen value his birthright? How far have we gone in creating in the mind of the world a knowledge that Canadian citizenship is a distinct

and valued asset? How far, in brief, have we gone toward becoming a nation, toward offering to these new Canadians a symbol to which they can attach the loyalty and gratitude which wells up within them? There have been those of us who have been inclined to scoff at the forthright American expressions of loyalty, at their reverence of the flag, at the idolatry towards their constitution, the salute to Old Glory, and the hand-on-heart recitation of the oath of allegiance. But on the grim testing ground of this latest war did not this schooling in loyalty pay off in the solidarity by which Smith and O'Mallory and McCrea and Cohen and Russo and Schmidt and Svensen mingled as Americans, mind you, without distinction as to grandparents or parents or as to their own native nationality? We Canadians, too, had that same deep democracy overseas, but we have not approached it at home.

We have no flag of our own to salute. We have no citizenship of Canada to proclaim boldly when our nationality is asked. Too often we have heard the assurance given to Americans, "No, you must not mistake us for the British," and the caution delivered to the British, "You must not confuse us with Americans." We have not shouted proudly from the housetops the proclamation that we are Canadians, a nation as distinctive as any that ever came down the pike of history, an up and coming nation, with the unique ability to get along with our neighbours and to pick a fight with none. A proud nation which when its own freedom and that of its friends became imperilled threw into the fight every man and woman it had available and still had enough left over to become the third greatest producing country in the world.

We have not realized our own greatness. We travel in the strange, conflicting shadow cast by our mother and by our neighbour, and somehow we still refuse to come out into the warm sun of the world's acclaim. Sometimes we actually seem ashamed of being Canadians. So little have we thought indeed of the rights and privileges of our citizenship that we have disfranchised some of those whom we have accepted into our community. You may ask, "Disfranchised them—why?" Because out of the welter of national origins that goes to make the country we dream of there have been some who sprang from countries which currently were our enemies. We did not do it once; we did it twice. Do we treat citizenship so lightly that those who were born to it are apathetic toward it, and that some of those who have acquired it can be stripped of it without inquiry into their loyalties?

[Mr. Croll.]

Let me say a further word about loyalties. It is well that we look to the structure of our own nest before we inquire too deeply to see who has fouled it. Loyalty is a coin with two sides. On the obverse is the attachment of the citizen to the state; on the reverse are the service and inspiration which the state gives to the citizen. I have no use for traitors or for those who accept the protection and benefits of the state and then sell it down the river. I entertain no belief that loyalty can be divided, so much to the state and so much to another organism. To me, as to other members of this house, treachery in all its forms is despicable, and the oath of allegiance is not double talk.

But have we gone sufficiently far in creating or perhaps formalizing that Canadian nation which will have a citizenship and a flag as its symbol? I do not suggest bolting away from the empire—far from it; but I do suggest the creation of an entity in which the Canadian by birth will find pride and the Canadian by choice will find inspiration. I suggest the recognition of a nation newly come of age but already sufficiently mature to accept proudly its high place in the world and to use its newly won prestige in the universal cause of peace. A nation to be proud of, a nation which will hold the loyalty of all whom it accepts within its citizenship.

I suggest also that we call our people Canadians and forget that destructive hyphen we are so wont to use. Surely after all these years we are no longer English or Irish or French or German or Hebrew or Ukrainian Canadians? Surely the people of these national backgrounds need no longer huddle protectively among others of the same descent, keeping alive their immigrant ways and customs only because they have not been accepted into the larger community which apparently is not yet ready to avow its Canadianism.

Surely the time has come for us all to eradicate that sense of domestic isolation? Surely the time has come for us to eradicate the hyphen? Above all, from the date this bill is proclaimed there should be no longer new Canadians or old Canadians—we all belong. I think the minister should undertake an intense educational programme to deal with languages, history and government so that Canadian citizenship may be appreciated, so that it may be known exactly what it implies; that citizenship means ninety per cent of interests that we have in common comes ahead of the ten per cent of the things that divide us. It should be known that citizenship is not only a challenge, that it is an achieve-

ment; that not only is it a responsibility, it is a privilege. It should be known that no man can be a citizen of a country without first being a citizen of a community, that no man can be a citizen of the world without first being a citizen of a country. How can we hope to understand the problems of other people and take an intelligent attitude toward them unless we first develop techniques and the willingness to understand one another here in Canada?

It is time we awakened to the greatness of our country and called a holiday on hatreds, both racial and religious, which are attacks on the hopes of a free people, and attach a real and important value to the very fact of Canadian citizenship as created by this bill. Surely the time has come for us to stop our damning of the many for the acts of the infinitesimal few? I say to the house that if we, as other countries, have at times produced Catilines, we have in turn produced many Ciceros.

This Canadian soil is hostile to ersatz Canadians and recognizes no changing styles in loyalty. We must dedicate ourselves anew to creating in this country a Canadian unity which will meet hostile challenges from within without having to abandon basic freedoms in order to meet that challenge. The time has come for us to dispense with the soft, apologetic Canadianism which has been so familiar to us. The time has come for us to build up a conditioned citizenship that can do a long march, sleep on hard ground, go on short rations and still be ready to go into action with a deep, genuine faith and loyalty.

This twentieth parliament I feel will not only give life to a Canadian citizen but present him with a flag and set aside a day to celebrate the occasion. I hope he has much to celebrate.

Mr. ALAN COCKERAM (York South): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up much time in discussing this bill, but as one born in the British isles I wish to state my reactions to the bill, especially those sections which will affect British subjects in the days to come if this bill passes.

I should like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) I came to this country in 1913 when many immigrants were coming to Canada from the British isles. I was preceded by three of my brothers and other members of my family, and within a few months of coming to Canada I and my brothers and a great many thousands of other young Englishmen who had come out to Canada found ourselves in the Canadian army. We were proud to serve in the Canadian army, and if the Secretary of State will take the trouble to look up the figures of the early enlistments in the great war of 1914-18 he will find that the great majority of those who served in the first and second Canadian divisions were men born in the British isles who had immigrated to this country shortly before the war. When I listen to members of this house belittle men such as myself who have come out to this country and have paid the price for being a citizen of Canada I wonder what the score is.

One must remember that when we left this country in 1914 and early in 1915 we were all Canadian soldiers. We wore the Canada badge on our shoulders as did the soldiers of the past war, and I consider that those men together with men of all races and creeds who served by their side in the famous battles of the war of 1914-18 helped to make Canada the great country that it is to-day.

The hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) has dealt with those sections of the bill which will be applicable to British subjects who come to Canada from other parts of the empire. I think it is a shocking thing that the Secretary of State should put British subjects from other parts of the empire who come to Canada to the trouble and humiliation to which they will be subject under this bill. The Secretary of State proposes that British-born subjects coming to Canada from other parts of the empire shall go through the naturalization courts, and not only that, but they shall be compelled to take an oath of allegiance to His Majesty the King. May I point out to the Secretary of State that a British-born subject owes his allegiance to His Majesty the King and it is an indignity to compel him to reaffirm his allegiance to the king as this bill provides. I object to that very much. I have no objection to the Secretary of State compelling subjects of the British empire to take an oath as a citizen of Canada, but they are already subjects of His Majesty the King and I see no reason to make them reaffirm their allegiance. I would ask the Secretary of State if this matter was discussed with other parts of the British empire?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. COCKERAM: Because it seems to me that the Secretary of State is making fundamental changes in the status of British subjects the world over. British subjects coming to Canada will have definite restrictions placed upon them by this bill, whereas Canadian subjects going to other parts of the British empire will have privileges which those coming to this country will not have. For instance, a Cana-

dian subject can go to England and after a year's residence there he is to all intents and purposes looked upon as a citizen of the British isles. The same thing is true of other parts of the British empire. I would ask the minister what he intends to do to clear up this situation. Is he going to leave it in the position that British subjects coming to Canada are treated in one way, whereas Canadian citizens going to other parts of the empire will get preferential treatment over British subjects coming to Canada?

Mr. MARTIN: Does my hon. friend want me to answer the question now?

Mr. COCKERAM: I would prefer to continue at the moment.

An hon. MEMBER: Putting up a straw man.

Mr. COCKERAM: I have no objection to having the minister answer now.

Mr. MARTIN: This bill in its present form has not only commended itself greatly but so great an impression has it made upon those charged with this matter in the United Kingdom that they propose to use it as a model for future legislation in that country.

Mr. COCKERAM: Then may I suggest that if it is to be used as a model we should make it a model one hundred per cent perfect.

It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that certain sections of this bill are the thin end of the wedge in loosening the ties of empire of which most of us are so proud. In that regard the hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret), speaking on Friday last, made the following statement as reported on page 591 of *Hansard:*

> In any event I do not wish my vote to be interpreted as a reaffirmation of the principles enunciated in article 26, because I believe that this theory is antiquated, and if, I might say so, I am myself progressively conservative.

He was referring to the section which says that a "Canadian citizen is a British subject". I wonder if that little warning thrown out by the hon. member for Outremont does not mean that at some time in the future the Secretary of State and his following will see that that section is eradicated for all time.

Mr. MARTIN: It was the present Secretary of State who put it in. I think my hon. friend wishes to be fair.

Mr. COCKERAM: But there is an opening to take it out. Further on in his speech the hon. member for Outremont said at page 595 of *Hansard*:

> [Mr. Cockeram.]
>
> The descendants of these Canadians of 1760 —they total some 3,500,000 to-day—are scattered all over Canada. They have remained truly Canadians and, to this day, they still are and feel Canadians. They could have returned to France had they so desired, but they preferred staying here, because they had no other country, no other home than that of America. These Canadians in 1946 figure that they, or at least their ancestors, have made a positive act of Canadianism, and they fail to see how and when the British subjects of English descent residing in Canada have done the same.

What a ridiculous statement that those of British descent residing in Canada have made no positive act of Canadianism! I would point out to the hon. member that no group in this country have been greater Canadians than those who, in the three wars which have taken place since the turn of the century, have been willing to leave this country to fight its battles and to give their blood, and if necessary their lives, for the cause of Canada. It is a well known fact that these forces have been comprised in the main of Canadians other than French-Canadians. When we are talking about being Canadians, we should compare those who are willing to fight the battles of their country with those who have displayed reluctance to do so.

I wish to speak for a few moments about the naturalization courts. The minister, as a lawyer in the city of Windsor, has had some experience of these courts. I ask him, if he were a British subject coming from some other part of the empire, would he like to stand in line and await his turn, possibly for months on end, when he knows that the whole time he is a British subject and that becoming a Canadian is a matter of formality only.

Mr. MARTIN: Is that the way it is to be done?

Mr. COCKERAM: I do not know. I think so. I am going to make a suggestion. If the purpose of this bill is nationalization and not naturalization of people who are already British subjects, and the minister intends to force this section through, I suggest to him that he make it possible in the bill now before this house for British subjects, after one year's residence in Canada, to apply to the clerk of the naturalization court and thereby take the oath of allegiance to Canada, an allegiance already possessed with the exception of the formality of declaration. This will, I believe, clarify the point that a citizen can be a Canadian and a British subject at one and the same time.

I believe that this can be made a great bill. The strength of Canada is in the unity of its people, and I believe that we should

be frank with one another, that we should get together and have an act which can be accepted by a majority of the people.

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) posed the question, who is asking for this bill? That question ran like a refrain through all his speech. He said that he had tried to find out in Toronto who was asking for the bill and had been unsuccessful. He stated that it was a belief of his that the bill had been asked for by only a few people, almost all from one province. Had the hon. gentleman gone beyond the confines of Toronto and of Ontario he would have found that the great majority of the people in this country want this bill. The error contained in that belief of his is matched only by the additional error when he said that most of the people who came from Europe are opposed to this bill. Again I say, had he known Canada he would have known how wrong that statement was.

The hon. member for Broadview proved too little, but I think the hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret) tried to prove too much. That gentleman has drawn a certain amount of fire to-day from hon. members on my right. I do not join with them. I certainly do not agree that he scolded the house. He spoke objectively and fairly and he presented to us his ideas. With some of them I disagree. He said that there are many more whose tongue is French who can speak English than there are those whose principal tongue is English and who also speak French. The ratio, he pointed out, is about ten to one. Perhaps there is a reason for that, and that reason certainly does not include any slur upon one of the official languages of Canada. But in the western stretches of this country there are many of us who have little opportunity of learning French, practically none to talk with in French, little chance to read or write in French, and the people will not, unfortunately, go to the trouble of learning a language if they find no opportunity at all of using it. Furthermore, may I say this; as far as we in the C.C.F. are concerned I think the majority of us, if not all of us, when we were asked that question in the census, "Can you read, write or speak French?", answered in the negative. Perhaps we were unduly modest. Certainly most of the members of this party in the house, while we may not understand and appreciate every word which is spoken in speeches in French, do grasp the gist of the argument; certainly most of us can read French papers with some comprehension. Perhaps we have not the temerity of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), and I congratulate him on it, in rising in his place in this house and giving a speech in French, but I think before this session is over some of us may have done the same.

The hon. member for Outremont went on to emphasize the efforts made by the French-speaking population to understand its English-speaking compatriots and the lack of cooperation given in the other direction. I am sorry he said that. Had he been acquainted with western Canada he would have realized that there we have a great realization of the problems and aspirations of the people of Quebec. I think we have a greater knowledge of them than perhaps the people of Quebec have of our hopes and fears on the prairies. I express this hope too: I should like to see members of parliament from the eastern parts of Canada travel through to western Canada, and they will find there a Canadianism second to none in this country. Because we come from the west does not mean that we do not have devotion or loyalty or a desire to serve our country; and the impression which was given in the speech of the hon. member for Outremont was precisely that.

Then he went on to say, is not a complete attachment to the soil true Canadianism? I do not think so. I think it is part of Canadianism, certainly, but we cannot divorce Canada and Canadianism from its people. To me true Canadianism must have a profound regard for the conditions under which Canadians live. True Canadianism cannot exist where there is malnutrition. It is not seen in sickly children. It can no more live in slums than can democracy. True Canadianism is not realized where many of our people are poverty stricken and where the vast majority have no economic security. True Canadianism will find its highest expression when we have eradicated these evils from our country. Then, indeed, we shall not need to talk of lack of patriotism, for never does patriotism burn brighter than in a country whose principal concern is the alleviation of human suffering, the constant improvement in the conditions of the people and the maintenance of equal civil and political rights for all.

It has been argued during this debate that we are a nation; that we are not a nation. I myself think that as yet we are not a nation. It is true that we have the right to appoint our own diplomatic representatives abroad. It is true that as Canada we can sign treaties, as Canada we can join inter-

national organizations such as UNO, as Canada we can declare war or maintain neutrality as we see fit. But we are not a nation so long as we are dependent upon an external power for the right to amend our own constitution; we are not a nation so long as we are dependent upon external courts to have the last say as to what our civil law shall be. I hope to see this government rectify these omissions before the twentieth parliament of Canada is finished. I hope to see, too, a Canadian flag, but I do not want to see a Canadian flag which is reminiscent of those things which have divided us in the past; I want to see a uniquely Canadian flag.

There are certain things in this bill which I approve. Naturally, as a member of the C.C.F. I approve the principle of it. As a Canadian I approve the principle. I am especially glad to see that the minister is going to take power at last to instruct our immigrants in the matter of democratic responsibilities and privileges. I only wish that he would go farther and take the power to instruct Canadians in these same privileges and responsibilities; for he has the tools at his hand. Within his department there is a citizenship branch; it is small just now but one which, I hope, will grow. Within the government, belonging to the people of Canada, we have the national film board. I should like to see the citizenship branch cooperate with the national film board and use it through audio-visual education, with leaflets and pamphlets and speakers going all through the country telling Canadians just what Canadianism really is. We have the means; we have the trade unions; we have the farmers' organizations, the cooperatives, the cultural societies in this country, and our people are waiting for that sort of message.

While I approve that I cannot approve another section which makes explicit, discrimination in citizenship. Already the government has decided that there are to be two classes of citizens, those who apparently are genuine citizens and those who, at the same time, for reasons which are not always good, can lose their citizenship. I object to that. I feel that I am as good a Canadian as the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin). I may differ from him politically; I undoubtedly do—

Mr. MARTIN: Perhaps you are a better citizen than I am.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): That, too, is possible, Mr. Speaker. The fact remains that there is discrimination explicit in the bill, where the rights of people who have come to this country as immigrants, as I have, are taken away. Already we are setting up the two categories of citizens.

The hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) objected to hyphenated Canadians. I regret to see he used the term "new Canadian". I am not a new Canadian; I am a Canadian without any hyphen about it, and that is how I should like to see all Canadians treated.

Last session I had the following resolution placed on the order paper:

> That, in the opinion of this house, there should be incorporated in the constitution a bill of rights protecting minority rights, civil and religious liberties, freedom of speech and freedom of assembly; establishing equal treatment before the law for all citizens, irrespective of race, nationality or religious or political beliefs; and providing the necessary democratic powers to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms.

I withdrew that resolution for a good reason. I had seen other resolutions talked out in the house and no vote arrived at. This motion, to my mind at least, was much too important to meet such a fate. It is regrettable that in a democratic state a resolution such as that should have to be introduced, but necessity compelled me to do so because there is no equality in this country for all groups and for all minorities. Our Canadianism means either that we are building Canada in terms of equality or that we are going to slide back into those terrible ways which we have seen demonstrated in Europe in the last fifteen years.

There has been discrimination in Canada against minority groups based on ignorance, bigotry and stupidity, and it still exists in this house. In the Winnipeg *Free Press* of March 31, 1945, the following editorial appeared:

> Somehow or other ways must be found which will bring individual firms and employers to a realization of the fact that to maintain discriminatory rules of employment is wrong.

In theory, at least, everybody will say "amen" to that. One of the most discriminatory practices I know of in Canadian industry and commerce is where an applicant for a job has to state what his nationality is and what his religion is before he can get work. If we are Canadians we should have the right to work in Canada on the basis of ability and merit and on no other basis. What do I find in the business office of the *Free Press*? An application form for employment which asks these precise questions: "What is your nationality? What is your religion?"

I might have more belief in the sincerity of that newspaper if it lived up to what it preached. The same thing applies to the government of Canada. I hold in my hand an

application form of Wartime Housing Limited for soldiers who fought overseas to give us a chance to live. Any soldier who has fought for Canada and who wants one of these wartime houses has to state what his nationality is and what his religion is. How does the government justify that sort of action with its protestations of the past?

Mr. MARTIN: Would the hon. gentleman send that form to me? I should like to see it.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I certainly will; I shall send it now.

These men battled for Canada not on the basis of racial origin or their religion. They fought as Canadians and it is as Canadians that we should recognize them. That is one of the things they fought for.

When we brought this matter up before the city council in Winnipeg the Winnipeg *Tribune* in an editorial on July 19, 1945, said this:

> How can we reasonably expect wholehearted assimilation into the national life of Canada on the part of peoples of many origins if the official attitude continues to be one which gives the appearance of being bent on segregation? Canada needs Canadians, not hyphens. Insistence on hyphenation seems to be firmly entrenched in the official mind.

Yet here again we find this newspaper, which took umbrage at these words, including in its own applications for employment the same request: "What is your nationality? What is your religious denomination?" If these newspapers are sincere, then I suggest that they strike these words from the application forms. They are used either for discriminatory purposes or they are of no use to them at all. But discrimination goes farther and strikes much deeper than these examples I have given of business practices. I have drawn to the attention of the house before the plight of certain minorities in this country. I have spoken of the Jewish people, and none has been more cruelly persecuted by the Christian world in the last two thousand years. They are still suffering all over the world. It still appears to me that anti-Semitism is on the increase. Anti-Semitism, racialism of any type is one of the most deadly enemies of any democratic community. It not only hurts those against whom it is directed but warps and twists the minds of those who practise it; yet we find it again in the government service, in the department of immigration; we find it in the allegedly cultured places in this country, in universities such as McGill and Toronto. I am glad to say that racial discrimination has ceased in the university of Manitoba, but we must never rest until we have wiped it out from these other universities and given to the Jewish people the same rights and the same privileges that every other Canadian citizen has.

Then we have another minority group, those who are of German origin. On September 19, 1939, the Prime Minister said in this house:

> I ask, above all, for a broad toleration. I was glad to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Manion) make that plea, not only on behalf of citizens here in our own country who belong to the two great races, but as well on behalf of those of German descent, who also are citizens of our country.

Yet during the war this government, at the head of which is the man who made that statement, discriminated wretchedly against those of German origin. Those who came to this country from Germany after 1922 were compelled to report to the mounted police, some every month. Like criminals they were compelled to have their finger-prints taken by the mounted police. I know one man, a German by birth, a Canadian by adoption, who had two boys. One of them received a medal for gallantry overseas as an officer in the Royal Canadian Air Force. His second boy died fighting for Canada; yet every month that man had to report to the mounted police. How does the government justify that conduct in view of its expressions of virtue? I know of other cases. I can think of one young lad who fought for three years for Canada, whose people have been in this country for four generations, but because his name was German he was denied the right to work. Yet last session this house accepted the united nations charter, and to what did we pledge ourselves? We said:

> We are determined to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and the equal rights of men and women.

How does the house intend to put those words into operation? That is one thing we should be considering seriously now. Then we have those of Ukrainian and Polish descent who were brought to Canada by the thousands by the railroads and unceremoniously dumped on the most barren and rocky ground in the west. The hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret) said the majority of the people of Quebec feel that they are the true settlers of this country. I would suggest to him that he go to western Canada, where he will find people who also believe they are the true settlers of this country. We do not say we are better than other Canadians; we merely say that we are as good. These people have made a garden out of what was practically a desert. As a memorial to their labour and toil

one can see on every farm great piles of stones which were taken out of the ground by heart-breaking, back-breaking labour.

There is still one other group; and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read part of an advertisement which appeared in a Winnipeg newspaper:

> This institution wishes to announce that beginning January 28, 1946, it will offer an eighteen months' course for practical nursing approved by the Department of Public Health and Welfare. Applicants must be eighteen years of age, have successfully completed grade 8 and have good health and good moral character.

This girl, who was born in Edmonton, applied for the job. This was her answer:

> Dear Miss . . .
>
> Following our telephone conversation of Saturday, I feel that I should let you know how sorry I am at not having been able to have your application accepted by our medical staff. They feel that accepting an applicant of your nationality would be a new thing in the history of our practical nursing school, and for this reason would like to have your acceptance postponed.

Mark those words: "They feel that accepting an applicant of your nationality." What nationality was that girl? She was Canadian, but her skin was dark; and because her skin was darker than ours she was refused one of the fundamental rights of a citizen of this country. That is not the only case; I could go on citing example after example, but there is one more about which I must tell the house. This is the story of a young man who came to Canada from the West Indies. He went to university and obtained a degree in science. He became a licensed pharmacist. He went to Dublin and there took two years of pre-medical training and three years of medical training; then, because his money ran out, he returned to Canada. He was coloured. He had this degree as a pharmacist, this degree as a scientist; but because he was coloured he was condemned in perpetuity, apparently, to do nothing but work as a porter on the railway. I have brought other similar examples to the attention of this house. How do we justify that sort of thing in the name of Canadianism? How do we justify it in the words of the united nations charter? In article 13 we say:

> We promise to assist in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

Are those words which we accepted last year to have any sincerity at all? If they do mean anything to us, then we cannot permit these conditions to exist in Canada.

There are many reasons for the racial discrimination we see in our midst. One of them obviously is lack of education. Another

is psychological. I have not time to deal with those matters, but I should like to suggest to the house that there is also an economic basis. In western Canada children of all ethnic groups and all religious faiths go to the same schools. Children are not born with prejudices; when they are at school they get on as well as any children do. Perhaps they fight and bicker and squabble, but by and large they are united by an esprit de corps to the school and by a bond of common comradeship. But when they leave the school and go out in the world what happens? They find there are not sufficient jobs, and there are too many seekers after work; so that instead of being friends and comrades they become enemies, fighting each other for the right to work. That is even more apparent among the parents, where you find that a man who at one time, in a period of full employment, was perhaps your neighbour, following a depression becomes a man who is possibly going to take the bread from your mouth and take away your job. Instead of being a neighbour he becomes an enemy; instead of his being a friend we begin to expand on the ethnic differences and the religious differences which separate us. One of the safest and surest methods of getting rid of racial discrimination in Canada would be for the government to carry out its pledge of full employment.

There is still one other minority, the Japanese, which was brought to the attention of this house the other evening by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) and the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). The hon. member for Kamloops, with regard to the deportation orders, spoke of:

> . . . that pressure which is being applied to it (the government) by, I submit with all respect, uninformed and unenlightened groups in the country.

The hon. member said that he submitted this with respect. I say that he submitted it with intolerable arrogance and insolence. Who are these uninformed and unenlightened groups in this country? I have here resolutions from the Church of England in Canada. Is that an uninformed and unenlightened group? I have resolutions here from the United Church of Canada. Is that an unenlightened and uninformed group? I have resolutions from practically every church in this country. Are we to believe that these are uninformed and unenlightened groups? The hon. member speaks with an ignorance which is unprecedented when he speaks on this subject. He says:

> Let us analyse what is involved in being a British subject. I submit that it means nothing more or less than being a citizen of the British empire.

If that is the case how are the Hindus who live in British Columbia treated? Are they treated as citizens of the British empire, or as people who are inferior because their skins are coloured? How can anybody in this house reconcile such conduct with these high protestations of Canadianism we have heard for so long? Either put those words into practice or let us admit that they are false and a complete mockery. Then the hon. member for Vancouver South found himself ably supported by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank). What a combination! Arsenic and old lace! The hon. member for Vancouver South said:

> The real genius of the governments of the British nations has been that questions are dealt with realistically, not by theorizing at which my friends of the C.C.F. are so good.

If the hon. gentleman is a realist I am proud to be a theorist. In my lifetime the realists have landed us in two world wars and two world depressions. If that be realism the hon. gentleman can have it. My theorizing is this, that any citizen of this country, whether he be Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant, believer or unbeliever, black, white or yellow, has exactly the same rights as any other citizen.

Then we had the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the dying hours of the last session coming here and tabling three orders in council which had as their intent the deportation of Canadians of Japanese descent. I have nothing but contempt for any party which calls itself a Liberal party which can do a thing like that. When I hear the Prime Minister state that such a policy will be carried out, and then clothe it in words such as "doing justly" and "acting with mercy," my stomach revolts. If this be Liberalism, then it is no wonder that all over the world Liberalism is failing and declining, because Liberalism has never had the courage to live up to its finest ideals. If that be Canadianism, then I do not know the meaning of the word.

In committee stage I intend to move an amendment which perhaps to some extent will define the rights and privileges of Canadian citizens. Perhaps I shall be told that this is just a moral gesture. I will not dissent. Perhaps I shall be told that one cannot legislate a people into morality. There I disagree, for a hundred years ago in the United Kingdom slavery was rife and accepted. Then legislation was invoked against it; and what was then a legal wrong is to-day a moral wrong.

A hundred years ago in the United Kingdom it was accepted that women and children should work down in the bowels of the earth in the coal mines for twelve or fourteen hours a day. Legislation was introduced against it. What was then a legal wrong has now become a moral wrong. I still think we can legislate people, at least to some extent, into a state of morality.

It is the responsibility of parliament to create these conditions which will make our citizens grateful for our traditions, proud of that even-handed justice and equality of treatment which is the right of all, regardless of creed or race. It is the responsibility of parliament to grant our citizens some measure of happiness in the enjoyment of the highest standard of living which Canada can provide; to give them that security from want which this country can afford if its resources are used for the benefit of all. Then we shall have Canadians. Then we shall have Canadians not in any sense of the lamentable nationalisms which still beset us and divide us, but rather Canadians who, in deepest tribute, can say, "This is our country; this is our Canada to which have come the people of all the nations to seek peace and freedom, to live in dignity and with justice; our Canada whose glory is certified for all time by the blood of its youth who died to give us an opportunity to make our country great."

Great? It was Disraeli who said that the greatness of a nation lies not in the mightiness of its armies and fleets, or in the repletion of treasuries, or in the factories and forges of industry which blaze on every plain; the greatness of a nation lies in the character of its people, and here we have a splendid and incomparable heritage. Then let us see to it that we do not neglect it or abuse it. Let us build a Canada which will be the pride of all its citizens and the envy, the friendly envy, of the peoples of the world.

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, the majority of those who have spoken in this debate have been men born in this country. Forty years ago, in the spring of 1906, I left England to take up residence in Canada. Had the phrase been coined at that time I should have then been called a non-Canadian British subject. It is a phrase used in this measure. Perhaps it is a somewhat cumbersome one, and the minister might wish to follow a procedure frequently followed in the army, and refer to that group of people as N.C.B.S.

When I left the old country I was the product of the ordinary English public school. By present standards I do not suppose my education was considered high. I was well grounded in history. I had a keen interest in games; perhaps to my love of sports can be attributed the root of a desire I have to compromise. Sometimes I think that in your

position, Mr. Speaker, you must regard sportsmen as those of a high order because, after all, you are a sort of glorified referee whose responsibility is to interpret to the house the rules of parliamentary fair play.

I believe that my religious education was a sort of sentimental attachment to the school chapel. I arrived here in Canada, and went at once to the western province of Alberta. There I arrived in a strange world. In that country were groups of people of many nationalities. I remember well in my neighbourhood a group of Icelandic people, and other groups of Welsh, American, English, Swedish, Norwegian, and down-east Canadians.

I lived in Alberta for some considerable time before I realized that there was anything else but a down-east Canadian. It was not mentioned in disrespect, but those Canadians in Alberta forty years ago were regarded as immigrants, in exactly the same way as I was regarded as an immigrant. They were settlers. It was a strange world into which I was inducted—and inducted not as a Canadian but as a westerner.

I wanted to be one of the gang, and therefore went out and bought myself a pair of chaps and a wide-brimmed hat. I became a westerner, and remained such until I went overseas during the first great war. It was on the slopes of Vimy ridge I first became a Canadian. I do not say I should not like to have become a Canadian before that date, but it had scarcely occurred to me that there was such an organization.

As I say, I wore the garb of the people of western Canada, and because of that, with the additional fact that I wore a Stetson hat, I was considered one of them. Had there been a more dignified method of welcoming me into the family of Canada I should have been delighted to follow it, by going before either a mounted police officer, a justice of the peace, or even a bishop. I should have welcomed whatever method might have been laid down.

But until now, so far as I know, no such methods have been laid down. As I have said, it was on the slopes of Vimy ridge, where I had the great honour of serving with a regiment recruited from the province of Quebec, that I first became a Canadian. I have been out west most of the time since the close of that war. No longer does one hear in western Canada the expression, "A down-east Canadian." One hears the expression, "Canadian." World war II has cemented that spirit of unity which, as far as I was concerned, was first sown when we fought on the slopes of Vimy ridge.

I believe that throughout this dominion there is a wide desire for Canadian citizenship to be defined and clarified. To me Canadian citizenship is not incompatible with being a British subject. After all, Canada is a nation in the British commonwealth of nations and as such I can be a Canadian citizen and still feel that I am a member of the British commonwealth of nations.

As I understand the present bill, a non-Canadian British subject may reside in Canada and remain a British subject if he so desires, or he may express a desire to become a Canadian citizen and by carrying out certain formalities laid down in the bill he can become a Canadian citizen. Provision is made also for the Canadian citizen who is travelling among other nations of the British commonwealth of nations still to retain his British citizenship. Therefore, if a non-Canadian British subject comes here and desires to become a Canadian citizen, to my mind he undergoes an act of renationalization rather than naturalization. I think there is a difference. He still remains a British subject; he gives up his nationality of Englishman, Scotsman or Australian and becomes a Canadian by nationality. That would have met with my early desires as a boy, which I expressed a few minutes ago, to be permitted to become one of the gang.

The average non-Canadian British subject coming here who is born in one of the other nations of the British commonwealth has been steeped in the history of the commonwealth. He is familiar with the system of government and the customs of our institutions, customs and institutions which in the main are uniform in every nation of the British commonwealth of nations. He will have learned about magna charta, he will know of habeas corpus and the bill of rights, and he will know something of the statute of Westminster. He is of the breed and, being of the breed, he knows the breed; he is prepared to take the worth of the breed for granted. Those things which are closest to the hearts of many are seldom found readily in their mouths.

I referred to the willingness to compromise. There is much in this bill that I can accept, but there is one point which I do find it difficult to take readily. I refer to the necessity of a non-Canadian British subject having to serve the same period of apprenticeship when he comes to Canada that must be served by a man who has not been brought up in the traditions, who is not familiar with the customs and the system of government of the British commonwealth.

Mr. MARTIN: As the hon. gentleman knows, that is not a new provision; that is twenty-seven years old.

Mr. GREEN: Oh, no.

Mr. PEARKES: I am referring to the provision that a non-Canadian British subject must remain in Canada for five years. That is the point I am complaining about.

Mr. MARTIN: The point I am making is that that is not a new provision. That has been in existence since 1919 in this country and in all dominions.

Mr. GREEN: For one purpose only, the Immigration Act.

Mr. PEARKES: Whether it is new or not, I still take exception to that clause. I regard this period of apprenticeship as a university course. A young man entering university may have to take the full course, but if he has certain academic qualifications which he has obtained elsewhere the period of the course may be reduced. He has to take the same examination and he has to go through the same procedure of receiving his diploma. I would look upon a non-Canadian British subject as a student entering this university of Canada who, because of the education he has received elsewhere in Canadian principles, will have his time of study in Canada reduced.

Perhaps there has been a certain amount of heat interjected into this debate and it might be well that there had not been so much. I feel that no group in this house or in this country has a monopoly on loyalty to Canada. I love Canada as intensely as any native-born Canadian. I may not express this in exactly the same way, I may not give vocal expression to my thoughts perhaps as readily as some others, but I still love this country.

I rode the range and I have drunk deep of the beauties of the prairies, of the sunsets, of the foliage of the fields. I have climbed the Rockies and I have been impressed with the grandeur of those mountains. I have wandered over the foothills and I have dreamed my proud daydreams. The proud daydreams I have dreamed have been, "What may I do to further the interests of this my country?" Therefore I do ask the minister to reconsider this five-year qualification clause.

I wish to speak of one other matter, the twenty-year provision in connection with those who have come to our country and who during that period have been unable to learn one or other of our languages. If they cannot speak English or French and have lived here for twenty years and are able to meet other requirements, such as knowledge of our customs and so forth, they are to be granted the right of citizenship. I consider that provision just in so far as elderly people who are here now are concerned. We know that with the system of colonization used in western Canada groups of immigrants have been tempted to live together in certain colonies where they have not had the same opportunities of free intercourse as the people coming to this country now do have. Therefore I would say: Allow men or women who are over fifty years of age and who have lived here for twenty years, whether they have been able to learn English or French or not, to have the privileges of citizenship provided that they meet the other requirements.

But I am not sure that I can go so far as to say that the young man or the young woman who has lived here for twenty years and who in the last twenty years has not taken advantage of the opportunities which now exist for all people to learn our languages should be granted citizenship until he or she has learned one of those languages. I suggest that an age-limit might be considered at which they might be permitted to become citizens of Canada by taking advantage of that clause.

As for the future I would make it quite definite and clear that anybody coming into this country who wants to become a citizen will be expected to learn one or other or both of our languages and I would not allow that twenty-year clause to apply in the future.

Reference has been made by the member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart) to Japanese residents of this country. I represent a constituency in which the Japanese lived in their thousands before the outbreak of this war. When war came with Japan those residents were removed as a protective measure because there was a danger of espionage or of hostile action being taken. The people of my constituency have realized the difference that there is now that the Japanese have gone, and whether the Japanese are made citizens of Canada or not the people of Vancouver island and the people of the gulf islands do not want to see the Japanese moved back into those areas. I have had letters from all kinds of organizations, I have had letters from individuals, from farmers, from fishermen, from employers of labour, from churches and organizations all containing this plea: Do not let the Japanese come back to this territory after the war. They believe that the present government has given an undertaking that the Japanese will not come back. They do not want them to come back. They do not want the Japanese to live there for various reasons, the main reason being that they

are not assimilable. They have been engaged, I know, in all kinds of pusuits, particularly in fishing, and it has been suggested that if the Japanese do not come back we shall not be able to maintain the fishing industry. But that has been proved to be incorrect because the white man has taken over the fishing industry, and moreover it has provided an opportunity for employment for our own native-born Canadian Indians, to step in and show their craft. They have been able to take over the industry of commercial fishing which the Japanese were exploiting before the war.

The people of Vancouver island do not want to see the Japanese come back. They expect the government to live up to the promises that that government made.

There are many high-principled people on Vancouver island and in other parts of British Columbia who wonder what shall be done with the Japanese. It goes somewhat against their grain to think that those Japanese, if they are Canadian citizens, must live in one part of Canada and not in another part or, if they are Canadian citizens, that they must be deported and sent back to Japan. But I do not believe that there is one-tenth of one per cent of the population of Vancouver island who want to see the Japanese come back. When the Japanese left they left in an arrogant manner. I should like to read an extract from a letter I received only to-day describing the manner in which the young Japanese males left just after Pearl Harbor:

> They were in uproarious spirits, taking possession of the lounges—

That was in the Canadian Pacific boats.

> —flirting heavily with some girls who were with them, gambling until stopped by the ship's officers, and behaving generally in a most unseemly manner. They embarked at every island port. The Japs here were Japs first and Japs to the last.

I do not know what the government's plans are to deal with this situation. I sometimes feel almost more sorry for the government than for the Japanese. It will not be an easy decision for the government to make. As a British Columbian I should feel quite happy if the Japanese were never coming back to the coast of British Columbia. As a Canadian—and I have been talking about Canadian citizenship—I cannot recommend to any group of Canadians that they should accept large numbers of these Japanese. As a British Columbian I must ask what steps are being taken by the government to prevent the Japanese from coming back to my country if they are moved to other places.

As I have already said, I would find it very hard as a Canadian to accept the principle that Canadian citizens must live somewhere and not be allowed to live elsewhere. It is a difficult and perplexing problem.

I could give advice to the Japanese clearly and definitely. To them I would say: Accept every opportunity to go back as quickly as you can to Japan whether you were born there or not. Go back because in the long run you and your children will be happier back in Japan than you will be here in Canada distributed across this country or living in British Columbia, as the case may be. You will have to live in small minorities where there will be no chance of you or your children or your grandchildren assimilating with the rest of the population. What is going to happen? Small groups intermarrying, and the children and the children's children will deteriorate.

I think from the high Christian point of view now is the opportunity to repatriate the Japanese back to their homeland where perhaps they would be able to introduce to Japan, which has suffered so much, some of the western and Christian ideas that they have learned and in this way raise the standard of the other Japanese. They can do a great missionary work there. If they have not assimilated the ideals of western civilization while they have been here, they never will, and we should send them back.

So that, while I find it difficult to help the government out of its present predicament I must hold the government to its promises, and I feel like offering the suggestion to every Japanese that they should go back to their land and that if they will do that the government will take care of their rehabilitation back in Japan or in some other island.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house met at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, may I first express commendation of the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) for the bill which he introduced into the house and which is now before us to establish the status of Canadian citizen. The bill, I think all hon. members will agree, gives every indication of being the result of very careful work, and I am sure the commendation the minister has received from all parts of the house indicates that it is a splendid piece of work. I am sure he must have been pleased to see it reported in

the press to-day that the government of Australia is so much impressed with the principle of this bill that it is inclined to consider introducing a similar measure in the commonwealth of Australia. So again I say that the Secretary of State deserves great commendation for the splendid bill he has laid before us.

In the debate which has taken place so far there was some suggestion on the part of some hon. members that the United States had dealt with their problems of establishing citizenship and fostering devotion to their country in a manner which Canada might well emulate. As I listened to various speakers giving expression to that view I thought to myself, can these be representatives of a people who decided at the very outset of the second great war that it was a war in which they should immediately take part in order to protect their freedom and the freedom of the world, and who did it unhesitatingly and with the support of all parts of the country? I happened to be in this house when that decision was taken, and as I recall, only two members showed the slightest inclination not to agree with that decision. In that war we, the Canadian people, took into our armed forces over 1,100,000 persons, the vast majority of whom enlisted on a voluntary basis. I venture to say there is no other country in the world, the United States included, which could put into its armed forces almost one-tenth of its people on a voluntary basis. I ask myself, can this be a parliament of the Canadian people in which its representatives find fault with the Canadian people and point to the country to the south of us as more deserving of our admiration? Much as I admire that country to the south, the fact remains that they were just as much in danger as we were on that fateful third of September, 1939, but it took over a year for their people to come to a united decision that they should take part in that war. Had it not been for the decision which was taken by the Canadian people just before our declaration of war on September 10, 1939, and remembering that France collapsed in June, 1940, and Britain stood alone except for the other members of the commonwealth and her empire; had Canada not been at her side, with the help she was able to give in giving an uplift to her morale, with the men she sent into the air force, the troops she had in the British isles to help defend the shores of Britain, I fear we would have lost the war. I shall not refer to-night to our achievements after entering the war. In view of these exploits of a people which has played such a crucial part at a time of crisis, a people numbering around twelve million who by their free will act saved, perhaps, the very liberties of mankind, it ill behooves any hon. member to compare our achievement unfavourably with that of the people of any other country, even the great republic to the south.

There has been some suggestion that Americans have so solved their problems that the people of the United States are more proud of being members of that great country than Canadians are of being Canadians. People who talk like that must have associated with different kinds of Canadians from those with whom I have associated. I happen to have served for a time in the army in the first great war, and again in the second great war. I saw something of the reactions of my fellow Canadians toward their country; also I saw and heard in my travels something of the reactions of peoples of other countries toward their respective countries; and I came to the conclusion that much of the feeling that we were somehow inferior in the way we dealt with our great problems was not justified by the facts of the situation. I am satisfied that deep down within the soul of every Canadian there is just as much love of country as there is on the part of any American. The Canadian may not be quite so open in his expression of that feeling; but from what I have seen and from what the men of Canada have achieved on the field of battle, in the air and on the sea, will anyone in this house say that the Canadian has not shown just as much devotion to his country as has any man who belongs to any other nation? After all, "by their fruits ye shall know them"; and I submit it ill behooves any member of this parliament, right at the end of a war in which our people have given such proofs of their bravery and their devotion to their country, their ability to organize themselves and strike blow after blow for freedom, to cast aspersions upon the loyalty of the Canadian people to their own country.

I have heard it said that there is a work of reconciliation to be done. A work of reconciliation has been done by the great leaders of the Canadian people ever since confederation. It seems to me there is some disposition in this house to assume that the two great races, which voluntarily went together to create this great country and have lived together in great friendship in spite of the strains which have at times developed since confederation, suddenly need to be reconciled to each other. If they had not been ready to give and take, confederation would never have been brought about. If they had not been ready to live and work with one another

in fraternity and friendship, we would not have been able to take the great part we took in the first great war.

I well remember the attitude as we appeared to be approaching still another great war. I well remember the thoughts of some people, people who did not believe that this country was built upon a firm foundation. They felt that the war would put such stresses and strains upon us that the country would be torn asunder. In the face of one of the greatest trials that any nation ever had to meet, trials which we went through in the last war, when we took into the armed services over 1,100,000 people, the vast majority of them on a voluntary basis, and when some people despaired of the country standing together united, what was the result? Time after time the apostles of disaster prophesied that the country would be split asunder, and every time the crisis was met under the leadership of the great Prime Minister of the country. Canada came through the war as a united country and survived many difficulties in regard to what had to be done, without impairing its essential unity. Therefore, when any hon. member rises in his place and suggests that suddenly the great work of reconciliation has to be commenced, I say that it was commenced by Sir John A. Macdonald, carried on well by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his successors, so that to-day I am satisfied that Canada is a more united nation and more at peace within itself, that there is more fraternity, more devotion to our common country, Canada, than has ever before been the case in its entire history.

I mentioned the work of Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I have also in mind the work of Sir Robert Borden, the man who insisted that Canada should as a nation sign the treaty of Versailles. I have in mind the work of the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, who was the first Canadian minister of the crown to sign a treaty on behalf of Canada. I have in mind the separate declaration of war by Canada on the decision of the Canadian parliament, which was taken in this very chamber in the early days of September, 1939. Hon. members will recall that Great Britain went to war on September 3. Our declaration of war, signed by His Majesty the King, came into effect on September 10. By these and other acts the world recognizes Canada as a nation. The world has admired the prowess of Canada on the field of battle, her achievements in the field of industry and invention, and her great contribution to the winning of the late war in other fields. The world recognized that Canada was a nation. It was certainly time that the fact that Canada was a great nation of the world was recognized by the law of this country. I was pleased to see that the bill recognizing and legalizing Canadian nationality was received with approval by all parties in the house.

I find the suggestion that Canadians do not regard themselves as Canadians a most strange one. If hon. members go to any person who was proud to wear the badge of Canada on his shoulder in either the first or the second great war and tell him that he did not think Canada was a nation and that he was not fighting for the freedom and liberty of Canada, they would get their answer. When one considers that 1,100,000 people entered the Canadian army in the late war and were privileged to wear the badge of Canada I think one will find that the feeling of loyalty and devotion to Canada, the feeling that there is a Canadian nationality, that there is such a thing as a Canadian is more widespread and deep-seated than many of us realize.

Section 3 of the bill—and I mention it with the hope that I shall not be called to order, and in order that hon. members will know what I am talking about—says that it shall be a sufficient answer to any question which brings up the nationality of a Canadian to say that he is a Canadian citizen. This simply puts into words what I venture to say has been the thought of nine out of ten Canadian people for the last twenty-five years.

If there has been one thing more than another that has been mentioned to me by Canadians of all racial origins it has been their resentment at the idea that, although they were Canadians who intended to live in Canada, have their families here and had no intention of going elsewhere, they had to put themselves down as of English, Scotch, Irish, French or some other origin. If there was nothing in this bill but the establishment of the will of the sovereign people of Canada that there is a Canadian nationality, the minister who introduced this bill would have done a splendid piece of work.

Something has been said about the provision that a person may become a Canadian citizen if he has satisfied the other requirements which are set out in section 10 of the bill, such as being of good character, lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence therein, has an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship, with adequate knowledge of the English or French language not an absolute requisite. I hope that the house will not in any way require that provision to be curtailed.

From time to time since I have been privileged to be a member of this house I have drawn to its attention a situation which con-

fronts many of our western pioneers who came and settled in western Canada, thirty, forty and fifty years ago, and who for one reason or another, some of them because they happened to come from a country which was under the domination of Austria-Hungary, which at the time in question was an enemy country, could not become British citizens when they were getting their homesteads. Therefore they were given a certificate in what is called "form K", which many of them thought did make them British subjects. Later on in life, when some of them wished to apply for old age pension, after going out, breaking up the land, clearing it of bush and stone and hewing out homes for themselves on the western plains and in the wooded areas, they found that they were not British subjects. Then they would come in and apply to be qualified as British subjects, and certain questions were asked of them. One question was: "Do you intend to apply for old age pension?" If one of these men who helped to pioneer this country admitted that he would like to get what the people of this country have provided for people in their old age, in many cases the judge would decline the citizenship even if the man could speak English or French. I hope the minister will see to it that that sort of thing does not continue in the future. Surely no judge should be permitted to deny to a man who has pioneered in this country, who has lived in it for twenty years and who is otherwise qualified to be a British subject, that which this parliament intended every worthy citizen of this country to have, by refusing for no legal reason to grant that man British citizenship. From time to time I have brought cases like that forward, and to-night I wish to thank the minister most sincerely for making it possible for some of my constituents who helped build western Canada and who sent their boys to fight and in some cases to die for Canada, now to become British subjects even though they cannot speak English as well as some hon. members.

A suggestion has been made that there would be no harm in permitting that section to apply to those already settled in Canada, but that it should not apply to future settlers. To-day people who are among the most freedom-loving in the world are looking for homes in Canada, or at any rate somewhere other than Europe. Because they let it be known that they favoured freedom in their own country, many are afraid to return to their homelands, and they wish to come to Canada. I think, for example, of some of the Ukrainian people, some of the Polish people, who when Poland was overrun went into the Polish army in exile or are now refugees in Germany. I get letters from them and from their relatives saying they do not wish to be returned to the Soviet Union but would like to be permitted to enter Canada. Could we wish to have better citizens than men who were so devoted to freedom and liberty that they were prepared to remain in exile for five years, fighting against tyranny, and who are now ready to throw in their lot with the building up of a great peace-time Canada as they were ready to risk their lives in order to establish freedom during the war? I hope the time will soon come when we may be able to admit to our country some of those worthy citizens who can make a great contribution to the building up of this country, even as their relatives have made a great contribution here in Canada in the past fifty years. I well remember when many of these people from central Europe were brought out and settled on our prairies. There were those who said they would never become good citizens. They feared what would be the result; but now that the country has seen what good citizens these people are and how ready they have been to support Canada in peace and defend her in war, those misgivings with regard to allowing some of them into this country should no longer prevail. Some of these worthy people may be fifty years old or more when they come in the future. If they come here and make good citizens, as their relatives did fifty years ago, then they in turn should be able to look forward to becoming Briitsh subjects and Canadian citizens, even if they have difficulty in mastering the English or the French language. Therefore I urge the minister and the house not to take that section out of this act.

It has been suggested that if a man is a Canadian citizen it should not be provided in the bill that he is also a British subject. On that point I submit that whether or not it is put in the bill, if a man is given the status of a Canadian citizen and takes the oath of allegiance to the king of the British empire and commonwealth set out in the schedule, by that very fact he has a status as a subject of His Majesty, a status common to the citizen of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and certainly Northern Ireland. He has a common status with the people of all those countries. Whether or not it is put in the bill I think the courts would rule that he was a subject of the king. Consequently I believe that section is just a recognition of the legal position. But through you, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to hon. members that while I want to be a Canadian citizen I am also happy to belong to the British family.

I happened to attend the monetary conference at Bretton Woods, where there were distinguished representatives from India, New Zealand, South Africa, Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and from other parts of the British empire and commonwealth. While each of these groups recognized that they were as free to speak their minds as any other groups (the most spirited attack upon British policy came from the Indian delegation), there was a common feeling that we belonged to one family. I thought to myself what a splendid thing the British commonwealth and empire was, that within it you could have people of all religions and all races, from all parts of the globe, with the feeling that they belonged to one family, people who would work together as brothers in one family. As far as I am concerned I think of such men as Field Marshal Smuts, General Botha, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe and others who were happy to belong to the family of British subjects, realizing that within that family they were just as free as the people of any other nation on the face of the globe, while at the same time they were part of a family that would help to promote the peace of the world, and I am happy and proud to join the company of such men as those I have mentioned, and other outstanding leaders of various commonwealth countries.

I think the tendency of the world at the present time must not be toward an ever-narrowing devotion to one nation. There must be loyalty to your own nation, yes; but there must be an ever-widening loyalty. If one looks to the past, first there was loyalty to the tribe, and the tribes fought each other. Then there was loyalty to larger and larger groups. So that to-day, as I see it, while being loyal to Canada, it seems to me we should do what we can to strengthen the good will and accord which prevail in the family of British nations.

But there is another aspect of the question which points to a part which Canada can play. We have brought into our midst the oppressed of other lands. One-fifth of our people have come to us from countries whose people are of other than British or French origin. As those people from other lands have lived in our midst we have come to realize that there is very little difference between one human being and another. We have overcore some of the racial prejudices we may have had before we came to know the people of other racial origins. While in the past Canada has served as a sort of connecting link between the United Kingdom and the United States, and to a certain extent by virtue of the fact that one of the great races which people this country is the French race we had a special appeal to the great French people, so now that we have taken into our midst the peoples of almost all countries in Europe, at least we in western Canada feel that if we can get along with them in perfect harmony and accord, we through them have learned that men are brothers and can live as brothers. Perhaps Canada, through that very fact can learn to play a part in the councils of the world in bringing all the nations of the world into greater harmony and accord.

Surely the nation of Canada playing a part in drawing together the various members of the British family, and the various members which make up the human family, to a point where war shall be no more and fraternity and brotherhood shall prevail—surely this is a greater vision than one which says, I will centre all my life and all my consideration in my own country, and have no care whatsoever in the working together of the different members of the human race.

Members find no difficulty in being loyal at the same time to their families, to their cities, to their provinces and to their country. Many people find no inconsistency at the same time in feeling a loyalty to Canada and to the British family of nations. Others to-day are ready to go farther and say that we must set up a world government where we shall have loyalty to the human family, where we shall recognize the fatherhood of God and the essential brotherhood of man.

There has been some suggestion that in some way British subjects should not have to comply in the same way as others with the requirements in regard to obtaining Canadian citizenship, the idea being that when they wish to become Canadian citizens they should not have, among other things, to take the oath of allegiance. I will admit that at first I thought that when a British subject came to this country we should give to him some extra consideration over a person who is not a British subject, when both applied to be Canadian citizens. But the more I thought about the question the more I realized that the disadvantages far outweighed the advantages.

Speaker after speaker has mentioned that if we are to have real unity we must treat every Canadian on exactly the same basis, no matter where his ancestors came from. If we are to say to an Englishman, a Scotsman or an Irishman who comes to Canada, we will treat you as a preferred person; we are not

going to require you to go through the same steps as the Americans, the Russians, or any other—

An hon. MEMBER: Why should he?

Mr. TUCKER: The reason why we should treat them the same is that if we treat one better than another he will carry that in his mind, and the other man will carry it in his mind after he becomes a Canadian citizen.

Mr. COCKERAM: Absolute nonsense.

Mr. TUCKER: My hon. friend says it is absolute nonsense. I would recall to his mind the words of various members on his own side of the house who have said over and over again that if we are to have wholehearted unity in Canada, we must treat all applicants for citizenship the same. If you say to a Scotsman, we will say—

Mr. KNOWLES: Careful, now.

An hon. MEMBER: Why a Scotsman?

Mr. TUCKER: If we were to say to a Scotsman that it was less needful that, to become a Canadian citizen, he go through the same steps as would be required from a man coming from the United States, the Scotsman would be inclined to say, well, it must be that I am a better Canadian to start with; I must have been better when I landed in this country than the other man was.

Mr. JACKMAN: One of them is a British subject.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, the Scotsman is a British subject; no one takes that status away from him; and if he does not wish to become a Canadian citizen, he does not have to.

If we want to have everybody coming to this country and applying for Canadian citizenship feel that they are all on the same basis, then the only way to do it is to say to the Frenchman, the Englishman, the Scotsman, or the American, you must all take the same steps, and you will have to take the oath or affirmation.

It is an oath or affirmation I think everyone should have to take before receiving the right to play his part in choosing our government. I do not believe anyone should come here from another country and have a vote in choosing a government without first taking the stand that he will uphold Canada and stand behind her. Surely there is nothing disgraceful about going before a judicial officer to take the kind of oath prescribed in this bill. This is the oath or affirmation.

An hon. MEMBER: A lot of people in your riding would not take that oath.

Mr. TUCKER: This is the oath or affirmation:

> I swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George VI, his heirs and successors, according to law; and that I will faithfully observe the laws and fulfil my duties as a Canadian citizen.

Is it disgraceful for a man from England to appear alongside a man from the United States, and take that oath or affirmation before a judicial officer? After all, I submit to the government that before any man has a right to vote or to hold office in this country he should be required to take that oath or affirmation of allegiance to our king and our country.

Indeed, it is pointed out to me that members of the privy council have to undergo that "disgrace" before they can assume the duties of their high office—and it is a disgrace which I am sure some hon. members opposite would not mind assuming. Perhaps, in view of the way they are acting, that would not apply to some on the other side.

In her short time as a nation, Canada has had a glorious history, one which has been based upon tolerance between man and man, no matter what his race or religious origin. There has been a feeling of fraternity developed with these peoples from other countries who have come and settled on our lands, and have shown their willingness to be good, faithful, loyal Canadian citizens. We have demonstrated by our past achievements, by our ability to weld into one Canadian people the diverse elements of which this great nation is composed, that if we carry on with the programme before us this session, that of laying a broader and firmer foundation for this Canadian nation, Canada will go forward to a future greater than she has yet known.

Mr. D. K. HAZEN (St. John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) upon the contribution he has made to the debate. I followed his remarks closely and while I do not agree with all he said—we have the right to disagree, of course—I may say that I am in wholehearted agreement with many of the things he did say.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) spoke with such eloquence and fervour on his motion for the second reading of this bill that a stranger listening might have been justified in coming to the conclusion that when it was passed we would "change the sorry scheme of things entire" and have a new heaven and a new earth in this country. Unfortunately that result will not follow.

We are all Canadians and we have called ourselves Canadians for many years. When this bill becomes law it will not make us better Canadians or more conscious of our

Canadian citizenship. We shall take no greater pride in our country after this bill is passed than we did before. We shall be no more loyal to our constitution and we shall be no less critical of or more satisfied with conditions that prevail in this country. We shall be no more united as a nation.

I make these remarks with two reservations. First, I believe that proper ceremonies on the granting of naturalization will be of benefit and, second, I think the provision in the bill that a declaration of Canadian citizenship will be an adequate statement of national status is a step in the right direction. But may I point out to hon. members that if a person applies to-day for a Canadian passport he can have inscribed on it the fact that he is a Canadian national. When the next census is taken I have no doubt that a person will be able to say he is a Canadian citizen, but inquiry will be made as to his national origin. There are good reasons why we should keep a record of national origin.

In dealing with questions of citizenship, nationality, naturalization and the status of aliens we are dealing with technical subjects. They are matters about which I do not profess to have the answers, and they are matters about which I think the members of the house should have a great deal more information. Therefore I am in agreement with the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) who suggested that this bill should be sent to a committee. There could be called before that committee experts from the Department of External Affairs, from the Department of the Secretary of State, from the immigration department and from the Department of Justice who could explain the difficulties they face in connection with the present legislation. There could also be called before that committee men who have made a particular study of this matter and who could express their views, who could criticize the bill and who could furnish information that hon. members do not possess at the present time. I strongly urge that the bill be sent to a committee for further study.

We have on the statute books of this country, and have had for many years, a definition of Canadian citizenship. This is to be found in section 2 (b) of the Immigration Act, which is chapter 93 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927. With the permission of hon. members I wish to place this definition on the record because that has not been done during this debate. I should like permission to do that without reading it in order to save time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must have the unanimous consent of the house.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. HAZEN: The definition of Canadian citizenship contained in the Immigration Act reads:

"Canadian citizen" means

(i) a person born in Canada who has not become an alien;

(ii) a British subject who has Canadian domicile; or

(iii) a person naturalized under the laws of Canada who has not subsequently become an alien or lost Canadian domicile;

Provided that for the purpose of this Act a woman who has not been landed in Canada shall not be held to have acquired Canadian citizenship by virtue of her husband being a Canadian citizen; neither shall a child who has not been landed in Canada be held to have acquired Canadian citizenship through its father or mother being a Canadian citizen;

That definition has much to commend it, although it is not as inclusive as it might be. Its effect is limited by the fact that it is applicable only for the purposes of the Immigration Act.

We have also had on our statute books for many years a definition of "British subject". This is to be found in the Naturalization Act which is chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. If I may be permitted, I would ask permission to place it on the record. Section 2 (a) reads:

(d) "British subject" means a person who is a natural-born British subject, or a person to whom a certificate of naturalization has been granted; or a person who has become a subject of His Majesty by reason of any annexation of territory.

Similar definitions of a "British subject," or definitions in practically similar words are to be found in the naturalization acts of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Great Britain.

We have also had on the statute books of this country for many years a definition of "Canadian national". This is to be found in the Canadian Nationals Act, which is chapter 21 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927. With your permission, sir, and for the information of the house I should like to place this on the record. It reads:

2. The following persons are Canadian nationals, viz:—

(a) any British subject who is a Canadian citizen within the meaning of the Immigration Act;

(b) the wife of any such citizen;

(c) any person born out of Canada, whose father was a Canadian national at the time of that person's birth, or with regard to persons born before the third day of May, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, any person whose father at the time of such birth, possessed all the qualifications of a Canadian national as defined in this act.

Before I go any farther I wish to say that I am in agreement with the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond) when he said—I am not quoting his words exactly—that this bill gives us no more than we had already as far as the definition of a Canadian citizen is concerned; that a Canadian citizen and a Canadian national means the same thing, that, if there is any difference, Canadian national means more; that the change made by this bill is more superficial than real.

The difficulty about these definitions is that they were unconnected and in consequence they led in some instances to conditions that were not altogether satisfactory. But I would point out that we shall always have some confusion and some difficulty so far as the term "Canadian citizen" is concerned owing to the fact that other countries have different definitions of "citizen" or "national". We shall at all times have in connection with those terms a conflict of law which will lead to difficulties. I agree with the Secretary of State when he said, in speaking on this bill:

> Despite what one often hears to the contrary, there has been a Canadian nationality, but the difficulty has been that the existing definitions were so specialized and so unrelated that they led to a condition of great confusion and misunderstanding.

It is well, I think, that this misunderstanding should be removed and that any difficulties which have been occasioned by the legislation that at present exists be overcome and cleared up if possible. So far as this bill clarifies the definition of a Canadian citizen I support it, but I do not agree with the definition of "Canadian domicile" that is contained in it because it has the effect of requiring a British subject to reside in this country five years before he can apply to become a Canadian citizen. I do not think it is necessary, in order to get a clear definition of Canadian citizenship, for the government to proceed in this way.

What this bill proposes to do, as I read it, is this. For better, for worse—time alone will tell—it proposes to turn our present Naturalization Act upside down. Under our present act a person who is naturalized becomes a British subject. Then the other statutes I have mentioned define him in many instances to be a Canadian national or a Canadian citizen. Under this bill the procedure is reversed. We give a man a certificate of Canadian citizenship and say that in consequence he is a Brtish subject.

It would be much better I think, to introduce a bill defining Canadian citizenship and then make the necessary amendments to our present Naturalization Act. I do not say that dogmatically. I should like to have an opportunity to have the matter further considered and looked into, and it is for that reason I suggest that it be referred to a committee of this house so that it can be given further study.

This bill will materially change our Naturalization Act. Not only does it change the Naturalization Act; but, as I read it, it enacts as well a nationalization act. Under this bill foreigners will be naturalized and British subjects will be nationalized. Both an alien and a British subject, with some exceptions, will be required to live in this country for five out of the six years prior to the time they apply and they must comply with the other provisions of section 10. If they do so, the alien or foreigner will not be granted a certificate of naturalization, as he is under the present act. What he will be granted is "a certificate of citizenship". It seems to me that perhaps the government is more or less playing with words in changing these terms.

The British subject who applies will receive a similar certificate. But the certificate the foreigner receives will naturalize him. It will make him a British subject and a Canadian citizen. The certificate a man from Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand or South Africa receives cannot make him a British subject for he is a British subject, but it makes him a Canadian citizen. This procedure, it seems to me, leaves very much to be desired. It is, in my humble opinion, objectionable.

Why, I ask, should a British subject, a citizen of Great Britain, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand or South Africa who comes to Canada for the purpose of making this country his home be obliged to reside here for five years and then go through exactly the same procedure as the foreigner who applies for naturalization in order that he may be nationalized or declared to be a Canadian citizen. I should like to repeat the question asked by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker):

> I ask the minister to explain why at this time when we in all parts of the empire are desirous in the interest of our own security to bind still closer the various parts of the empire together, should a British subject coming into Canada and properly entering this country under our immigration laws be required to go through the same formalities as persons coming from other parts of the world.

I would call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of hon. members to the fact that any British subject who has ordinarily resided in Canada for at least twelve months and in the electoral district where he

seeks to vote for at least two months immediately preceding the issue of a writ for election can vote in a dominion election. I think all of us have read that section with a good deal of interest.

Why is that privilege accorded to a British subject who has been in Canada for only a year? There is a reason for it and that reason is, I believe, that British subjects are familiar with democratic institutions and with British laws and British principles of fair play and justice and they speak our language. That is the reason why a British subject is permitted to vote after he has been twelve months in this country. That is a good reason, I think, why he should, when he applies for Canadian citizenship, be treated differently from a person coming from a country where a different system of government and different laws prevail and who is not familiar with our constitution and cannot speak our language. Surely there is nothing unreasonable in permitting a man who is familiar with our way of carrying on and who is a British subject to be treated differently from a foreigner who is unacquainted with our ways and who possibly cannot speak our language.

I should like to call as a witness in support of this view Doctor John E. Read, K.C., who until recently was legal adviser to the Department of External Affairs. He gave evidence in 1943 before a committee of this house which had to do with the defence of Canada regulations. The committee was also considering questions of naturalization and immigration at that time. He was asked if he would draw any distinction between a person who was a British subject coming to Canada and a foreigner with regard to the time it would require to obtain Canadian citizenship, and he replied:

> I think we ought to draw a distinction. I think a foreigner who comes here should have to reside here five years, no matter what happens, before becoming a Canadian citizen, but I should think a person coming here from another part of the British empire should be able to get it in a shorter time.

Mr. MARTIN: He helped to draft this bill.

Mr. HAZEN: I am giving the house his views. It does not follow from his having helped to draft this bill that he has changed them. This was in 1943.

> That would depend on whether it was possible to work out some arrangement that would be satisfactory to meet the immigration requirements as well as the other requirements.

I should like now to direct the attention of hon. members to the fact—I think it has already been stated—that a certificate of naturalization granted in Canada prior to January 1, 1945, was of a limited nature; it had no effect outside Canada. For many years the question of naturalization had engaged the attention of the statesmen of the empire and had been studied at practically every imperial conference, for the situation had been regarded as far from satisfactory. At the imperial conference of 1907 it was agreed that a naturalization act should be passed creating uniformity within the empire. That decision, it seems to me, was a wise one. It exhibited a breadth of vision and a statesmen-like approach which were most commendable. In that year and at the conference in 1911 Sir Wilfrid Laurier strongly urged the adoption of the principle that there should be uniformity in the effect of naturalization wherever granted, and that a man who was a British subject anywhere should be recognized as a British subject everywhere. Let me quote from the statement he made on June 13, 1911, at the imperial conference. It is found on page 251 of the proceedings as reported to both houses of the British parliament. This is in part what he said:

> This is in my estimation one of the important questions that the conference has to deal with. The power of naturalization is one of the incidental powers of sovereignty and one of the most important attributes of sovereignty. The British government, in granting the constitutions of the several dominions, has parted with the power of sovereignty and delegated it to the dominions. It has given the power to all the dominions of granting letters of naturalization to aliens. That was one of the necessary incidents, I think, of the power of self-government which was given to the dominions, and the one power which it was very important for them to have, because being young nations and all inviting immigration, it followed as a measure of practical moment that they should have the power to grant letters of naturalization. They have all availed themselves of that power, and each one has its own law of naturalization, and those laws are all different . . . I do not think there are two laws in all the dominions which are here represented which are the same—they all vary.
>
> The practical difficulty which arises at once is, as to what is to be the effect of this power of naturalization. The power which is given to Canada, to New Zealand, and to all the self-governing dominions, is one which is limited each to its own territory. It does not extend beyond the limits of the territory covered by that legislation.

Then, after giving instances of the difficulties that occurred under the legislation which then existed, Sir Wilfrid continued:

> In these days of travel and locomotion it is conceivable that this condition of things—this divided allegiance—may produce serious complications. Therefore I think the first consequence to be deduced from this condition of things, this divided power of legislation between the mother country and the dominions beyond the seas, must be remedied in some way,

and I think this principle may be laid down as an object to be ultimately reached—a British subject anywhere, a British subject everywhere.

In consequence of these consultations at imperial conferences, Great Britain in 1914, Canada in 1914, Australia in 1920, New Zealand in 1923 and South Africa in 1926 passed naturalization acts identical with respect to their important provisions. These acts provided that a certificate granted in one of the dominions or in the United Kingdom would be recognized as conferring on the holder the status of a British subject throughout the world. The point I wish to make is that these acts were passed after an agreement had been reached between the dominions concerned.

The bill that is now before us makes a material change in the present act. It is not a change merely in procedure but a change in substance, for under our present laws a British subject became a Canadian citizen after five years' residence in Canada, but this bill requires a British subject from Great Britain or any of the other dominions coming into this country after five years' residence to make a formal application and go before a court, just as a foreigner is obliged to do. Under our present laws a woman marrying a British subject becomes a British subject, but under the proposed legislation that is not the case. Here again we have a material change.

On June 15, 1943, Doctor E. H. Coleman, K.C., under-secretary of state, appeared before the committee I have referred to, and with reference to the provisions of the naturalization acts passed by the different dominions and Great Britain, he was asked:

By the way, in each of these British dominions were the important provisions reenacted?

He replied:

Yes. They are identical. That is the whole basis of the thing, in order that there might be uniformity and that the certificate granted in one of the dominions or in the United Kingdom might be recognized as conferring on the holder the status of a British subject throughout the world. There was an informal, if not a statutory, understanding between the governments of the United Kingdom and the dominions that no fundamental changes would be made without consultation. I think the subject had been on the agenda at more than one imperial conference held in the interval. There have been some modifications made by common agreement, and there have been some proposed which have not been made because a common agreement could not be reached. But the point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that we are bound—perhaps not legally, but morally at least—not to make any fundamental changes in the act without consultation with the other dominions, which includes the United Kingdom.

In 1929 a preparatory conference of the members of the commonwealth was held in London for the purpose of considering, among other questions, that of naturalization. The Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe headed the Canadian delegation that attended that conference. It made certain recommendations that are to be found in sections 73 to 78 inclusive of its report. I propose to read two of these recommendations which are found at page 128 of the evidence given by Doctor Read before the committee to which I have referred.

Mr. MARTIN: Doctor Coleman or Doctor Read?

Mr. HAZEN: Doctor Read.

Section 76 reads as follows:

A common status directly recognized throughout the British commonwealth in recent years has been given a statutory basis through the operation of the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914.

77. Under the new position, if any change is made in the requirements established by the existing legislation, reciprocal action will be necessary to attain this same recognition the importance of which is manifest in view of the desirability of facilitating freedom of intercourse and the mutual granting of privileges among the different parts of the commonwealth.

This report was approved in this house on a resolution introduced by the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. It came before the imperial conference in 1930 and was approved by that conference. The conclusions that were reached by the conference are to be found in its proceedings. I believe these proceedings were also approved by this house. The conclusions read as follows:

(1) That the conference affirms paragraphs 73 to 78 inclusive of the report of the conference on the operation of dominion legislation.

(2) That, if any changes are desired in the existing requirements for the common status, provision should be made for the maintenance of the common status, and the changes should only be introduced (in accordance with present practice) after consultation and agreement among the several members of the commonwealth.

(3) That it is for each member of the commonwealth to define for itself its own nationals, but that, so far as possible, those nationals should be persons possessing the common status, though it is recognized that local conditions or other special circumstances may from time to time necessitate divergences from this general principle.

(4) That the possession of the common status in virtue of the law for the time being in force in any part of the commonwealth should carry with it the recognition of that status by the law of every other part of the commonwealth.

There is one other extract from the report that I should like to read. It is to be found on page 124 of the evidence to which I have referred, and reads as follows:

(2) Although it would seem that no question could arise as between members of the British commonwealth in the case of those referred to in subparagraph (1) (a) above, it is recognized that in the case of a migrant, referred to in subparagraph (1) (b) above, the member from which he might wish to declare an interest in the conditions under which the member to which he went might claim to be entitled to regard him as a member of its community. It is also desirable to avoid laws or rules as to acquisition or loss of such membership which might lead to overlapping. As time has not allowed consideration to be given to the different criteria which a member might desire to impose, it is recommended that any member contemplating passing a law on the membership of its community, should submit its proposals to the other members of the commonwealth, so as to enable them to offer observations thereon, if they feel so inclined.

I have quoted these paragraphs for one purpose. When the Secretary of State introduced this bill, and when he spoke on second reading, he did not tell us whether the proposals contained therein had been submitted to the other members of the commonwealth before it was introduced here.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: I am going to ask the minister whether it was submitted to them, when it was submitted to them, and what their answers were. When he replies he should give us a full explanation of what took place.

Mr. MARTIN: I can do so now if the hon. member desires it. The answer is yes, but I shall give greater detail later on.

Mr. HAZEN: This practically concludes all that I have to say. Once or twice in the speeches that have been made—there have been remarks to the effect that this bill might break the bonds or weaken the bonds between the different parts of the empire. I do not hold any such view. The British empire and commonwealth is more closely united to-day than it has ever been before in its history.

In reading the speech made by the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe in May, 1930, when he moved that the recommendations of the preparatory conference to which I have referred be accepted by this house, I was interested in a certain portion of it. I have not time to quote portions of that speech, but I should like to read a quotation he gave from a speech made in the House of Lords by Lord Balfour, which reads as follows:

The British commonwealth is held together far more effectually by broad loyalties and common feelings of interest and devotion to the great world ideals of peace and freedom than by anything else. A common interest in loyalty, in freedom, in ideals, that is the bond. If that is not enough, nothing else is enough.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): In rising to take part in the debate on the new citizenship bill my first remarks are to congratulate the government and also the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) on introducing such an important bill at this time. I believe that the bill meets the general views of all people in this country. I suppose the only differences will be in regard to the interpretation of many of the sections. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I was a little disappointed when the minister changed his view this year and did not suggest that the bill be sent to a committee. I believe the importance of the bill warranted having it sent to a committee where every section could be thoroughly discussed and more information obtained than can be the case in the house itself.

My first criticism of the bill is that it is wrongly named. I think it should have been called the "Canadian nationality act" instead of the "Canadian Citizenship Act". I believe the word "nationality" would convey more, not only to the people of Canada but to the people of all countries especially if a person from Canada going abroad could say, "I am a Canadian national". In the United States they use both terms in their naturalization act; they refer to both nationality, naturalization and citizenship. In that country one can be a citizen and not be naturalized, and vice versa.

I wish now to deal with some of the sections, although I realize I must only comment on them because on the motion for second reading only the principle of the bill may be debated. I would find it extremely difficult to debate the bill or the principle of it if precluded, however, from dealing with some of the sections.

Before I begin to mention the sections may I say that I have listened to many speakers during this debate, and I have come to the conclusion that some of them have not studied the bill very carefully. Some of the sections which I believe to be among the most important have not yet been touched upon so far during the debate. I am going to mention one right now. Under section 4 a child becomes a natural-born Canadian citizen if its parent, either father or mother, was born on a Canadian ship. That follows the British act, and I do not think a great deal of objection can be offered to that section. But what do we find in section 5? A child born outside Canada, perhaps in the middle of China or on some island in the Pacific

or elsewhere is a natural-born citizen under this measure if its father or mother was born on the Canadian ship. I contend that is carrying our natural citizenship much too far. Especially is that so, in the light of the criticism which has been offered, and I suggest rightly, to the sections of the bill which will compel a British subject coming from Great Britain or the other dominions to take out naturalization papers after a residence of some five years. So that I think when we come to the various sections of the bill we shall have something more to say with regard to this particular matter.

We have heard some expressions with regard to the word "British", and I have met some people in this country who even actually hate that word. There are some persons in certain provinces who would like to cut all ties of any kind with Great Britain. I have wondered many times if those people have given any thought to the part Great Britain has played in the development of this country of ours. Have they ever considered that perhaps we never would have had confederation but for the fact that following the Plains of Abraham, Great Britain took control of this country. In all kindliness I ask my hon. friends from the province of Quebec to consider what kind of treatment might have been meted out to them had some power other than Great Britain taken possession from France at that time. I go farther than that. I say that had France retained control of what was then Canada the treatment given the people of the province of Quebec would not have been as fair or as generous as the treatment given them under British rule. The rights of minorities have been maintained to the letter. Again when one looks over the history of France and reads about the persecution of the church in that country; and when one considers the very fair treatment that has been given by the British, one wonders just the reason for this desire in the minds of some citizens of Canada to cut ourselves entirely free from everything pertaining to Great Britain, even to the extent of hating the very name.

To my mind in this bill far too many powers are given to the minister. I believe in a matter so important as the conferring of citizenship this parliament should say in every particular what is to be done, and it not be left to the minister. That is how it is done in the United States; all the regulations are passed by the legislative body and contained in the United States act. In connection with the conferring of citizenship I would be loathe to give the minister the power either to confer naturalization or the power to ask for a rehearing after naturalization has been granted. Section 14 is somewhat singular. After the court approves, under that section, naturalization, the minister may ask for a rehearing. The bill does not direct the court as to what shall be said or argued by the person brought before the court for the second time, other than that he must prove the right to have Canadian citizenship conferred upon him. I am of opinion that once the court, having heard all the facts of the case, decides that naturalization should be granted, that should be the end of it. If the minister is of opinion that a rehearing should be held, then the man should be given some intimation as to what objection has been raised by the minister to the granting of citizenship. Further, I wonder how many hon. members have noticed the provision that if on the second hearing the court decides to revoke citizenship, the person concerned will have to wait a further two years before his case may be heard again. When we reach the committee stage, that is something about which we should, I suggest, ask a number of questions.

I come now to sections 16, 17 and 18, all important sections, dealing with the loss of Canadian citizenship. I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) who, in his argument, could not see why a person from Great Britain should not be called upon to take out papers and to take the oath. He spoke of handing out treatment with fairness and equality. Well, if we are to treat all with fairness and equality, then why not do so? So far as I can find in the bill, loss of citizenship can happen only to one who is naturalized, and not to one born in this country.

I know it is only a natural feeling on the part of those born in Canada that they have a natural or prior right over those from other lands. But as I look at members of my own family and as I look at others born here I just wonder if we are viewing things in the bill in the right perspective. After all, remember that those who were born in this country had no say whatsoever as to where they were to be born. On the other hand, when I, like others who came to this land, chose it as one of the best countries to which I could go—and I have found it was the best country. If we are to treat all Canadians with fairness we should also consider those born in this country who might commit certain acts against the state.

No one, I believe, is going to accuse the United States of being inhuman or un-Christian because of her naturalization laws. Yet I find that in the United States there are many conditions under which a citizen of

that country may lose his citizenship. That applies both to those born within the United States and to those obtaining naturalization papers. For instance, deserting military or naval services of the United States in time of war is punished by loss of citizenship, whether a person be born in America or not. Then, again one loses citizenship if he commits an act of treason, or attempts by force to overthrow the state, or bears arms against the United States, provided, of course, that he is convicted thereof by a court martial or some other court of competent jurisdiction.

Time will not permit my reading all those sections dealing with loss of nationality, so that I shall touch upon only one more. Many Americans who have come to this country have lost citizenship in the United States by voting in a municipal, provincial, or federal election. I had a case in my own community last year where a woman who had been thirty-five years in Canada, but whose parents were born in the United States— and she, too, had been born there—wanted to attend her daughter's wedding in that country. But when she came to the border the United States immigration officer said to her, "Just hold on a minute; have you ever voted in a municipal election?" She replied, honestly, that she had. "Well," he said, "you cannot enter this country; you are no longer a citizen of the United States". And that woman living in my own district was debarred from entering what one would term her own native land.

Does anyone call the United States un-Christian or cruel, or does anyone accuse it of doing something wrong? Yet if we proposed anything like that here there would be cries of, "Oh, that is un-Christian; that is cruel; that is wrong." But the United States has been carrying on in that way for many years.

I am suggesting to the minister and to hon. members that we should give careful consideration to this matter of loss of nationality, because even those born in this country may commit some act which, in some of our minds at least, believe should place them in a position where they should not be allowed to retain their Canadian citizenship.

The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) and some other hon. members have mentioned minority groups, and have spoken particularly about Japanese. It is not my intention this evening to deal at length with that subject, because I feel certain that another occasion will arise when the entire matter may be dealt with. Let me say at once however that I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver South when he points out that by the passing of this measure we thereby confer citizenship upon the Japanese—every one of them. I am going to leave this thought with hon. members: There were 1,600 Japanese who left this country prior to the outbreak of war.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Was it not 16,000?

Mr. REID: Well, I am not quite sure of the number. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni says it was 16,000, and that may be so. However, I thought that 1,600 had gone back to Japan just prior to 1939 to perform their military duty and to fight on the side of Japan, against us.

All these young men were born in British Columbia; they were educated there, and had reached the stage in life where they were able to use their own discretion if they so desired. But, having been registered in Japan, and looking upon Japan as their country they went back to comply with the regulations for military service in that country. I hope when we get into committee the minister will answer this question: If we pass this measure in its present form what will be the status of those 1,600—or 16,000, as the case may be? What will be the status of that great number of Japanese who left voluntarily to fight on the side of Japan, the country to which they owe first allegiance, against this country of ours. Under the act they are designated natural-born Canadians. Are we to open the doors to them again? I was not at all surprised that the hon. member for Vancouver South and the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes) were greatly perturbed about what is to happen. One of the things worrying those of us from British Columbia particularly is the dispersal of these people.

However, before discussing that point further may I say this. First, however, I have asked two important questions of hon. members in the House of Commons. Those particular questions have been quoted in the Japanese paper, but, as yet, they remain unanswered. My question to hon. members of the House of Commons, and to the people of Canada, is this: Can a man owe allegiance to two countries at one and the same time; can he be a citizen of two countries?

I remember the special committee on elections and franchise which sat in 1934. While I was not a member of that committee, one which sat long before the war, I appeared before it. That was a time when this question was not as acute as it is to-day. True, there were only a few of us trying to point the way in those days. There were four Japanese who came before that committee, and I well remember asking two of them this question: In case

of war or trouble with Japan, to which country will you owe allegiance? Without hesitation both of them said Japan—and that was long before the war.

Through their newspaper I have asked Japanese, and I have asked many gatherings why is it that, so far, not one Japanese has renounced his citizenship or allegiance to Japan. Why is it that none of them has said, "I was born here; I am a Canadian; this is the country to which I owe allegiance." I have wondered at that great silence. Why? What is holding them back? If a committee is to be set up to investigate the Japanese who signed papers indicating a willingness to go back to Japan but are now asking that they be revoked, I urge the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) to ask them that very question. I have spoken on this matter many times and I am not going at this time to deal with it at any great length. However, I am a little worried about the position of this class of people under this bill.

There is another question which I forgot to mention: Can these people be really assimilated into the life of the Canadian people? My answer is, "no, they cannot." I look to the United States and I ask myself if the question of the blacks is any nearer settlement to-day than it was fifty or seventy-five years ago. I have travelled in the United States and spoken to men in authority and to others, and I have come to the conclusion that the question of the blacks in that country is more acute to-day than ever it was. Then I look at the Japs. I am not considering this problem only in the light of to-day; I am looking at it in the light of the time when I shall be gone. I wonder if it is right to encourage a group that is not assimilable, a group whose first allegiance is not to Canada but to Japan. And so I protest.

Strangely enough, there is a provision in the bill that one holding a dual citizenship may renounce his Canadian citizenship if he so desires and hold on to his original or foreign citizenship. But there is nothing in the act to compel anyone to make a decision in favour of retaining Canadian citizenship. I am maintaining, and I will maintain as long as this bill is before the house, that no one in Canada should be allowed to hold Canadian citizenship if he or she at the same time owes allegiance to and is a citizen of another country.

The minister stated in his remarks, and it is provided in the bill, that ceremonies will be held at the time citizenship is granted. Ceremonies are all right in their way, but I should like to have seen us do what they do in the United States. I think I am on firm ground when I refer to that country because there are something like thirty-six different races who make up the peoples of the United States. If we consider the races who have come to Canada I think we shall find that we also have thirty-six different races who make up the Canadian population. Before a person can become a United States citizen he must attend a school, which is free, and be able to answer certain questions, before being granted naturalization. These questions are not of a harsh nature; they are educational in character. I should like to read the section of the United States act dealing with this matter. It reads:

> 356. 3. Educational examination of petitioners for naturalization. The examination of each petitioner for naturalization shall include an educational examination. The purpose of the educational examination shall be to determine whether the petitioner has a fair knowledge of the fundamental principles of the constitution and is qualified to assume the duties and responsibilities of a citizen of the United States. To this end the petitioner may be questioned as to (1) the principal historical facts concerning the development of the United States as a republic; (2) the organization and principal functions of the government of the United States, and of the states and local units of government, and (3) the relation of the individual in the United States to government—national, state and local, the rights and privileges growing from that relationship, and the duties and responsibilities which result from it. Every care shall be exercised to avoid abstruse, technical, irrelevant and extreme questions. The language level of the questions shall be suited to the particular petitioner having regard to his educational background and the extent of his knowledge of the English language.

I believe that the effort which an alien must put forth before becoming a United States citizen makes him more conversant with that country and with the affairs of government. Someone, perhaps in a joking way, has said that many aliens know more about the United States after passing this educational test than many children who were born in the United States knew upon leaving school. Be that as it may, I believe that if something like that were done before we grant Canadian citizenship it would be far better than waiting until the citizenship is about to be granted and then making a ceremony of it by having someone put on robes and having a kind of show. Make the applicants do a little work and undertake a little study and that will make them even better citizens. At least it will make them more conversant with the affairs of the country.

As I say, we should take note of what the United States has done. Not only am I in favour of setting up schools for this purpose;

I would advocate that all the regulations and all powers granted under this act be passed upon by the people's representatives in this parliament. Many of the matters mentioned in the bill should not be left to the minister or to some of his officials.

I believe I have covered most of the salient points I had in mind. I think the immigration department should be linked up with this bill. As is well known the records of those entering either Canada or the United States are kept by the immigration department of that country.

I am rather doubtful about section 29 which confers property rights upon those who become naturalized citizens. It is my opinion that we are infringing upon provincial rights because property rights are entirely within the jurisdiction of the provinces. If by this bill we confer property rights on anyone who becomes a Canadian citizen, then I think we are doing something we should be most careful about.

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this debate conclude without once more appealing to the government, in support of what the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) has said, and asking them to make a statement with regard to their present position in connection with the disposition of the Japanese. We have had the policy explained to us, but unfortunately little or no progress appears to have been made as time has gone along.

For twenty-five years in this house members from British Columbia have been endeavouring to explain the situation with regard to the Japanese in that province and to warn the people of Canada that the day would come when the question would become a red-hot and dangerous one. It needed the treacherous action of the Japanese at Pearl Harbor and the ensuing war to bring the situation really home to the Canadian people. I am very much afraid that the opinion of the Canadian people is slipping back to the belief that this is a provincial question and not a dominion one.

At the time that the Japanese were sweeping through the Pacific and moving in a northerly and northeasterly direction in the islands below Alaska there was great anxiety in British Columbia. So great was the anxiety at that time that it spread throughout the rest of Canada, and it seemed to us that Canada at last was getting hold of this problem as one which would have to be recognized as a dominion problem.

In August, 1944, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) proclaimed the government's policy in the matter of the Japanese. In November last the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) summarized that policy and reiterated it and reported at that time as to the numbers and the position which the question then occupied. Unfortunately things have happened since then. With regard to parts of the government's policy representations were made which resulted in an appeal to the supreme court. The supreme court largely upheld the orders in council, which were a portion of the government's policy. But in one way they did not, and there apparently the matter stands. We do not know whether the government is proposing to carry the matter to the privy council or whether the government is facilitating the other party in carrying it to the privy council, or whether in the meantime, if that appeal be long delayed or perhaps never taken, the government's policy will still remain at a standstill. This bill is now before the house, and there is a very close connection between what this bill contains and the Japanese question. I therefore ask the government to make a statement clarifying their position at the present time before this bill passes out of our hands.

The first portion of the policy to which I have referred states that it must no longer be looked upon as a provincial question and that the Japanese must not again be allowed to concentrate in British Columbia. But we have had no information about how that is to be brought about. We have no knowledge as to whether the hint dropped by the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) last session that special legislation might be brought in will be acted upon or not. But it is quite clear at the present time that there is no power in the hands of the government to prevent the Japanese from again concentrating in British Columbia, although the government has had plenty of warning that if that should take place the difficulties and the dangers will be great.

The position of the government in that regard is modified also by the answer which the Prime Minister gave to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Gibson) last December. When this matter was being discussed the hon. member asked whether the Prime Minister would undertake to make this statement, that the Japanese would not be allowed to return to the coast. The Prime Minister said that he was unable to make such a statement. That caused doubt in the minds of us from British Columbia as to whether the government was really sincere in its statement that never again must these people be allowed to concentrate in British Columbia.

The government's policy also contains the setting up of a commission to measure the loyalty of the Japanese. It has been pointed out in this house more than once that you cannot expect thoughtful people who have considered this problem to believe that it is possible for a commission to measure the loyalty of these Japanese. Can anybody conceive of any way in which the loyalty of a Japanese could be measured so that the commission might be able to say: This man's loyalty is twelve inches long; he is all right. That man's loyalty is only nine inches long; he is all wrong. It is impossible to believe, the Japanese being what they are, and from our knowledge of their habits and behaviour, that their loyalty can be measured by a commission.

Whilst the Japanese were sweeping through the Pacific victoriously before Pearl Harbor and at the time of Pearl Harbor there were scores and scores of instances where they told their employers that soon they would be on top and we would be below. Maids told their mistresses; employees told their employers; high school and collegiate students boasted of the fact that the day would soon be here when they would be on top and we would be below. Those people were very largely Canadian-born, those who are held up to us as so saintly that we must not tamper with the position in which they find themselves. It is impossible for me to believe that a commission can measure with any certainty where the loyalty of the Japanese stands. Now that their emperor has been deposed, if they are asked questions it is not at all unlikely that they may declare loyalty to this country. They come of a race which for centuries has worshipped the emperor whom they described as their god and which believed in the domination of the Japanese race in the countries surrounding the Pacific. Is it to be expected that merely because the children of these parents were born in this country that they have given up all belief in the sanctity of their emperor? It is far more probable that had that invasion come, had those Japanese paratroopers landed in Canada, had Japanese operations along the southern shore of Alaska and down the Pacific coast been successful, the incoming Japanese troops would have benefited greatly by the existence of twenty-three or twenty-four thousand Japanese in this country.

Another plan which the government has in its policy is the distribution of the Japanese through the other provinces. It has not been successful. Not so very many of them have been so distributed. The government has not found the provinces cooperative in endeavouring to carry out that policy, and one province has already asked that the Japanese be removed in accordance with the clause in the contract entered into between the British Columbia security commission and that province. Sixty per cent of these Japanese are still in British Columbia. They are in camps; they are in the settlements in the mining towns in the south; and if we look at the numbers of those who have already been removed and compare them with the numbers of those who will have to be received by the various provinces, if the distribution is in accordance with the population of the provinces we find something like this. Let us say that there are twenty-three or twenty-four thousand Japanese in Canada. If all the ten thousand that the minister mentioned who have asked to be allowed to return to Japan or to be removed from Canada should go, that will reduce the figure we are examining to fourteen thousand. If we distribute that fourteen thousand to the other provinces this is the picture:

Prince Edward Island would have to be asked to receive 140. They have none now.

Nova Scotia would be expected to take 700. They have none now.

New Brunswick would be asked to take 560, and there are none there now.

Quebec would be asked to take just over 4,000, and by the last figures I had, at the last session, there are 394 now in Quebec. Is it considered likely that the province of Quebec will be ready to take 4,000 in order to carry out the government's policy of distribution?

Ontario will be asked to take 4,600. There are 2,500 there now.

Manitoba will be asked to take 840. There are just over 1,000 there now.

Saskatchewan will be asked to take 1,120, and there are only 146 there now.

Alberta will be asked to take 980. They have almost 3,500 there now, and the premier has asked that they be removed.

It should be remembered that, outside the protected area which was proclaimed for about 100 miles up the Pacific coast in British Columbia we had Japanese resident for a considerable number of years. Those Japanese are still there, and when the removal from the protected area threatened, the Japanese started moving in to that area that I represent and to the area represented by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton). So that in that section we have certainly enough for the quota for British Columbia: we cannot be expected to take any more, particularly bear-

ing in mind the statement of the Prime Minister that they must not be allowed to concentrate again in British Columbia.

Therefore I find myself in this position. The government's policy of distribution has certainly not succeeded. I see no likelihood that it will succeed in the future if it has not done so in the past. The policy which sets up a commission to measure their loyalty is not, to my mind, a satisfactory one. I am driven, therefore, to the only expedient which I think is left, namely, that we should boldly undertake the removal of the Japanese from Canada.

"Ah", it is said, "to do so would be flouting British justice." Mr. Speaker, of the many problems which confront us in private life and the decisions which have to be made in this house in international questions, how many of those problems can be decided by the application of one simple formula? We have to weigh the pros and cons. In matters which come up for decision here it is no easy thing for a government in Canada to balance all the arguments and decide which is the right course to take. Think of those boundary decisions which followed the great war. Think of the boundary of Sudetenland, and Poland, and the Polish corridor, to mention but a few. Why, justice could have been argued on both sides on each of those questions. You could not say that justice ruled the answer. The decision had to be weighed in the light of many circumstances, and the application of no simple formula settled one of these boundary cases.

Likewise in this matter there are other factors which have to be considered than merely the application of "British justice." One of the duties that each member of this house has to perform is to have a vision of what Canada will be like when our descendants are occupying our places. We are here to represent those who sent us to this House of Commons. We are here to consider these matters from the point of view of Canada at large. I am not sure but that the most important duty falling upon us is to endeavour to see the picture that may be painted in Canada when our grandchildren and their descendants are here, and I cannot bring myself to believe that we shall be wise if we fail to remove these people from Canada now when the opportunity of settlement at the peace table is before us.

I do not consider that it is proper to expect our descendants to work, in that great task of building Canada, in collaboration, in cooperation, with the equal help of people whom I consider unassimilable, people whose loyalty is unquestionably in doubt. They are unassimilable in the sense that, even though mixed marriages did take place, it would be unwise, for the resultant children that would be born would start that hateful trouble of the Eurasian question as we see it in many other lands. It is all very well to say that half-breed children ought to be accepted by society and placed on an equality with either of the two races; it is easy to say that. But the answer is that they are not, and all their lifetime they are pathetic people who are looked down upon by the rest of the population and are not received on an equality with them. It will be lamentable if we give countenance to the setting up in this country of a half-breed race composed of Canadians and Japanese.

I do not accept for a moment the doctrine that we have not the right to remove these people from here. We cannot trust them. They have shown that they are unreliable. We cannot answer for it that if they say they are loyal to Canada they really are. For a generation past their births have been registered with the Japanese consul general. How can a child whose birth was registered with the representative of another country have the same form of loyalty to our country and our king as we have? They are not on a par with us; and it would be a very grave mistake, in my opinion, if we allowed this matter to be settled by leaving some of them in this country, when the Prime Minister tells us that they shall not concentrate in our province and yet there is no means at present to prevent them from doing so.

Before this bill passes out of our hands, I trust that the government will see fit to make a statement clarifying the position in which it finds itself at present with respect to the policy it has enunciated, and explain particularly whether it is its intention to proceed to the privy council for a decision on the matters which were submitted to the supreme court.

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): In rising to speak in support of the principle of this bill, I might say it is my belief that one of the greatest and longest standing needs of the Canadian people is unity; not only that, but a sense of equality among our people. It was a realization of this need that caused the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation national convention to adopt as part of its programme the establishment of the legal status of Canadian citizenship for the people of Canada by way of birth and residence qualifications. It was in realization of that need and the resolution from our convention that caused me last July 23 to write to the

Clerk of the house and inform him that it was my intention to place the following resolution upon the order paper:

That, in the opinion of this house, it is in the best interests of Canada to establish a distinctive Canadian citizenship, which shall be available to all persons of certain residence or birth qualifications within the dominion.

Mr. MARTIN: Great minds think alike.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Yes; I hope they are thinking at the same time. My hon. friend had a long time to think about this and his party has been in power for many years.

When the house opened there was an undertaking in the speech from the throne that it was the intention of the government to bring in such a bill. When the bill was introduced, out of deference to it and under the rules of the house I withdrew my resolution. Unfortunately the bill died after it received first reading and the last session closed without anything further being done.

I again placed my resolution on the order paper prior to the opening of this session, and we welcome this bill. I hope it does not suffer the same fate, either in this house or in the other place, as did the last one.

Canadians must feel that they are all members of one family. We must have that feeling in order fully to develop our possibilities as a Canadian nation. On meeting Canadians from all parts of Canada one is struck forcibly by two or three things. The first is the lack of a real understanding and appreciation of the problems, of the contributions, of the difficulties and even of the way of life of our fellow Canadians within our own country. There is a provincialism which is stifling Canadians and which prevents and overshadows a national outlook. As a nation Canada lacks the spirit of greatness and the passion for knowledge which is one of the attributes of a progressive nation.

One fact which proves this, and which causes Canadians to think deeply is that so many of the cream of Canada's educated youth, the graduates from our universities, the brains and ability of our young people, the greatest asset we have, have migrated in their thousands, yes, in their hundreds of thousands to the great nation to the south of us. The fact is that we have lost a nation in the making to the United States where the statue of liberty is a symbol of the great unity of that country, of its freedom. Had those Canadians who left our shores been imbued with a true realization of their duty as Canadians they would have remained in this country and helped to remedy its defects which prevented them from having within this land those opportunities which they found elsewhere. The truth is that Canadians do not know Canada.

I do not wish anyone to think I am not aware of, or wish to belittle, the achievements and contributions that Canada has made. What I am trying to emphasize is the fact that we are only about five per cent of what we could be, five per cent of what we should be. It is my opinion that we shall not achieve that greatness until we have a consciousness of our unity. We are prone to emphasize our differences and to overlook our common heritage. We lack a realization of our own greatness, our own strength and our own possibilities for the future. There cannot be a future unless we are a united people.

In the part of Canada which I have the honour to represent and where I was born, are people who came to Canada with hope, pride and faith that this was the greatest country in the world in which to live. These people carved out their homes from the park areas and the prairies, like their brothers from the wooded lands of Canada from coast to coast. They built their schools, their churches and their little communities. Their children worked and played with their fellow Canadian children in their youth and mixed their blood with the blood of their fellow Canadians in the wars of this land. They thought they were becoming Canadians. When they took out their naturalization papers it was a surprising thing to them to find that they were not called Canadians.

Naturally they feel that there is discrimination between them and those who were here before them; particularly when officials appointed by the federal government to take the census come and ask them this question: "What nationality are you?" Proudly they reply: "I am a Canadian." They are told, "No; you cannot put down on the census paper that you are a Canadian. What is your racial origin?" Many of these people came to this country as adults. They spent the latter part of their years in this country, sometimes twenty and thirty years. They have been busy making a living; in pioneer Canada it is not an easy job. Many of these people did not learn the English or the French language. On reaching the age of seventy many of them find themselves unable to make a living. They have applied for the rights of Canadians to the pittance of an old age pension such as we give in Canada, only to find that they are not qualified. These are people who have done everything to make Canada a nation. They have given their all to Canada, contributed their sons and their life work;

yet they are denied even that right. The fact that this bill ends that injustice commends it to the support of every hon. member.

I believe this bill should have been embodied in the terms of confederation almost eighty years ago. Certainly it should have been in the Statute of Westminster which was intended to give Canada the status of nationhood. What reasons the governments of the past had for not establishing citizenship I do not know. Such a citizenship is the very foundation of nationhood. Without it no nation can be progressive. We pay lip-service to something which does not exist. Without it Canada will never achieve real progress. If Canada is to rise in the scale of nations, we must brothers be. The consciousness of unity is the first essential in the building of a nation. That unity cannot be built merely by a bill. There must be something deeper than that. In the hearts and minds of all Canadian citizens there must be a realization, an acceptance of the principle of equality of people irrespective of their colour, race or creed. Without it, jealousies divide us and progress is impossible. Irrespective of colour, race or creed, human beings within the Dominion of Canada must be conscious of an equality with each and every other Canadian.

It is interesting to note that one provincial government recognizes that equality. I have a news item here from the Toronto *Globe and Mail,* which, at any rate, can scarcely be accused of C.C.F. sympathies. To its credit it says this:

> Appointment by the Saskatchewan government of a Canadian-born Japanese as legal adviser to its economic planning commission again focuses attention on the dominion government's plan for wholesale deportation of Japanese from this country. This particular individual has been given a position of great responsibility. The colour of his skin may be different from that of most Canadians, but the fact remains that he is a Canadian and is entitled to opportunities of citizenship in keeping with his abilities, so long as there is no abuse of this right . . .
>
> There are persons of Japanese origin who can be expected to make a definite contribution to the country. They should be allowed to stay here and make the best of the opportunity of citizenship. There are others who are not to be trusted. There is no place for them in Canada and the government has at its disposal all the machinery required to send them elsewhere. But it will be a sad day indeed when a Canadian government expels people from the country on the sole grounds that it has the legal power to do so.

To illustrate further what I mean about equality among people, I am sure the person concerned will not mind if I tell of a little incident which happened in this fair city of Ottawa. Recently a lady entered a street-car on her way home. It was a windy day, and the lady was wearing on her head what I believe is termed a babushka. She took her seat in the street-car and overheard another lady remark to her companion, "There is another foreigner." The lady with the babushka was none other than the only lady member of this house. This illustrates the sort of thing Canada must overcome. Within this nation everyone must be conscious of the fact that all people are equal. The people of Canada must subscribe to that principle. The basis upon which unity must be built and which must become a part of Canadian citizenship is a recognition of the fact that citizenship must carry with it these basic freedoms: freedom of speech; freedom of peaceful assembly; freedom to worship as one chooses; freedom of the press; the right to a speedy public trial; the right to hold property. Canadian citizens must also appreciate their obligations and duties. They must inform themselves thoroughly of those duties which are related to citizenship. The Canadian must learn his responsibility in connection with voting; he must learn that this is a part of the democratic process. There must be instilled in each and every citizen of this country a passion for education and enlightenment.

I am going to suggest to the government that it prepare a simple, easily read pamphlet outlining the rights of every citizen before the law and some simple, basic principles of legal rights within this country so that a citizen may know what his rights are irrespective of the price of the lawyer whom he may or may not be able to hire.

In closing, I wish to say that only upon this unity can Canada hope to reach its full status. Self-governing and free, we can then work out our destiny. It must be a destiny of peace, happiness and enlightened freedom. We shall then be able to make our contribution to brotherhood among men, to a heritage of freedom which is a right common not only to people in Canada but to people everywhere in the world. We realize and appreciate that to-day we are part of one world. We cannot hope to make our contribution to the welfare of that world until we have achieved brotherhood within our own nation. This bill can form the basis of a new conception of Canada; it can place Canada among the nations moving toward a common brotherhood of mankind throughout the whole world.

Mr. W. A. McMASTER (High Park): Mr. Speaker, it is largely because of what was said this afternoon by the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart) that I felt

I must say a few words and apologize for being one of British descent. I felt I also should apologize to the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) for being of Scottish descent. I do not know why the hon. member took a Scotsman and placed him beside an American before the court of naturalization. I could understand why he would choose a Scotsman, but I do not know why he should mention an American as well. I can only say that if the hon. member believed the Scotsman could be made to think any less of himself by having to appear before a court, he is very much mistaken. A Scotsman in his own quiet way will still think he is one of the best people in the world.

I did not take in very good part the lecture given us to-day by the hon. member for Spadina, who spoke of something being very wrong here in Canada. That did not seem to be entirely in accord with the eloquent way in which he told of many people having come here from his own and other countries, and having found this a land of opportunity. Surely he must recall that at the time they came here there was no citizenship act in force. But I cannot believe the fact that no such act was in force made Canada any worse to live in, or the fact that this act will come into force will make it any better. My ancestors came from Scotland when Canada was quite different from what it is to-day. My grandfather remembered when the battle of Waterloo was fought. He came to Canada, to Glengarry. I venture to say that Glengarry was not a very easy place to live in then; opportunity was a long way off. When he worked on the Rideau canal, which passes near these parliament buildings, I venture to assert that he earned his money the hard way, because in those days they had no mechanical tools with which to work. Then he left the eastern part of Ontario to go to the south-western part of this province, and settled in a virgin forest. For many years he lived in a part of the country where he had to carry on his back for seventeen miles the flour used by his family. They were really the people who made this country the land of opportunity to which people now come, and where those now entering enjoy the benefits provided by our forefathers. Then they proceed to lecture us as to what we should do about the laws of this country.

Neither did I take very kindly the statement made by the hon. member for Spadina that our boys overseas died without any citizenship and without any flag to salute. It is a wonder he did not go on and say they had no Canada day to observe. I feel sure the 10,000 airmen and the 17,000 infantrymen and others who died overseas believed they had a flag to salute, and believed they were citizens of a great country. I can say to you now, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the flag they believe they did salute, and would want to salute, was the union jack, or probably the red ensign.

I can remember reading that the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) said that when he as an engineer came to parliament he forgot about his engineering. Perhaps as a lawyer it is very easy for me to forget all about law. However, I believe that in an approach to any bill there are certain rules of interpretation which must be observed, and that those rules should be applied to the present bill.

What defect was it intended to cure? There must have been some reason for introducing the bill. In the debate there have been many eloquent speeches, perhaps the most eloquent of which was given by the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) who introduced the bill.

After all, no good and sufficient reason has been given. It is true they have mentioned that there was no particular act defining citizenship. But the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Hazen) has pointed out that there are three acts of parliament in which citizenship and nationality are mentioned. They are the Immigration Act, the Naturalization Act and the Canadian Nationals Act. This latter act was mentioned only incidentally by some hon. members, and by the Secretary of State.

I wondered what was said about Canadian citizenship when this act was brought into force in 1921, a generation ago. With that in mind, I took the time to look into the debates of that session, to find what was said. I find that the bill was introduced by the Right Hon. Charles Doherty, who at that time was Minister of Justice in a Conservative administration. The hint was offered by some hon. members, and possibly by the Secretary of State himself, that the real reason for introducing that bill was that it was required so that a Canadian should be a national, as distinct from a British national, in order to obtain greater responsibility before the league of nations.

In introducing the bill, the then Minister of Justice stated this, at page 645 of *Hansard* of that year.

> But the purpose of the bill is to define a particular class of British subjects who, in addition to having all the rights and all the obligations of British subjects, have particular rights because of the fact that they are Canadians. I think we have always understood that without a specific statutory definition there has for a long time been such a person as a Canadian, and some outstanding indications which justify a man in claiming to be a Canadian.

In other words, at that time the then Minister of Justice did not believe that it was necessary that they be made citizens by statute but believed that in fact they were Canadians. Then he went on to explain the use of the word "national" instead of the word "citizen", the reason being that in the French version of the league of nations documents the word "ressortissant" more nearly approximated in English the meaning of the word "national" than any other word.

In the course of the debate, in which there was a considerable amount of discussion, and during which Mr. Doherty seemed to answer some questions forty or fifty times, he was asked by Mr. Fielding:

Is there such a thing now as a Canadian national? Is it right to say, "the following persons are Canadian nationals," or do we not by this bill make them so? It is a very fine distinction; I merely call the hon. gentleman's attention to it.

Mr. Doherty: I think that both things are true. There does exist to-day such a thing as a Canadian national; if there does not, then all those who are proud of the fact that they are Canadians have been attaching to themselves a designation that means nothing. It is equally true that this act speaking the day it is passed, declares the fact to exist that certain persons are Canadian nationals. The moment this bill is passed—whether by virtue of this law or by virtue of any anterior thing is immaterial—these people are Canadians.

So that again Mr. Doherty states that he believes that they were Canadians, and that there was such a thing as Canadian citizenship prior to that act.

Later on, Mr. Marcil referred to the fact that when he went to France on one occasion he wanted to register as a Canadian, but it was suggested to him that he should register as a British subject. When that point was raised in the debate Mr. Doherty said:

I certainly think he would be entitled to . . .

That is, he would be entitled to register as a Canadian subject.

. . . indeed, I thought he was, in the past. On any occasion when I have been travelling and have been asked what my nationality was, I have said, "Canadian"—and it went right down. At the league of nations we from Canada were never known as anything else—and we were not anything else—than the Canadian representatives, and we sat at the table in the position officially designated "Canadian delegation."

Then, again, later on, Mr. D. D. McKenzie, who at that time was an outstanding Liberal, took part in the debate. As I recall, he was a doughty fighter. He, as a Liberal, criticized the bill introduced by the Conservative administration in these words:

I do not think the good loyal people of Ontario will like the idea that we have forsaken Canadian citizenship with all that term meant, and that we are now nationalists if we take our definition as a nationalist from what Mr. Bourassa and those behind him were preaching . . .

Then he proceeded to discuss a matter of domestic strife in the party which I shall not bother reading. There again he thought there was a Canadian citizenship, before that time

A great deal has been said about the taking of the census. I went to some trouble to find out why a census is taken and, so far as I can discover, it is because the British North America Act says there must be a census every ten years. Those ten-year periods were in 1871 1881 and so on. I find nothing in the British North America Act which says that any particular questions shall be asked. They wanted to find out only how many people there were in the country; at least that was the chief reason.

Yet, in 1941 I find that on the form which was handed the census takers there are two columns, one immediately following the other, the first of which calls for nationality or citizenship, and the country to which the person owes allegiance. I have not a copy of the instructions given the census takers, although I tried to get them. I was late in asking for them. However, if the government in office at that time—a Liberal government—said to those census takers that a natural-born Canadian was to be classified as anything other than a Canadian, it gave those census takers wrong advice.

The next column deals with racial origin. This would refer to Scotsmen, Irishmen, Englishmen, or Frenchmen, as the case may be. I believe the instruction there was that it should be traced through the father, rather than in any other way, a procedure which, of course, is not always fair.

I have mentioned one reason for introducing any legislation, namely, that there must be a defect. Since the introduction of this bill I have believed firmly that it is not necessary in order to establish Canadian citizenship. What is the reason for it? One of the other rules in interpreting a statute which the minister will know better than I do—

Mr. MARTIN: No, not at all.

Mr. McMASTER: —is to ask: "What is the true object and intent of this amendment?" In this case, what is the object and intent of the bill? Perhaps in this instance I can help the minister. I do not believe there is any other reason in the world for introducing the bill than that of having a codification, and to compel those who come from the British isles

to appear to declare themselves nationals in the same way as do the peoples from any other country.

It is no disgrace to anyone coming from a country not speaking the English or the French languages to be asked to appear before a court, because they must give proof that they understand one of those languages. It is a fair thing to ask that that be done. One of the previous speakers referred to elderly people who would be naturalized although they do not speak the language. I know of a fine lady in Toronto who had not learned the language and who was naturalized. It was only right that she should be, because she is a good citizen. But, generally speaking, it is not unfair to ask anyone to learn either English or French before he becomes a citizen. This does not mean that he will necessarily be a good citizen. As I have said time and again, and as has been said in other countries, when naturalization is at stake the smart immigrant will learn the language quickly, whereas the good immigrant may perhaps find it difficult to do so. But this reason does not apply to British subjects.

I should like to deal for a moment with the question of intolerance. I do not think I ever heard any of the members of a certain political party praise anyone except those whom they call members of minority groups. I am bound to say that I have heard people of British stock say the same thing. I do not believe there is any justification for such statements. They have a strange idea of intolerance. Lately we heard of a case in Toronto where the owner of a rink refused admission to a certain boy. His friends rallied around; the case was brought to court, and the owner of the rink was compelled to allow that boy to go in. It has been said that this is a case of intolerance when, in, fact, it is just an example of tolerance. They will not stand for that sort of thing in Toronto. I cannot understand why anyone should think that we in Canada are intolerant. Reference has been made to this twenty per cent of our population, but we are not intolerant toward them in Toronto and we do not hear of this intolerance towards them. It is strange to hear this sort of thing from other parts of the country.

Then we have heard of the wearing of a babushka. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mrs. Strum) was referred to by bystanders as a foreigner because she wore a babushka. No doubt it was rather unusual, but the mere wearing of it would not make her a foreigner.

I am opposed to this bill on principle. I believe it is proposed for one purpose only, a purpose with which I certainly am not in agreement.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, there are only fifteen minutes left before I adjourn the debate. I know the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt) is ready to give way to me because I am probably more conversant with what I am going to speak about than he is. I am not going to take up much time, but being a good Canadian I am interested in this bill. Being a good Liberal I am glad to know that the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) agrees with me. In this instance I think the hon. member is right. If he listened to me more often he would be right more often.

Mr. GREEN: I would be in trouble.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The particular section in this citizenship bill with which I am concerned is section 10. I am not a lawyer, and I have listened to lawyers in the house talk about Canada day and every other kind of day. As I understand this section, a man who resides in Canada for twenty years automatically becomes a Canadian citizen—

Mr. MARTIN: Oh, no.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: —whether or not he can speak the language. Not being a lawyer, I do not know about that, but I am opposed to it. As I see it, this will discredit our minister, for whom I have the greatest regard and for whom I believe every veteran in Canada has the greatest regard. As my minister has said, "Not a Jap from the Rockies to the sea." I stand by that and I presume he stands by that. However, I am in position to go still farther.

The province of British Columbia is the gateway to the great Pacific, the greatest market that this country ever had. There are 400,000,000 people in China alone who offer a great potential market for Canadian products. I wish to ask the members of this house what they would think of the province that was the gateway to that great market if it had no minister in the cabinet. I am here to tell the house that no member of the Liberal party from British Columbia will ever sit as a member of the government if he permits the Japs to come back to the coast. That is covering a lot of territory, but the minister gave me that opening. I am talking for the rest of the members. If any other private member cared to go into the government and permitted the Japs to come back he would never be elected as a Liberal from British

Columbia. I think the hon. member for Vancouver South will agree with me when I say that no Conservative member would be elected from our province who allowed that. I am making no comment about the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis).

A citizen of this country must have all the rights of law and all the privileges of a Canadian citizen. I am glad the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is making careful notes of what I say because, added to what he has learned in Moscow, it will be an addition to his knowledge.

Mr. COLDWELL: He will read it in *Hansard* in the morning.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I always have the greatest respect for and admiration and appreciation of what the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) says. I have never had the privilege of visiting Moscow. I remember when the premier of the great province of Saskatchewan told off this house and said that a man such as the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard had no knowledge of what they were doing at Dieppe because he had been there on a twenty-four hour visit on one occasion.

We are told by this C.C.F. that these Japs should have all the rights which they will have under this bill. I am not a lawyer, but according to the press this is what the hon. member for Vancouver East said, and I quote from the Regina *Leader-Post* of April 19, 1945. He may have been misquoted because my hon. friend, the leader of the C.C.F., is always being misquoted. The article is headed, "Would disperse Canadian Japs". It reads:

> Angus MacInnis, C.C.F. member of parliament for Vancouver East, said in an interview Wednesday night that Prime Minister Mackenzie King should follow up his proposal of August 4 last, that orientals be dispersed across Canada.

I am not going to read the whole article.

Mr. MacINNIS: What did you come across that you did not like to read?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I will read it all; do not worry.

Mr. MacINNIS: I want it all read.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: It goes on:

> "All restrictions against loyal Japanese should be removed," he said—

I want the hon. member for Vancouver East to bear this in mind.

> —"except that they should not be allowed to return to British Columbia after the war."
>
> Loyal Japanese should be permitted to settle anywhere in Canada without disadvantages or prejudices, he added. After the war, British Columbia should be prepared to take her share.
>
> "The Japanese problem before the war," he said, "was essentially a British Columbia problem, but now it is a dominion problem and should be handled as one."

Mr. MacINNIS: What is wrong with that?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The point I wish to make is this. If the hon. member for Vancouver East is sincere in his idea, and I give him credit for that, particularly as regards the C.C.F., I ask him, how can you give all the rights of citizenship to a man when you tell him what province or what municipality he shall live in? You cannot tell him where he shall live if he has all the rights of Canadian citizenship. But that is what the hon. member for Vancouver East advocated.

Mr. MacINNIS: No, it is not.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You will have your chance to-morrow.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am going to take it too.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I hope you do because I will finish up after you are through.

Mr. MacINNIS: No; you are shooting your bolt to-night.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The people I represent in British Columbia support me in my stand. The hon. member for Vancouver East, I presume, represents the C.C.F. party which says that the Japanese must have every right as Canadian citizens, and there is a section of this bill which says that after twenty years' residence in Canada you may be given all those rights whether you can speak the language or not. But you cannot possibly give a man all the rights of Canadian citizenship and then tell him which province of which municipality he shall live in. To carry that to its ultimate conclusion, can you imagine anybody, Mr. Speaker, wanting to reside in Vancouver East when he could reside in the Fraser Valley? I want the hon. member for Vancouver East when he rises to speak on this question to tell me and the fishermen and the berry growers of British Columbia how the Japanese can have all the rights of Canadian citizenship if you are going to tell them which province and which riding and which municipality they shall reside in.

On motion of Mr. Merritt the debate was adjourned.

SUPPLY

LABOUR CONDITIONS

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask what the motion is?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I announced last evening that we would ask for permission to go into supply, to take an item in the Department of Reconstruction and one in the Department of Labour, and I am now asking for permission to call these items in committee of supply.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I wish to raise. I should like to preface my remarks by saying that I think this practice of moving the house into committee of supply at three or four minutes to eleven o'clock, which does not give the members of the house an opportunity to raise any matter which they wish to raise, should be discontinued. But we have been doing this now for a considerable time. So far as we are concerned we are determined to take advantage of the motion, and we expect that the house in the future will be moved into committee of supply at a more convenient time. One of the departments mentioned by the minister was labour, but there is no guarantee that the estimates of the Department of Labour, if moved into supply to-night, will come before the house for consideration before Easter, and there are some matters dealing with labour problems in this country which should be considered by the house before we adjourn for the Easter recess. I propose, therefore, to raise some of them now.

Within the last week or so two delegations have met the cabinet and discussed with them the problems of labour, the Canadian Congress of Labour and the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. Both of these organizations have pointed out to the government that conditions in the realm of labour in this country are far from satisfactory, and indeed far from the conditions that were expected when this government was elected to power in June of last year.

May I point out to the members of the house, and to the government in particular, that the principal slogan which was used by the party in power during the general election of last June was: Jobs for all. To-day we find that there are—I was going to say, several hundred thousand; I would be within the mark in saying that, but I will put it in this way—a very large number of men and women who have contributed to the winning of the war in the field of industry and labour who are at the moment unemployed; and not only those who have contributed to the winning of the war in industry and other forms of labour, but thousands of veterans also who have returned from overseas who are at the present moment unemployed and living on their gratuities.

The briefs which were placed before the cabinet by the two labour organizations I have mentioned were comprehensive, and I was surprised at the reception they received when they were placed before the cabinet. I noted the reports in the daily newspapers of the reception which the brief of the Canadian Congress of Labour received from the Prime Minister and the cabinet. I have the brief before me, and I am at a complete loss to understand why it aroused the kind of criticism that was made on the occasion of its presentation; for, after all, is it not a fact, for example, that we have no real plans as a nation for the orderly transition from war to peace, apart from the disposal of industries which were established by the government and which should have been retained for the making of needed civilian goods and the giving of employment to large numbers of people in Canada at this time?

The hour is too late, Mr. Speaker, for me this evening to say what I intended to say and intend to say on this matter. There are several other important considerations which I wish to place before the house in connection with what is going on in the country in the realm of labour and the attempts that are being made by certain persons in Canada to carry on propaganda against labour receiving its rights in this country at the present time. But I see it is eleven o'clock, and I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, April 10, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

First report of special committee on revision of standing orders.—Mr. Speaker.

Third report of special committee on war expenditures and economies.—Mr. Isnor.

CANADIAN ARMY

STATEMENT RESPECTING ALLEGED DESERTER—REPEAL OF ORDER IN COUNCIL

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the other day the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) raised a question concerning a deserter from the United States army, one McCloy, who was arrested in Winnipeg for

return to the United States. At that time the hon. member asked if steps would be taken to see that such return was not made.

May I inform the house that the order in council under which these arrangements were entered into with the United States was repealed yesterday. Perhaps by way of explanation I might say that this order represented a consolidation of arrangements which had been in effect for some time following discussions between representatives of the United States and Canada, going back as far as 1940. We asked first that there might be an arrangement whereby our deserters would be returned to this country, and the United States later made a similar request to us. The fact is that such arrangements were carried out, although it was perhaps a bit uncertain as to just what the legal authority for them might be. All this culminated in the passing of the order in council, one which is now largely unnecessary. It was never intended that the order in council should cover such a case as the McCloy case, and the case in question has served to emphasize that fact. Therefore the order in council was repealed yesterday.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

MOUNTED POLICE—PENSIONS—BENEFITS TO WIDOWS

Mr. PROBE:

1. What is the schedule of benefits to widows of commissioned officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and what is the basis on which contributions are made to the benefit fund?

2. What differences exist in respect to non-commissioned officers and constables on the one hand and commissioned officers on the other in (a) the basis of contribution in the widows' benefit fund; (b) the amount of benefits payable?

3. What is the amount of retirement pension for members of the R.C.M.P. for each rank of the services?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

There is no schedule of benefits but under sections 52 and 54 of the R.C.M. Police Act the widow is eligible for a pension equal to one-half the pension to which her late husband would have been entitled, or was in receipt of immediately before his death. Commissioned officers of the force are required under Section 49 of the act to contribute five per centum per annum of their pay.

2 (a). Non-commissioned officers and constables receive for themselves a free pension, but any of these members of the force who joined after October, 1934 must contribute five per cent per annum of their pay to the widows pension fund established by part IV of the R.C.M. Police Act. Other such members already in the force at that time had the right to elect whether they would contribute or not. In the case of officers they are required to contribute five per centum per annum of their pay under part II of the act, as already related in answer No. 1, above.

(b) The amount of benefits for officers' widows is already indicated in answer No. 1. The amount of benefits for non-commissioned officers and constables depends upon how much each has contributed and for how long, and how much of an annuity such total amount is capable of purchasing. The actuaries of the department of insurance are requested to supply these details in each individual case.

3. Part II of the R.C.M. Police Act governs in the case of commissioned officers and part III in the case of non-commissioned officers and constables, according to length of service. An officer receives for each year of service an annual pension of one fiftieth of his total pay and allowances at the time of retirement, but not exceeding 70 per cent thereof, and a non-commisioned officer receives an annual pension not exceeding two-thirds of his total pay and allowances for the last year of his service. The amount in each case is governed by rank and length of service. It is calculated as follows:

(a) If he has completed ten but less than twenty-one years' service, one-fiftieth of his annual pay and allowances during the last year of his service for every year of service;

(b) If he has completed twenty-one but less than twenty-five years' service, an annual sum equal to twenty-fiftieths of his annual pay and allowances during the last year of his service, with an addition of two-fiftieths of such pay and allowances for every completed year of service above twenty years;

(c) If he has completed twenty-five years' service, an annual sum equal to thirty-fiftieths of his annual pay and allowances during the last year of his service with an addition of one-fiftieth of such pay and allowances for every completed year of service above twenty-five years; provided, that the pension shall not exceed two-thirds of such annual pay and allowances.

ROYAL CANADIAN NAVY—OFFICERS

Mr. COCKERAM:

1. How many officers, holding the following ranks, are now on the strength of the Royal Canadian Navy, at home and abroad (a) admiral; (b) vice-admiral; (c) rear-admiral; (d) commodore; (e) captain.

2. How many of those officers have received promotion since V-J day?

3. Who are they and what ranks do they now hold and what appointment do they now hold?

4. How many of these officers, in addition, have received promotion since December 1, 1945?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. (a) Admiral, none; (b) Vice-Admiral, 1; (c) Rear-Admiral, 3; (d) Commodore, 5; (e) Captain, 35.

2. Ten.

3. Vice-Admiral H. E. Reid, C.B., R.C.N. "Bytown" additional as chief of naval staff and first naval member of the naval board.

Rear-Admiral H. T. W. Grant, C.B.E., D.S.O., R.C.N. "Bytown" additional as deputy chief of naval staff, chief of naval administration and supply, and third naval member of the naval board.

Rear-Admiral C. R. H. Taylor, C.B.E., R.C.N. "Scotian" additional as commanding officer, Atlantic coast, and as superintendent, H.M.C. dockyard, Halifax, and east coast repairs.

Commodore P. W. Earl, C.B.E., R.C.N. (Reserve). Former chief of naval personnel; now on special duty prior to retirement.

A/Commodore R. I. Agnew, O.B.E., R.C.N. "Bytown" additional for duty as N.M.C.S., Washington.

A/Commodore G. R. Miles, O.B.E., R.C.N. "Bytown" additional as chief of naval personnel and second naval member of the naval board.

A/Commodore (E) J. G. Knowlton, O.B.E., R.C.N. "Bytown" additional for duty as assistant chief of naval administration and supply.

A/Captain H. F. Pullen, O.B.E., R.C.N. "Bytown" additional as director of naval reserves.

A/Captain J. R. Mitchell, R.C.N. (Reserve). "Bytown" additional for duty with C.N.P. as director of officer personnel.

A/Captain (S) H. E. Hubbard, O.B.E., R.C.N. "Bytown" additional for duty as director of victualling.

4. One of these officers, Rear-Admiral H. T. W. Grant, was previously promoted to the rank of commodore, R.C.N. to date 1st January, 1946.

Note: These figures do not include officers who are now on retirement leave.

HOUSING—DUNSDON PROPERTY NORTH OF BRANTFORD

Mr. CHARLTON:

1. How many houses are (a) completed; (b) under construction, on what was previously the Dunsdon property north of Brantford, under the Veterans Land Act?

2. How many different types of houses are there?

3. What is the complete cost per unit of each type to the government?

4 Have any of these houses been rented, sold or leased to the veterans and at what cost for each type?

5. If not, when will they be available and at what cost for each type?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. (a) Nil; (b) twenty.

2. Two. Bungalows and 1½ storey. Eight different designs

3. Estimated total cost including land, services, roads, and houses:

Bungalows

Humphreys No. 3	$6,009 22
Humphreys No. 4	5,709 22
Rule Wynn Rule No. 1	5,709 22

One and one-half Storey

Humphreys No. 1	6,509 22
Humphreys No. 2	6,209 22
Rule Wynn Rule No. 2	6,709 22
Van Norman No. 3	6,809 22
Moody and Moore No. 3	6,809 22

4. No.

5. About May 15. Cost to veteran not yet finally determined.

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER FAMILY*

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf):

What is the average number of children per family (a) in Canada; (b) by province?

Mr. CLAXTON:

(a) 2·35.

(b)

Prince Edward Island	2·54
Nova Scotia	2·39
New Brunswick	2·66
Quebec	2·82
Ontario	2·05
Manitoba	2·12
Saskatchewan	2·34
Alberta	2·22
British Columbia	1·92
Northwest Territories and Yukon	2·30

Note.—These figures are taken from the records of family allowance payments in March 1946 and show the averages for the children under 16 in respect of whom family allowances are paid.

INVESTIGATION OF JAPANESE FISHERIES AND JAPANESE CANNING PLANTS

Mr. REID:

1. Have any delegates been chosen to represent Canada in connection with the investigation of Japanese fisheries and Japanese fish canning plants by the United States?

2. If so, what delegates have been chosen?

3. If not, what are the reasons for Canadian delegates not having been chosen?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Discussions are proceeding with the United States authorities with regard to Canadian participation in the investigation of Japanese fisheries. Pending the outcome of these discussions, no definite appointments have been made.

*CANADIAN NAVY—LIEUTENANT FRANK B. LEE

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Was Second Lieutenant (retired) Frank B. Lee, B.Sc., informed by the interviewing officer, Captain Grant, that his proposed application for appointment to the technical branch of the Royal Canadian Navy could not be successful?

2. If so, under what authority?

Mr. ABBOTT: I can answer this orally. The answer to the first question is no, and the second question is answered by the answer to the first.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think that answer is incorrect.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

AIR TRAINING PLAN

Mr. POULIOT:

With reference to the British commonwealth air training plan: 1. (a) When; (b) where; (c) by whom was it signed in the first place on behalf of the original partners to the plan, and (d) what was the ministerial capacity, if any, of each of the signatories?

2. Was a copy of the original plan ever tabled in either houses of the parliament of Canada at the next sitting following the approval of the plan by the governments of Canada and the United Kingdom?

3. If so, when and where?

4. If not, was it tabled at a later sitting of either house before November 23, 1944?

5. If so (a) when; (b) where, and (c) why was it not tabled at an earlier sitting?

6. If not, why was it not tabled?

7. Did the then Minister of National Defence for Air forward a copy of the said original plan to all members of parliament for their personal information?

8. If so, when?

9. If not, why?

10. Was it agreed in the first place between the governments of Canada and the United Kingdom that the original plan should have been in operation at an earlier date than that of its actual inception?

11. If so, when was it?

12. If not, what was the reason for that delay?

13. Did the government of the United Kingdom fail to fulfil any of its original obligations, and, in particular, that of delivering airplane propellers to the government of Canada for the execution of the said plan?

[Mr. Reid.]

14. If so (a) when did it occur, and (b) how long did it delay the actual inception of the training?

15. Did the Minister of National Defence for Air take parliament into his confidence to inform the members of parliament about it?

16. If so, when, and if not, why?

17. Did the government of Canada fulfil any of the obligations assumed in the first place by the government of the United Kingdom, and, if so, how much did Canada pay on that account?

18. Before November 23, 1944, did the government of the United Kingdom refund to the government of Canada any amount for the latter having fulfilled any obligation assumed by the former?

19. If so, when and how much?

20. If not, why?

VETERANS AFFAIRS—TRADE SCHOOLS

Mr. FRASER:

1. What trade schools have been established in Canada, or are being used by the Department of Labour or Veterans Affairs for the training and education of ex-servicemen and women?

2. What subjects are being taught in each of these schools?

3. How many are enrolled in each of these schools?

Mr. MITCHELL: Return tabled.

LETHBRIDGE INTERNMENT CAMP—WILSON KEW

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Is Wilson Kew of Stavely, Alberta, employed in Lethbridge Internment Camp, Alberta, as a part-time auxiliary services supervisor?

2. What is his salary and expenses per month?

3. What are his duties at the camp?

4. What days or hours per week is he employed?

5. Has the department paid for repairs to his private automobile during the past three years? If so, what amounts?

6. How many gallons of gas have been supplied by the department for the above car during the past three years?

CANADIAN ARMY—OFFICERS

Mr. COCKERAM:

1. How many officers, holding the following ranks, are now on the strength of the Canadian army, at home and abroad (a) general; (b) lieutenant-general; (c) major-general; (d) brigadier; (e) colonel?

2. How many of these officers have received promotion since V-J day?

3. Who are they and what ranks do they now hold and what appointment do they now hold?

4. How many of these officers, in addition, have received promotion since December 1, 1945?

RADIO BROADCASTING—SACKVILLE STATION

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's):

1. Is the short wave radio broadcasting station at Sackville complete?

2. If so, what is the total cost?

3. If not, how much has been expended and what will the total commitment be?

4. To what areas and principal countries are signals being sent?

5. How many and what hours are so used?
6. In what languages are the signals sent?
7. What is the nature of these broadcasts?
8. What departments of the government are utilizing the facilities of the station?
9. What is the cost of operation to the 1st of October last?
10. How many employees are there operating the service?
11. What is the nature of their occupations and salaries or wages of each one?

Mr. McCANN: Return tabled.

CANADIAN VOCATIONAL TRAINING ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKMAN:

1. How many men are now being trained for the construction industry by the Canadian Vocational Training organization?
2. Where are the various training schools located, and what is the capacity of each school?
3. What are the conditions of entrance?
4. What is the number being trained for each trade classification?
5. How long is the period of training for each classification?
6. What remuneration do the trainees receive during the period of instruction?
7. How many trainees are expected to have completed each of the various courses by (a) September 30, 1946; (b) March 31, 1947?
8. Is provision made for the upgrading of veterans who have had previous experience in the construction industry?
9. If so, give details and number of veterans taking such upgrading training?

Mr. MITCHELL: Tabled herewith.

MALTING BARLEY

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What is the present visible supply of malting barley in Canada?
2. Is malting barley being exported to the U.S.A.?
3. How much malting barley has been exported each month since October, 1945?
4. (a) Is brewing malt being exported to the U.S.A.; (b) what quantities have been exported each month since October, 1945?
5. How much Canadian beer has been exported to the U.S.A. each year since 1940 and each month since October, 1945?

CANADIAN FORCES—SERVICE IN JAPAN

Mr. REID:

1. How many Canadians (a) army; (b) air force; (c) navy; (d) civilians, are at present in Japan in the service of the Canadian government?
2. How many Canadians are receiving instructions or undergoing training with the view of their services being utilized in Japan or other countries of the Pacific?
3. For what specific purpose in Japan are military or civilian personnel being used?
4. Is there any agreement whereby Canadians, both military and civilian, are to be used in Japan?
5. If so, what are the terms of such agreement?

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, WELFARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

On the order for notices of motions:

That, in the opinion of this house Standing Order 63 be amended by adding after subsection (1): (m) on public health, welfare and social security, to consist of thirty-five members, ten of whom shall constitute a quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: This notice of motion is out of order, on the ground that the standing orders of the house were referred to a committee on March 26, 1946. The hon. member will see at page 44 of *Votes and Proceedings* the following notation:

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King it was resolved,—That a special committee consisting of Messrs. Adamson, Gladstone, Glen, Golding, Hansell, McGarry, Jean, MacInnis, Pouliot, Smith (Calgary West) and Stirling be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in revising the standing orders of the house with a view to simplify, accelerate and expedite its business, and to report to the house during the present session.

If the hon. member wishes to be heard before the committee, I am sure the members of the committee will be pleased to receive and consider his suggestions.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF FULL-TIME MINISTER

On the order for notices of motions:

Whereas the minister in charge of the Department of External Affairs has been up to the present date the prime minister of the day;

And whereas the said department has developed and grown in size and importance to the point where the appointment of a full-time minister is essential in the public interest;

And whereas Canada's responsibilities abroad require ever more frequently the attendance of the appropriate cabinet minister at international gatherings outside Canada;

Therefore, be it resolved that in the opinion of this house the government should consider immediately the advisability of appointing a minister of the crown whose duties shall be solely concerned with external affairs.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been standing in my name since the opening of the session. The purposes and objectives I had in mind when it was placed on the order paper have to a large extent been carried out by the legislation introduced some weeks ago by the Prime Minister. That legislation, which was passed by the house, provided for a separate and full-time minister of external affairs. Such minister would be appointed under the statute as amended. In view of the fact that the government has accepted the principle of the resolution I would now ask for permission to withdraw it.

Motion dropped.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

AGE AND INCOME REQUIREMENTS—PROPOSED INCREASE IN AMOUNTS PAYABLE

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East) moved:

That in the opinion of this house, consideration should be given to amending the Old Age Pension Act by lowering the pensionable age to sixty years, by increasing the amount of the pension so as to enable the recipients to live in health and self-respect, and by deleting the income requirements for eligibility.

He said: Mr. Speaker, about six months ago I had the opportunity of moving a resolution almost identical with the one I now move. I do not apologize for taking up the time of the house in a discussion of this subject, because I am convinced that better provision for our old people is one of the most important questions confronting Canada to-day.

For many years the plight of old people in this country has been a sad one, and in my opinion it is daily growing worse. Those of us who read the immortal Scottish poet, Burns, will remember his poem "Man Was Made to Mourn," one verse of which says:

Look not alone on youthful prime,
Or manhood's active might;
Man then is useful to his kind,
Supported in his right:
But see him on the edge of life,
With cares and sorrows worn;
Then Age and Want—oh! ill-match'd pair—
Shew man was made to mourn.

Almost two hundred years have passed since Burns wrote those words; yet the condition of people faced with old age and want, the same ill-matched pair—is not very much better now than it was then.

The resolution before us asks for three changes in our old age pension legislation. First, I am asking for a reduction in the eligible age for receiving a pension. Second, I am asking for an increase in the amount of the pension. Third, I am asking for the abolition of the means test in connection with receiving a pension. I am sure that anyone who has given any thought at all to our old age pension legislation will agree there is no need to elaborate upon those three changes.

Whether the eligible age is sixty or sixty-five years, I think we are all agreed that seventy years is too advanced an age at which to begin the payment of old age pensions. I am asking in this resolution that the eligible age be reduced from seventy to sixty years. I think I can bring evidence before the house to prove that the age of sixty is a proper eligible age. First, I would ask members of the house to consider the age at which old age pensions are granted in other parts of the world, and I would refer them first, to the legislation in the nations of the British commonwealth, countries that perhaps are more like our own than any other part of the world.

Under recent legislation passed in Great Britain the eligible age has been made sixty years for women and sixty-five years for men. In New Zealand the eligible age is sixty years for both men and women. In Australia the eligible age is the same, sixty years for both men and women. I believe the eligible age in most of the states of the United States is sixty-five years, with some states having it as low as sixty years.

There is another reason for reducing the eligible age. Because of the way in which modern machinery operates, many people are not able to carry on with their ordinary labours much beyond the age of sixty. This is particularly true of those whose work is manual. Persons engaged in sedentary occupations are often able to perform useful service after the age of sixty-five, or even after the age of seventy-five, but few who do manual work can hold their jobs after they have reached sixty years of age. This is particularly true of those who have intermittent work.

Often when a man has been employed for a period of years he is kept on by his employer, although he may not be as efficient as a younger man would be. Personal and humane considerations enter into the matter. This is particularly true where there is a retiring pension system. These pensions are usually paid at sixty-five years of age, and often an employee is kept on in order that he may reach the eligible age for a retiring pension. That is what happens with the good employer, but there are other employers who are not so thoughtful or humane and who are ready to find an excuse to discharge an individual who has reached such an age that his usefulness is impaired.

Age is a factor in engaging men and women for the government civil service. Employees in the civil service are supposed to retire at the age of sixty-five years. Very few, except service men or women, are brought into the service after they have reached the age of thirty-five and this applies also in private employment. Unless a person has some particular ability or skill which will make him more useful than he would be at an earlier age, very few employers care to hire any one beyond the age of thirty-five. I do not think I need labour the point.

Less need be said about the necessity of increasing the amount of the pension. Taking into consideration all payments that are made in connection with old age pensions, in most

provinces there is a nominal payment of $30 a month, but in no province does the old age pension from all sources average $30 a month. I have here an answer which was made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) to questions asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) as reported on page 579 of *Hansard* of October 1, 1945. The hon. member asked for the average pension paid to old age pensioners in each of the provinces, and also for the number of the old age pensioners in each province, both as at June 30, 1945. I should like to quote these figures so that hon. members will realize how many persons are receiving these inadequate payments. The number of persons receiving old age pensions as at June 30, 1945, is as follows:

Alberta	11,594
British Columbia	15,505
Manitoba	12,427
New Brunswick	12,335
Nova Scotia	14,135
Ontario	58,323
Prince Edward Island	1,881
Quebec	49,645
Saskatchewan	12,971
Northwest Territories	11

Add the figures I have given and you will have the number of old age pensioners as of June 30, 1945. These are the average monthly amounts received by pensioners in the various provinces: Alberta, $24.13; British Columbia, $24.38; Manitoba, $24.47; New Brunswick, $22.18; Nova Scotia, $22.54; Ontario, $24.45; Prince Edward Island, $18.66; Quebec, $23.94; Saskatchewan, $24.63; Northwest Territories, $24.09.

Additional sums are paid in some of the provinces, and adding these to the figures given by the minister in his answer gives this result: Alberta, $29.13; British Columbia, $29.38; Quebec, $29.38; Manitoba, $25.72; New Brunswick, $22.18; Nova Scotia, $27.54. In the case of Nova Scotia the pension is limited to $365 per year, and the additional payment is whatever amount up to $5 per month will bring the annual pension to $365. The figure for Ontario is $27.45; Prince Edward Island, $18.65; Quebec, $23.94; Saskatchewan $27.63.

No one can tell me that an individual to-day can live on less than $20 a month, as it is in some cases, or on less than $30 a month as it is in other cases. Members of this house are, especially considering the action we took respecting ourselves at the last session, in duty bound at this session to see that the old people of this country receive something more than $360 a year on which to live.

The third change which my motion proposes is that the Old Age Pension Act should be amended so as to abolish the means test. Old age pensions to-day are paid only if the applicant is really destitute. I cannot do better than put on the record a few paragraphs from the proposals made by the dominion government to the dominion provincial conference. I quote:

> The means-test is generally recognized as undesirable after a certain age. It has been noted that about 40 per cent of all persons of 70 years of age and over make application, satisfy the means-test requirements and receive pensions.

I call particular attention to the next paragraph:

> There is little doubt that a very considerable number in addition are not able entirely to support themselves, but are dependent upon their family, and refrain from applying for pensions because of the embarrassment occasioned by the means-test.
>
> The minimum age of 70, though convenient as a dividing line with respect to the payment of any kind of universal old age pension, is nevertheless too high in a number of cases of actual need.

That is an understatement. It goes on:

> A strong case can be made for reducing the age limit to 65 in order to provide assistance, at least for those in the age group of 65-69, who are actually in need.

I do not think I need add anything to that to show the need for the abolition of the means-test in order that persons, even if they are not absolutely destitute, may apply for the old age pension without feeling that they are asking for charity.

I have before me the annual report of the Department of Old Age Pensions in the province of British Columbia for the year 1944-45. It gives the value of the real property and personal property owned by applicants for the old age pension. The following table gives the percentages of applicants for the old age pension holding real and personal property to the values shown:

(a) Holding real property of value—	Per cent
Under $251	57·41
$251 to $500	8·66
$501 to $1,000	13·68
$1,001 to $2,000	14·20
$2,001 to $5,000	5·80
$5,001 and up	0·25

This table shows that only one-quarter of one per cent of the applicants had real property of a value of $5,001 and up. When you come to personal property the situation is even worse, as the following table shows:

(b) Holding personal property of value—	Per cent
Under $251	71·77
$251 to $500	13·74
$501 to $1,000	8·22
$1,001 to $3,000	5·63
$3,001 and up	0·64

Surely in view of these figures we could get something better for the people who are investigating these applications to do than looking into the personal affairs of old people who have given the best of their lives to their country. I should like to quote a short paragraph from this report:

> From the middle of 1939 until the end of 1940 the rate of increase in the number of pensioners is seen to continue evenly. This represented the early period of the war. The latter period of the war, beginning with the year 1941 and continuing into the early part of 1944, shows a rate of increase in the number of pensioners less than in any former period. However, early in 1944 it is noticed that a sharp rise began in this rate of increase, became steeper towards the end of that year, and continued into 1945.

With the worsening of economic conditions throughout the country, since the end of the war the number of persons making application for old age pensions is continually increasing.

In the province of British Columbia we have what is called the Parents' Maintenance Act. It provides that persons who make application for old age pensions and have children who might be able to support them or contribute to their support, must bring court action against them for that support before their applications will be accepted. A question on the point was asked in the British Columbia legislature in the 1943 session as follows:

> What is the actual or estimated saving to the pensions board for the year ended December 31, 1942, due to the assumed ability of children to contribute to the maintenance of parents in receipt of the old age pension?

The answer was $3,560. As the number of old age pensioners in that year was 14,615, the amount collected was equal to 24 cents per pensioner for the year. Yet we keep in the administration of old age pensions in British Columbia people whose business it is to find how much children can contribute to their parents' maintenance. I should not be a bit surprised if the cost of administering that provision were found to be much more than the $3,560 accruing to the board. I would, therefore, ask this house to see to it that the means test is abolished. What is required in this connection is a social security programme to cover all the hazards of modern life—by which I mean any contingency which prevents an individual from earning an income; it does not matter what it may be. The individual should be covered, and he can only be covered by a social security programme administered by the state. I am aware of the difficulties in this connection in Canada, because of our constitution. But recognizing these difficulties, I believe we should try to find a way around them.

[Mr. MacInnis.]

So far as I know there is only one country in the world which has developed a complete social security programme. I should like to put on the record the various benefits which are given under that programme, so that hon. members can study them for themselves. I refer to New Zealand, but in order that hon. members may not, as they generally do when New Zealand is mentioned, blow a gasket or something, I will read briefly from the social security bulletin of the United States, volume 8, under date August, 1945. This bulletin gives among other things a summary of social security programmes throughout the world. In regard to New Zealand it says this:

> New Zealand.—A high degree of income security for the entire population of New Zealand has been achieved through the Social Security Act of 1938, which welded a number of older scattered programmes into a unified whole. The New Zealand social security system represents a considerable departure from the pattern followed or proposed elsewhere, particularly with respect to cash benefits. The medical care benefits of the programme—including relatively complete medical, hospital, and laboratory services—are available to the entire population. The cash benefits are paid upon the occurrence of specified risks—old age, invalidity, widowhood or orphanhood, sickness, and unemployment—to individuals whose income is less than a specified amount.

That is not my statement; it is the statement of those who edited this social security bulletin. I would like to give the house the different headings, and, if I have the time, the amounts, yearly or weekly as the case may be, in Canadian money which are paid in benefits under the New Zealand programme:

Age Benefit	yearly rate
All persons 60 years old	$374 40
Married couple (both eligible)	748 80
Additional for wife not eligible in own right	187 20

Widows' Benefit	yearly rate
Widow who has had children	$374 40
Widow who has never had children	280 80

NOTE: Deserted wives and wives of mental hospital patients receive widows' benefit.

Invalid Benefit	yearly rate
Married male invalid	$374 40
Additional benefit for wife	374 40
Unmarried invalid under 20 years of age	280 80
All other permanent invalids	374 40

Sickness Benefit	weekly rate
Married couple	$14 40
Single person	7 20
Person under 20 years of age without dependents	3 60

	weekly rate
Unemployment Benefit	
Married couple	$14 40
Single person over 20 years of age	7 20
Single person under 20 years of age	3 60
	yearly maximum
Orphans' Benefit	
Orphan under 16 years of age	$147 60
	yearly rate
Miners' Diseases Benefit	
Miner and wife	$748 80
Single miner	374 40
	yearly rate
Family Benefit	
For each child under 16 years of age irrespective of parents' income	$93 60
NOTE: All children receive the above even when parents are in receipt of any of the aforementioned benefits.	
	yearly maximum
Emergency Benefits	
To cover all persons not otherwise eligible	$374 40

The last provision is made in any emergency in which none of the others apply. Let me point out that these benefits are all on a contributory basis, but all the benefits come out of the same fund and persons are entitled to them without the taint of charity.

I think I have said enough to show that the time has come, indeed it came long ago, when we should improve the conditions for our old people. Let us remember that it is not a question of money, but one of organizing the man-power, the resources and the capital equipment of the country to produce the things the people need.

I would conclude with a sentence or two from the American philosopher, Lewis Mumford. He says:

> The final test of an economic system is not the tons of iron, the tanks of oil or the miles of textiles it produces. The final test lies in its ultimate products, the sort of men and women it nurtures, and the order, the beauty and the sanity of their communities.

We cannot have order and beauty and sanity while a great many of our people are living on what the dominion government in its proposals to the provinces describes as a minimum subsistence.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): There can be little doubt that this question of old age pensions is one of the most important that can come before the Canadian parliament at this time. It is also one in which the members of the House of Commons should show great interest, since it involves directly the welfare of our senior citizens. In the last few years there has developed in the country an appreciation of the value of humanity. I believe that the Canadian people as a whole are now placing far more value on humanity and far less on material things than they did ten years ago.

To-day I propose to place before the house certain cold, hard, unpleasant facts about the Canadian old age pension. All hon. members probably realize these facts, but in any event it will do no harm to mention them again in order to refresh memories. I am quite certain that the Canadian people, realizing these facts, are very much concerned that something should be done to remedy the situation.

The first fact is that the old age pension paid in Canada is not high enough for anyone to live on. I would ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) to make that admission when he speaks, or if he feels that the pension is high enough in any province I would ask him to say so. The highest amount paid is paid in British Columbia and Alberta, and in those two provinces it is only approximately $30. That, Mr. Speaker, no matter how we try to get away from it and to make excuses, is not sufficient to enable any human being to live in Canada in health and self-respect, to use the words of the motion that is under discussion this afternoon.

The second fact is that there are thousands of Canadians under the age of seventy who are in need of old age pension but cannot get it because seventy is the earliest age at which a Canadian can qualify. It cannot be disputed that that age is higher than the age required in almost any other country where old age pension is paid. I have here the report on "Social Security for Canada," prepared by Doctor L. C. Marsh for the dominion government in 1943, and at page 73 I find this statement:

> Review of the forty or more systems of old age assistance—contributory and non-contributory—effective in the world to-day clearly shows that the generally accepted view as to the proper age when consideration should be given to retirement from work and provision of security is sixty-five for men and sixty for women.

There is a great deal to be said for having the age for the wife lower than for the husband. There are many husbands who can qualify because they have reached the age of seventy but whose wife is some years younger, and where she cannot qualify it means that the old couple must live on the pension payable to one person.

The third fact is that the applicant for old age pension in Canada must go through a valley of humiliation before he or she can qualify. I might say something further about those words, but this is strictly a non-partisan speech. That, at any rate, is the position of a proud and dignified Canadian who goes to

make application for the pension. Many of them have come to my office in Vancouver and almost invariably they are hurt by the questions they must answer. They have the feeling that they are under suspicion, that the governments suspect them of trying to get something for nothing. There is a stigma attaching to the information that is required, and this I think is very unfair and unwise.

For example, they must answer questions about the gifts they have received from their children or from any other source during the twelve months preceding application, and what salary their sons or daughters are earning. These questions make it difficult for a parent to complete the application without feeling humiliated. We have been led away from the original idea of the Old Age Pensions Act. I remember reading the debates that took place in this house and in the provincial house of British Columbia when the Old Age Pensions Act was passed. At that time there was great talk about these pensions being a reward for pioneers. They were to be a payment for something that our older people had richly earned during their earlier years. There was no question at all of the pension being considered a hand-out. But it was not very long after the act had been passed until the administration was being carried on in such a way that the applicant felt that he was classed as somebody trying to get a hand-out. An old age pension should be treated throughout as a measure of security for our senior citizens.

The fourth fact I should like to place before the house to-day is that in Canada a large percentage of applicants cannot qualify for a pension because of the stringency of our regulations. I hold in my hand the green book which was issued in August, 1945, and which contains the proposals of the government of Canada to the dominion-provincial conference on reconstruction. At page 37 we find this statement with regard to the deficiencies of the present old age pension scheme in Canada. It reads as follows:

> It has been noted that about forty per cent of all persons of seventy years of age and over make application, satisfy the means-test requirements and receive pensions. There is little doubt that a very considerable number in addition are not able entirely to support themselves, but are dependent upon their family, and refrain from applying for pensions because of the embarrassment occasioned by the means-test.

The percentage of those who qualify in Canada is far lower than in Great Britain and, I think, far lower than in any other nation of the commonwealth.

[Mr. Green.]

Mr. CLAXTON: Great Britain has a contributory system which entitles the people as covered of right—

Mr. GREEN: If the minister will read his own proposals of last year and also the report of Doctor Marsh he will see that there was no doubt in the minds of the people who drew these documents that the position in Canada was not right, that it was not as fair as in other parts of the commonwealth.

In addition to those who cannot qualify, there are many thousands who, because of the present regulations, can qualify only for a partial pension. For example, there is a provision which says that a percentage of the value of a person's real property can be counted as income, although actually there is no income; take the case of a man who has a piece of land or a building which is assessed at $3,500; whether or not he gets any income from that property, the old age pension regulations call for his being charged with an income of five per cent of the assessed value of the property. That is a most unfair regulation.

The fifth unpleasant fact about the Canadian old age pension is that thrift is penalized. Take a man who has put away a little money. He may have an income of $20 a month from the savings of a lifetime. Under the regulations as they stand to-day an applicant for old age pension is allowed an income of only $125 a year, which is about $10 a month. If he has an income greater than $125 a year his old age pension is cut down accordingly. That, I suggest—and I am sure no hon. member in this house can contradict me—penalizes thrift and is unfair to the Canadian who has been saving throughout his lifetime.

The sixth unpleasant fact about Canadian old age pensions—there may be many more but I picked out the six which I considred the most important—is that dominion governments as distinct from some of the provincial governments, have not faced the old age pension problem. There has been delay after delay. I have been a member of this house for over ten years and during all that time very little progress has been made in modernizing the Old Age Pensions Act. It is almost impossible to have any change made in the act or in the regulations. In this house there has been a tendency for the Minister of Finance, and through him the government, to take the stand that old age pensions are a provincial responsibility. I can quote from different speeches made by the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to that effect, but I shall not take the time of the house to do so. That has been the outlook, that this

question of old age pensions concerns the provinces and that the dominion government should not be bothered about it. It is true that now a change is coming about in that outlook, but there has been too little desire on the part of all dominion governments to settle this old age pension problem. The dominion government should take the lead in having the question settled.

Now, in 1946, of all times, prompt action is imperative. Of course the time element is always important to these old people because of the fact that they are old. They have few years left to live, and a delay of a year or two years at this time means great unhappiness to many of these elderly Canadian people.

Now in 1946 we are in the time of reconversion; we are turning over from wartime to peacetime. We are laying new foundation for Canada, building for peace. There are hundreds of thousands of young Canadians coming back to go to work. The number of unemployed is increasing steadily across the country. Now is the time when something should be done about old age pensions, about our senior citizens.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I come to my suggestions. I realize that the dominion government has made certain proposals to the provincial governments in connection with old age pensions. I also believe that fact has been used as an excuse for delay. I suggest that at this session, not in the session of 1947 or 1948 or some subsequent session, the government bring in legislation providing for a national old age pension for those of seventy years of age or over without any means test whatever.

Mr. CLAXTON: No matter what the provinces say?

Mr. GREEN: That was the proposal submitted to the provinces. I should like the government to show, by actually bringing in legislation, that it was not simply dangling that proposal as a carrot before the noses of the provincial governments. Let them bring it in, to show that they really meant business.

The second suggestion is that an amendment be brought in covering the years from sixty-five to seventy. When the original Old Age Pensions Act was introduced the dominion government did not wait for the provinces to pass similar legislation. The dominion took the lead; then as the years went by province after province brought in the same act, thereby enabling the citizens of those particular provinces to get old age pensions. Let the dominion government of to-day do the same thing. Let it bring in an amendment to the Old Age Pensions Act whereby any province wishing to provide pensions for its citizens between the ages of sixty-five and seventy years may be able to do so by the passing of complementary legislation.

Then there can be no excuse for not revising the old age pension regulations, without further delay. The residence qualifications need to be widened. Those regulations dealing with income should be revised. Application forms should be changed. Allowance should be made for higher earnings of applicants. An applicant should be able to earn and to receive as pension up to a total of $660, the amount which remains untaxed under the Income War Tax Act. In offering that figure, I refer only to the single man or woman. Applicants should be permitted to make higher earnings.

I have this final suggestion. Why does the governmnt not get busy at once on a retirement insurance plan under which Canadians could contribute during their working years and, then, as of right, and without any means test, become entitled to an adequate pension? If that were done, I believe the pension could be paid even at the age of sixty years, as recommended in this resolution. But some such scheme should be brought into being in Canada. We shall never have these old age pension problems settled, nor shall we settle other security problems of other types for the people of Canada until we have some broad retirement insurance plan.

In 1944, when discussing old age pensions, the Minister of Finance said, as reported at page 3535 of *Hansard* of that year:

> The object would be eventually to work into a contributory scheme which would have very wide coverage. Of course it would not be contributory as far as present old age pensioners are concerned, because it is too late.

I am not suggesting that the present old age pensioners should be compelled to wait until there is a contributory scheme of this type, but there must be a retirement insurance plan for Canada. The government would have been much wiser if it had placed before the provinces some such plan. Had that been done, we would have got at the root of this problem, and of other security problems. But instead, so far as I am aware, no such retirement insurance plan has as yet been submitted to the provinces. I hope the government will get busy, working out the details of some such plan. I feel confident that if the government were to do so it would have the support of hon. members of all parties in the house.

Mr. L. PHILIPPE PICARD (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, it is most consoling to hear the words of the hon. member who has just preceded me, because it shows that Liberal processes of thinking can get across the floor and into the minds of our hon. friends opposite.

Mr. GREEN: The trouble is they have long since left Liberal thought.

Mr. PICARD: What was the attitude of my hon. friend's party when that measure was initiated by the Liberal party? But that is the Conservative trend or frame of mind; they are always in favour of a project, but it is never the appropriate moment to introduce it. We saw the same thing in connection with family allowances.

Mr. GREEN: You did not.

Mr. PICARD: I admit my hon. friend was one of the bright exceptions when that measure was introduced.

Mr. GRAYDON: Let us not make a political football of the old people.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members must not interrupt the hon. member who has the floor. He can be asked questions only with his consent.

Mr. PICARD: It is good, at times, to have a little brush-up, and remind ourselves where we stood a few years ago. I do not mind the interruptions; it is fun.

But when my hon. friend talks about delays he should not accuse us of having delayed, when the fact is that we were the first to bring this measure before the House of Commons, and when all the social security measures now on our statute books were put there by Liberal governments, and initiated by Liberal members.

Mr. GREEN: No, no.

Mr. PICARD: There is not one that has not been.

Mr. CLAXTON: Every single one.

Mr. PICARD: They all have been. Each time, when a new one was brought in we have been faced with the same opposition. In connection with family allowances, the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) and the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) were for it, and voiced their opinions. But there was a lot of hesitancy on the other side of the house; and there was even opposition—not so much to the principle, but because it was not the right moment. It is never the right moment for the Conservatives to bring about a reform.

Since my hon. friend wanted to keep his remarks above politics, I shall carry on in the same vein. The point I wished to make was that the delay was not on our side, but on theirs, in introducing such measures.

Social security is not a cure-all for man's troubles, nor is it intended to prevent man from working for his living. It would not be right to bring into being any social system which would have as its outcome any diminution, if I may so describe it, of individual effort, or any crushing of initiative. On the other hand, it is impossible to do away with risks and responsibilities, and it would not be right to have a society based on paternalism. What must be created is equality of opportunity for all. Heredity, talent, initiative and work will soon make sure that equality of attainment will not be achieved. For that reason social security measures must be enacted, some in the shape of contributory plans, others in the shape of assistance for the less fortunate, without any contributions from the people who are to benefit.

As I said a minute ago, up to now Canada has been given one of the best systems of social security to be found on the statute books of any modern nation. We are not behind. Indeed, we are ahead in many of the fields we have entered. There are some, though, who because of their relative success in life, have failed to see the good fortune that helped them to higher achievements, and who looked down upon those who had not reached the same level.

They selfishly overvalue their virtues or their work, and blindly or ignorantly hold that equal work and equal industry will inevitably bring about similar results. That is far from the truth, and that is why we need social security measures. Assistance of the kind to which I refer is one of the urgent needs of modern society to bring about more equality of opportunity and more security against the hazards of life. Social security, which aims at preventing and controlling the hazards of life, meets an end which is not only vital to the individual but is essential for his morale and economic well-being.

During the session of last year I had dinner on a train with a business man, who had achieved considerable success. He said that he had not had any advantages, that he had started from nothing, He would not agree with any suggestion that another man working just as hard with the same talents could not reach the same level as he had. The fact is that chance and other considerations account for these inequalities. Social security is a necessity which is now recognized by everybody and there is no room for hesitancy

in regarding it as essential. I am glad my hon. friends opposite have reached the same conclusion.

The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) stated that conditions for the working man throughout the world were about the same to-day as they were in the time of Burns, which would probably be a hundred and fifty years ago. I think he has overlooked a few of the things that have happened since then. Hours of work have changed considerably. Hours of work in industry generally have gradually been lowered until they are now from forty-five to forty-eight per week, and there are proposals to reduce them still further. The conditions in this regard are very different from what they were at the time referred to by my hon. friend.

Health conditions have changed a great deal. As a result of the advances made in science and economic development, probably the poorest man to-day lives better than the wealthy man of fifty years ago. The life of man has been extended considerably by the achievements of medical science. While all these things may not depend upon governments, I do not think my hon. friend would ask us to go back to the days of fifty years ago.

Consider the advances which have been made in housing generally throughout the world, and in Canada in particular. I admit that there is room for improvement, but much has been done over the years. Consider the conditions of the people who lived in the slums of England a hundred years ago. Some of those people—and I bow to them—came to Canada and helped to build up this country. To-day they are living under conditions much better than those which prevailed in England. Wages have gone up. Let us be just; let us not try to compare the conditions of to-day with those of a hundred years ago. What about child labour?

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. PICARD: Yes.

Mr. IRVINE: I think the hon. gentleman's point—

Mr. PICARD: Is this a question?

Mr. IRVINE: I think the point made by my hon. friend (Mr. MacInnis) was that in the time of Burns, they were mourning because of hunger and old age, and they are still mourning. If there has been so much improvement, how does my hon. friend explain the fact that there is still mourning for bread?

Mr. REID: Not to anything like the same extent.

Mr. PICARD: My hon. friend, and the hon. member who spoke before me, should realize that conditions have changed. I think everyone wants to be fair. No matter what government may have been in power, is it not a fact that conditions have improved considerably throughout the world, and particularly in Canada? I admit that there is room for still more improvement, and in a moment I will say that I am in favour of better pensions. But I do not think it is fair to compare conditions of to-day with what they were a hundred and fifty years ago, even if some of our people have not reached the level which we should like to see achieved for the population in general. The standard of living throughout Canada is much higher to-day than it was in England and than it is at the present time in many other countries.

Among the different measures that could be included in social security—and which, if I may remind the house, were brought about by Liberal governments—are the workmen's compensation acts and measures to provide for the arbitration of labour disputes. The matter of health insurance is under consideration by the minister. It has been studied by committees, and as soon as the proposals are accepted by the provinces it will be placed upon the statute book. It is another innovation for which a Liberal government was responsible.

May I remind my hon. friends that when unemployment insurance was first brought before the house it was stated that the time was not opportune, economically or otherwise, to bring forward the measure. But we have unemployment insurance. It costs the government a considerable amount; it costs industry a considerable amount, but it has resulted in a tremendous improvement in conditions. Family allowances are now being paid, and they cost the treasury quite a large amount of money. Then there are old age pensions, as I mentioned a moment ago.

Mr. GREEN: I know the hon. member does not wish to be unjust. He will remember that this party advocated unemployment insurance, and actually the first unemployment insurance bill was brought in by Mr. Bennett.

Mr. PICARD: If the hon. member will look up *Hansard* he will see that the objection was not to the principle, but to the time at which the measure was brought in.

Mr. GRAYDON: It was brought in by the Bennett government.

Mr. PICARD: At a very opportune time—just before the election of 1935.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I say to my hon. friend—

Mr. PICARD: Does my hon. friend mean the election bill?

Mr. GRAYDON: Unemployment insurance was brought in by the Bennett government.

Mr. CLAXTON: It was thrown out by the courts.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister will have his chance. It was brought in by the Bennett government, thrown out by the present government and sent to the supreme court and privy council for decision. It was thrown out by the courts. Then it was brought in by this government in 1941. I happened to be a member of the committee which brought the bill in, and I know there was entire unanimity with respect to it. There were no reservations at all.

Mr. PICARD: I am glad to know that some Conservative elements approve of what we proposed at the right time.

Workmen's compensation has been in operation throughout the world for about fifty years. Most of the workmen's compensation legislation which is now on the statute books was enacted between 1911 and 1930. France started in 1898, and Spain in 1900, on a moderate scale. Workmen's compensation implies a modification of common law rules relating to liability for damage for the purpose of securing, with the minimum of litigation, limited compensation for all injuries incurred in the course of employment.

I am reviewing briefly these different measures because most of them touch directly or indirectly the question of old age pensions. Workmen's compensation is or should be related to old age pensions. Health insurance is another measure which has to do with it. The proposals made to the provinces have been read and are known by all members of the house, so I need not go back to them. Sickness is the most constant and frequent risk for the low income population and for wage earners in general. It is a risk which may entail the loss of health and earning capacity, the loss of livelihood, the loss of ability to pay for medical assistance.

What is needed is to place at the disposal of the people the facilities of modern medicine for the preservation of the health and detection of disease. As stated in the proposals to the provinces, under our present system, for those who cannot afford to pay, the cost of ill health falls at the very moment when earning capacity is cut off. Those unable to pay are left to the charity of benefactors. It is evident that a scheme of health insurance such as is proposed by the dominion to the provinces is necessary, and it is to be hoped that an agreement in this regard will be reached. Any such scheme should include an extension of assistance to the blind, assistance to needy mothers, and maternity grants. Unemployment insurance, shall I say, to correct what I said a moment ago, has been adopted unanimously by the house.

The outstanding feature of any social security act has been considered to be the old age pension. Social security for aged people can be arrived at by two systems, one supplementing the other, if we wish to have a real social security system. One is the retirement or long-service pension scheme on a contributory basis, as adopted in some countries and as we have it in Canada for certain trades and professions. We might classify old-age insurance plans as follows: schemes applying to salaried employees in general; schemes applying simply to occupational groups, such as bank clerks, civil servants, public utility workers, railway employees, and so on; schemes applying to workers in one entire branch of economic activity, such as all industrial workers, or all commercial workers; and schemes applying to wage-earners or employed persons generally.

The outstanding feature of the occupational scheme is the retirement or long-service pension at a given age, and with that are usually coupled invalidity provisions for retirement on practically the same conditions if the worker becomes an invalid and incapacitated from earning. The different definitions of invalidity or incapacity to earn a living can be considered later, as they are very elastic and differ from one country to another and from one scheme to another.

Many of these retirement schemes, depending on the type of occupation involved, provide a pension as early as fifty, but usually at around sixty-five, and in some cases at sixty years of age after from twenty-five to thirty years of service. That is the average of most of the schemes now in operation. The employee becomes entitled to a pension ranging from two-thirds of his average salary for the previous five years, and pensions for survivors are often provided in such schemes at the rate of fifty per cent of the pension which the deceased employee was receiving or would have received.

Most of these schemes are financed by contributions from the employers and employees, but not by the state.

Insurance schemes for wage earners in general or in an organized trade present a much more complicated problem. Large contribu-

tions for the purpose of old age insurance schemes cannot very easily be levied on manual workers who are not permanently employed. Enough is already taken from their weekly pay by workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and—probably later on—by the health insurance programme; and so for most wage earners a contributory scheme will not be practicable. The main object is to withdraw as little as possible from the wage earner's income for current consumption needs, because it is of the utmost importance to society generally that he should maintain a decent minimum standard of living and sufficient purchasing power to ensure large markets for our production, if we do not want our whole economy to be endangered and if we want to keep employment at as high a rate as possible.

We are left therefore with the necessity of providing pensions for old age on a non-contributory basis. The present old age pension scheme is well known, therefore I do not need to enter into details. But as we have to compare what is being done with the proposals contained in this resolution, it may be said that up until now the maximum amount of pension to which the dominion has contributed is $25 a month. Some of the provinces granted supplemental amounts. The monthly pension varies from $18.63 in one province to $29.41 in another, including provincial supplementary grants. This resolution, although it does not specifically mention any sum, it calls for an increased pension, and if I understood the mover aright he would like to see the pension increased to $50 a month. On the other hand the dominion government has made proposals to the provinces with respect to the old age pension, and it might be well to consider these before we go any further.

The proposals made to the provinces rather suggest that they cannot very well be applied, as the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) suggested, by separate federal enactment without infringing upon the rights of the provinces. This is an important consideration in some places throughout the country, and of course we must act with due consideration for the wishes of the provinces. We know how ticklish it is at times to get agreement from the provinces on schemes which we would normally regard as perfectly acceptable and to which neither side of the house at first seems to see objection; yet we find that one province or another objects. So I think that before we go into any new pension scheme for the aged we should have the answer of the provinces to the proposals which have been made by the dominion government.

I am all in favour of a higher rate of pension, and a lower pensionable age, but we must take into consideration the capacity of the country to pay and we must consider the burden it will impose upon the taxpayers. There are many people—some of them sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker—who clamour for lower taxation, lower income tax, and lower corporation tax. If we want to reach that objective, and at the same time plan for higher government expenditures, it will be difficult for the Minister of Finance to make ends meet.

The proposal of an old age pension of $50 per month at age 60 would, I am given to understand, involve an annual expenditure of $851,000,000. That was the figure given by the minister last year, and I am told that further calculations have not changed it. On the other hand the expectancy of income tax revenue this year is $680,000,000. In addition to the $851,000,000 for old age pensions there will be the cost of the present social security programme of the government, which I entirely support. While I should like to see the old age pension increased to $50 a month and the age reduced to 60, I wonder if, in view of the figures I have mentioned, it would be at all possible to do it, and whether we could not say that the programme proposed by the dominion government to the provinces is a good one. Already, taking the figure given by the minister when he spoke to the house the other night on disability pensions, we have reached an expediture of over one billion dollars yearly, which does not include more than $39,500,000 from the federal treasury for old age pensions. If to that we add another $851,000,000 to finance the scheme proposed by my hon. friend, we would have an annual expenditure of $1,851,000,000. With income taxes as they are, I wonder how we would be able to get along with the system we had during the war, financing half our expenditures by taxes and half by loans. I think we would be top-heavy, or lop-sided, or whatever you call it, in our finances if we went all along with the proposals which have been made to-day.

Social security in all its phases is in a constant process of evolution. No system of government for the world has been found to be permanent, and no system of social security benefits has been evolved all at one time. I think the government has not done badly in years past with the programme it has put on the statute books. I think also that the present proposal should be considered an improvement and that it will be acceptable.

One point in the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) which I heartily approve is his criticism of the means test. It is an awkward system and should be entirely discarded. The present proposals mention that the test should be disposed of for those who are seventy years of age or over. I would favour going farther than that and making the change applicable to all who come under the benefits of the act from the age of sixty-five years. The means test and the withdrawal from the estate of the deceased man under the circumstances mentioned by the hon. member are not, to my mind, the best of policies. They may be regarded as necessary by those who are better versed in such questions than I am, but I do not think they work satisfactorily, and I personally would favour their abolition. Let the payment outright of $30 a month to everybody of the age of seventy and over be the obligation of the federal government; and, as to the age groups from sixty-five to sixty-nine, let the federal government contribute 50 per cent of the cost of $30 a month. I believe that would be a considerable improvement on the present system and that it would be highly appreciated by the people of Canada.

While I am on this subject of old age pensions and still have some time left, I should like to apologize to the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Burton). The other night he took me to task because at the end of my remarks on the disability proposals I said, and I thought I was perfectly right in saying, that I would carry on the debate next Tuesday. I wish to apologize because I realized last evening that I would have been out of order had I tried to proceed with that debate; but the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand), who proposed this resolution, was under the same impression as I was. Probably at a later time he will find a way to say a few words on his resolution. Since it is intimately connected with the question of old age, I think I might say one word in this regard, that when amendments to old age pensions are considered it might be appropriate to consider some form of benefits for invalids or other people who are absolutely incapable of earning their livelihood. These people, of course, as do all workers, fall into different categories. There are those who during part of their life have been able to work but who have been incapacitated: some of them fall under schemes of pensions which give them definite benefits; others come under the provisions of workmen's compensation acts, if their disability was occasioned during the course of their work. But such protection is provided for only a certain number.

I believe that the majority of wage-earners, for example those employed in agriculture, in domestic service, as casual workers, as daily manual workers, are usually excluded from all sorts of benefits or compensation laws dealing with disability. In these cases something should be done. If I understand well, in England there is protection in such cases up to the age when those concerned come under the provisions of the old age pensions law. I see here in a book by Beaman, although I cannot vouch for the fact, that the British law covers the field of need, because all wage-earners in the United Kingdom are insured for disability benefits up to the age of seventy, although I doubt whether that includes all occasional and daily workers. What of the unskilled labourers, the farmers, the fishermen, and, above all others, people who have permanent disability from childhood, people who have never worked, not people who are trying to evade the law of work but those who, on account of their physical build or their ill health, have never been able to work? All of us know in our constituencies many such cases which are not provided for under existing laws. It would be well, therefore, for the minister to consider a readjustment of the old age pensions law or some appropriate way of dealing with them. The other night, when he so ably presented his opinion on the matter, the minister mentioned disability as coming after certain other things. He said that unemployment insurance would come first, under the Doctor Marsh report and the recent speech of President Truman: he put second, health insurance; third, disability and old age pensions; fourth, children's allowances; fifth, sickness cash benefits. I think the minister in his speech included the people we are mainly talking about in the fifth class, namely sickness cash benefits. With all due respect for his higher knowledge, I think they should come in the third category, that of disability and old age pensions, and that they should be treated, as I have said, in one act or under one scheme.

Mr. GRAYDON: The principle is now recognized in the case of blind people, and it should, I think, be extended.

Mr. PICARD: Yes, it is done now for the blind. Here the minister had in mind those who probably become invalids through sickness, and he put them into the fifth category. As I was going to say for the benefit of those who were not here the other night, I think it might be well to consider what the minister has done up to now for the building of social security plans for Canada. He has given of the best of his ability to evolving an

entirely new system, one which is comprehensive, well organized and well balanced, and I think he deserves credit for it and the gratitude of the country for it. I know that he is anxious and desirous above anybody else in the house to bring about as speedily as can be done a comprehensive system of the kind which has been outlined. As I said a moment ago, this cannot be done all at one time; these matters are in process of constant development.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Other countries have done it, have they not?

Mr. PICARD: Does the hon. member mean New Zealand? That is one country which has been given often by him as an example. But I do not think any one country has brought about at one time, in one year, a plan of social security. Does the hon. member, by any chance, mean Russia? I forgot about that entirely. Whatever any nation may do by means of revolution, I do not know of any country which, by process of evolution, can effect an immediate change in the present system. At any rate, so far as democratic countries are concerned, working along evolutionary lines, I do not think we in Canada are doing too badly. The situation is improving gradually.

I feel keenly about the question of disability, and what I suggest might well be done concurrently with a revision of the old age pensions law. Some people have raised the objection that it is quite difficult to define disability or infirmity, but there are three descriptions which are given as taken from the United States laws at the moment, and which I think I can readily bring to the attention of the house. Here I am referring to a publication entitled "Social Security Bulletin," for March, 1941, and in particular from an article by the chairman of the social security board of the United States, Mr. A. J. Altmeyer. I quote:

> Under the retirement law for the civil service employees of the government, for example, an employee meets the test of disability if, by reason of disease or injury, he is totally disabled for useful and efficient service in the position occupied by him. The Railroad Retirement Act requires that a railroad worker be "totally and permanently disabled for regular employment for hire" before he is granted a disability benefit.

There is quite a distinction there.

> Under United States life insurance, purchasable by persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the war, total permanent disability is any "impairment of mind or body which continuously renders it impossible for the disabled person to follow any substantially gainful occupation, and which is founded upon conditions which render it reasonably certain that the total disability will continue throughout the life of the disabled person."

That, I submit, is an apt definition, because impairment of mind or body, which renders it impossible for a person to follow any gainful occupation, is more specific than simply the stipulation that in order to be considered an invalid a man should be subject to certain restrictions. The definition, I think, is broad enough. Of course there must be an avoidance of any duplication of benefits, but any objection in that respect can easily be met.

It is evident that we must consider a broader source of relief for the numerous persons in Canada who to-day have to depend upon relatives or upon charity, so that, as regards those who have parents to support, family resources which heretofore have been used for the assistance of such persons may be set free to meet the important needs of those who have to contribute such support. It would mean fair treatment and the removal of a source of anxiety.

Mr. IRVINE: I rise to a point of order. I am no stickler for the rules, Mr. Speaker, but time is short, and I am suggesting that my hon. friend is not discussing old age pensions.

Mr. PICARD: I have about concluded, Mr. Speaker, although I submit that what I am saying is directly connected with the question before the house. We owe it to the country to do something for these people. We all admit that the workers are entitled to rest after a life of labour, but we should not have to leave to the children alone the obligation to support their parents. Their burden should be lightened in order that they may see to the education of their own children. At the same time, we must see to it that the aged are not deprived of purchasing power, which is important if we are to maintain stable economic conditions.

The hon. member who introduced the resolution has done the house a real service. We must improve our old age pension system and provide for those who find it necessary to take advantage of it, and we must have a pension scheme that will cover all those who are not already taken care of. But let us do it in a way consistent with the interests of the Canadian economy. I submit that by passing legislation which will put into effect the proposals made by the federal government to the provinces we may best attain our goal for the present.

Mr. L. E. BAKER (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare): Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that you

hear from this remote corner of the house, but occasionally, when I see the storm clouds gathering and mounting in the sky, I feel impelled to say a few words. In my solitude down here I have been giving particular study to various members of the house, one of whom is the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis). I have learned to respect the hon. member for Vancouver East and I realize that he is a great humanitarian. He is always looking out for the unfortunate individual and I have acquired an admiration for that hon. gentleman. To-day I must differ with him in certain respects, and I differ not so much in principle as in point of time and expediency. I know you will want me to explain that. Do not suppose that I am trying to use up the time of the house unnecessarily. Far from it; I do not often speak.

When I speak of time and expediency, I mean this. We all know that the dominion-provincial conference is due to resume on the 25th of this month. Proposals have been set forth by the dominion government and with those proposals we are all acquainted. I would not want to see the premiers of the different provinces embarrassed in any way, nor would I want to see the federal government in any more complicated position than it may be in at the present time when it comes to ironing out the differences that may exist.

I regard the dominion-provincial conference as one of the most important conferences we have ever had in Canada. We must recognize that there are certain powers which the provinces must have, and I for one have great faith in the premier of my province, the Hon. Angus L. Macdonald. Down there we all know that he will not accept any proposal from the dominion government unless he believes that it is for the good of his province, and I trust that all other hon. members have the same faith in their provincial premiers. I am sure that if they have as much faith in their premiers as I have in mine they will not do anything that will embarrass those gentlemen when they come here to discuss matters.

I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver East that in time we should reduce the age from seventy, but I do not know when. That is something which will have to be discussed, and it should be discussed by the premiers as well as by the federal government. I agree with the hon. member, in principle, so far as that is concerned.

One thing I loathe and have always loathed is the means test. I do not like a means test or anything else that is likely to make any man appear undignified in his old age. The

Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) expressed his views, with some slight differences, on the same matter on October 3, 1945, as reported at page 729 of *Hansard:*

> When the proposals were put before the provinces they received what I think anyone who was present would regard as a sympathetic reception. Certainly the provinces gave every assurance that the proposals would receive serious consideration, and we in this house can only take it to be the case that they are receiving serious consideration to-day.

I am sure that they are receiving consideration, because those premiers are all serious-minded men. I believe they are making an honest effort to come together with the dominion and to work out some sort of grand scheme which will have far-reaching effects, not only for us but for all our children and our children's children.

In what I am about to say I do not wish to be misunderstood. Sitting in this corner, I hear a lot of debate going on backwards and forwards. I find it interesting. I am particularly interested in the views I hear expressed regarding western Canada, because I do not know too much about that part of the country, but I am learning fast. From one side of the house we hear statements that we must lower the taxes. Then we hear that we must raise the allowances, raise payments and so on. The province of Nova Scotia, from which I come, is something like the highlands of Scotland where money is hard to come by and we value it highly there. I think the time is coming when we have to call a halt. We must make a reconnaissance and not move forward one yard until we have made a thorough survey of the entire situation. We must make that reconnaissance as quickly as we can. Then, when we have a solid foundation laid and plenty of support behind us, we should move ahead in the right direction. Our social legislation must be founded on rock bottom. If it is not, and we increase the old age pension now and lower the age limit, in time, if we do not balance our budget and occasionally have a surplus, we shall reach the stage when our children and our children's children want the old age pension and there will not be anything to pay them. We shall all agree in principle, but there will be no principal to pay them. That is a matter we must take into serious consideration.

I was so much interested in the debate last fall that I wanted to take part in it again to-day. May I quote again from page 729 of *Hansard* of October 3, 1945, so that

people who read this debate will be able to refer readily to the previous debate. The Minister of National Health and Welfare said:

> . . . for old age pensions to be paid to all citizens on attaining the age of sixty years, at $50 a month without a means test. The estimate which the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has given me would indicate that in the year 1948, $50 a month to every person of sixty years of age and over would cost the federal government $850 million for that year alone. When I tell the house that the total amount raised by personal income tax for the year 1944-1945 is estimated to be $667 million hon. members will see something of the magnitude of the proposal put forward by the hon. member.
>
> In other words, the cost of this proposal would be more than the total personal income tax paid by the Canadian people during the last year. That has a definite bearing on our relations with the provinces.

I maintain that that has a definite bearing—

An hon. MEMBER: So what?

Mr. BAKER: An hon. member said, "So what." I cannot say, "So what" when it comes to large sums of money like that. People all over this country and the men and women in the armed services bought victory bonds. If we reach the stage where our dollar drops to the extent that it might, if we go ahead too rapidly—I mention victory bonds because that is something with which outside concerns have nothing to do; that is something we all own; the country belongs to us—the bonds will depreciate and it will hurt the people who need the money most. I agree in principle with much that the hon. member for Vancouver East has said. I know the hon. member for Vancouver East is a champion. What Angus was not a champion? There is Angus MacInnis; he is a champion for humanitarian causes and I grant him that. There is Angus Walters who was the skipper of the undefeated north Atlantic fishing schooner *Bluenose*. There is Angus L. Macdonald, who is Premier of Nova Scotia. He is another champion from my province. I want to give my champion a chance to come here to see what he can do, and work things out for my province. I shall give him my support and I am sure that many other hon. members will do the same.

I have not a great deal more to say on this subject because I am not trying to take up a lot of time. However, I believe the motion is premature at this time. I hope that some day in the future, and the sooner the better, we shall be able to have these things so arranged in Canada that the old and aged people will be able to pass through the twilight of their lives with dignity, comfort and security.

Mr. PATRICK H. ASHBY (Edmonton East): Since this debate started I have noticed that approximately one hundred Liberals have walked out, joined, I must say, by a great number on this side of the house.

An hon. MEMBER: What about your own group?

Mr. ASHBY: I said that they were joined by a number on this side of the house. Therefore I must come to one of two conclusions: either they are not interested in old age pensions, or they realize we have done nothing but talk. I think that is the correct answer; they realize that we are doing nothing but talk. That is true.

I have listened to the impressive figures, financial and otherwise, that have been given here this afternoon. The only figures that I am interested in are the figures of our old folk, and they have just about lost them. I visited an old folks' home, and I can assure the house that the old people I saw there had no figures left. The skin that was hanging over their bones looked to me just like a coat on an old senator. I wanted to aid some of these old people, but they did not want me to help them even to walk. The woman in charge of this particular place said: "Pat has come to see you." Immediately there was a scramble to get up to have a look at me. I saw one poor soul trying to come down the stairs. He had on a shabby dressing gown which looked like a thing that had been thrown out in the garbage months before, but he did not want any help. He was an independent fellow. His knees were about the size of the old gray mare's that I used to have, swollen up with arthritis, knocking together with a clatter that could be heard like the bones on the prairie in a windstorm.

I am not deaf and dumb, as apparently the Minister of Finance and this government are. I do have fairly good eyesight, and I can see the plight of these people. My hearing is not too bad. I can hear their groans. They have been in need for years. What are we going to do about it? Stand up and talk all day? What I want to see is a bill brought into the house so that we can vote on it. Who is holding it up? We brought in a bill in the latter part of the last session giving each hon. member a couple of thousand dollars tax free, and it went through like a house afire. Had it not been for the fact that the bill was held up by one or two members who wanted to get their names in the papers, it would have gone through in half the time. That is all there is to it: Bring on the bill; who is holding it up?

An hon. MEMBER: You are.

Mr. ASHBY: No, I am not holding it up. I will support a bill if you will give me an opportunity to vote on it.

When I listened to this talk about millions and millions—well, what about it? Did we talk about that when war was declared? No; we went ahead and produced abundantly, and gave it all away to the enemy. Well, surely to God we can provide our old folk with a few crackers and some thin soup.

I am not interested in methods; I am interested in results. However I must bring to the attention of the house this fact, that there are four methods of dealing with our old folk. There is the present method we are now using, that of starving them to death. I do not agree with this method. I suppose my disagreement is due to some weakness on my part, but it just makes my heart bleed to see these old folk slowly dying. When I have an old mare who has fulfilled her usefulness I sell her to the fox farms. I do not just tie her up somewhere and let her starve to death. And so I disagree completely with the present method.

Another fellow did have a better method, I believe; that was the gas chamber in Germany. That was Adolf's method. I think it would be far better to put our old-age folk in a gas chamber, because it does not take long to gas them to death, and we would not be bothered with them any more. If that were done we would not hear their cries, but of course I would object to that method, on more than one ground.

Then there is another method known as the guillotine. I would object to that too, because it is a terribly messy job. Besides, in these days one has to have a licence for everything. You have a licence for this and a licence for that and a licence for the other thing.

Folks are not keeping as many dogs as they used to have, so that we have not enough canine scavengers to clean up the mess. So I think the best answer is to let them live. Yes, I do. Just let them live as they want to live. So far as I can see when I walk through the city streets, there is plenty of food for sale in the stores. The storekeeper is always right behind the counter, ready to sell it. I can see no reason why these old folks should not be able to buy all the food they want.

I have asked them what they want, and they tell me they do not want very much. A great many of them have said to me, "You younger men"—and they look upon me as a younger man—"want a car, fine clothes, luxuries; you want far more than we do. But when one gets along in years, to sixty-five or seventy years of age, one does not want very much. We do not want to go gallivanting around the country as you do, in automobiles. No, we do not even care about going to the moving pictures. All we want is a street-car ticket once in awhile, so that we can go to the cemetery and have a look around at our last resting place."

I heard some hon. members talking about some contributory method by which in their younger days people would be able to contribute part of their savings to a fund for their old age. Well, have they not already contributed? I wonder how many thousands upon thousands of dollars they have contributed. I'll warrant some of them have paid in as much as $25,000 or $30,000 in taxes during their lifetime. And what about those taxes? Where did the money go? Did someone burn it up? It must be around somewhere. Where is all this money that was said to have been spent during the war? There were billions and billions of it; I should like to see where it is. They talk about money being scarce; what became of it? Did it go up in flames like the wood-pile across the river? What became of it?

When hon. members begin talking about a contributory system I feel like telling them to go and chase themselves. I could have brought down to the floor of this house dozens of resolutions I have received. My suggestion was $60 a month at fifty years; but no; our old folks are so generous that they do not want that. Certainly they are not greedy when they say, "No, we can get along on $50 a month at sixty years." I said to them, "Well, if you feel that $50 a month at sixty years is sufficient, it is perfectly all right with me."

If a bill were brought in here to-morrow which would enable our old folk to receive $50 a month at sixty years, without a means test, it would receive my support and the support of this house. It is none of our business what their means might be; that is their private concern. It is not my business to pry and spy into the affairs of my people. Just imagine me, a member of parliament, going along the street, stopping folk and asking them how much they have in their pockets, or to let me look at their bank books. Just imagine my going up to a lady, grabbing her bag from her arm, opening it, and looking inside of it. Of course I would not do that in these days, because women wear their finger nails so long. But I have not the right to pry and spy into the affairs of the people I represent. What reason have we collectively to employ civil servants and demand that they must know all about the

private affairs of our people? Certainly that is not democracy; it is pure unadulterated nazism. It is the sign of dictatorship.

When we refer to $50 at the age of sixty, we must remember there are many whose wives have not yet reached sixty years, or sixty-five—whatever the age at which the pension is to be made payable—who are incapable of earning anything. The people, not members of parliament, have the right to decide at what age these pensions shall be payable. And if the people decide that the age of sixty is the one they want, then the wife of every old age pensioner should also receive a pension. I see no reason why she should not. Ninety-nine times out of a hundred she is incapable of earning anything, or of going out to work.

I must say that old ladies are sometimes tougher than men. Indeed I have seen some old ladies whose vitality puzzled me; I wondered how in the world they kept alive. Surely they must be made of better material than any other animals with which I have associated.

I do not think there is any use in talking any more. We have talked and talked about it. Dozens of resolutions have reached me —indeed, they have been coming in for years. And why not? I know it is useless for a private member to introduce a bill involving an expenditure of public money, but I am wondering why the government does not bring in such a bill. It would not take long to do it. Meantime these old folk are groaning in their old age and suffering poverty and want in this great country of abundance.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to finish in five minutes time. I do so in the first place because the hon. member who introduced the resolution was just as lucid and logical in his presentation as he usually is. He covered the ground admirably. Anything he may have missed was brought forward by the hon. member who followed him in the debate, and other points were brought out by my hon. friend across the way. So, much as I should like to talk on the subject, I shall refrain from doing so, and shall make only a brief plea to the house.

In the first place, I wish to emphasize that this is not a party question. My hon. friend opposite, perhaps facetiously, introduced a party spirit into the debate. He wanted us to think with the Liberals and to give them credit for having done certain things. I have no objection to giving the government credit for having done some things. I do not know of any government in the history of Canada, federal or provincial, that has not done some things worth while. I am looking forward to this government doing some more things that are worth while. I am not forgetting about that, but I should like to point out to my hon. friend that the thinking about this subject has been done already; it is the acting that we are interested in now.

In spite of the apparent futility of discussing private members' resolutions in this house I still have some faith that some good may come out of such discussion and out of this one in particular. I do not know of any other way by which private members can bring before this house what their people are thinking. I do not know of any means by which the government can more readily get to know what the people of the country are thinking about than to hear frank expressions on the floor of the house during private members' discussions about national matters of importance.

I suggest that we do not try to talk out this resolution, that we bring it to a vote as speedily as possible so as to get it through before six o'clock. I would also suggest that the whips be called off and that this matter be treated as being what it is, a private member's resolution which binds the government to no definite action but which has as its object telling the government what the private members think the country wants. It is then the government's business and duty to formulate a policy in accordance thereof to the best of their ability. If they cannot go all the way with us, we shall be prepared to consider whatever policy they may advance.

On the last occasion when this matter was before the house the minister suggested that we could not have reduced taxation and increased pensions at the same time. The hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare (Mr. Baker) suggests that it is time we called a halt, and he hit his desk to emphasize the importance of that halt. I think it is time the we said, "Quick march." We have been halting all the time. I agree with the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Ashby), in one thing, although I did think he was going to gas the old people to death before he got through. I agree that it is not a matter of adding up figures and presenting huge sums. The first consideration of any government or of any economic system should be to provide the living needs of a living people. If this government cannot reduce taxes and at the same time provide for old age pensions, then it is not the right kind of government for this dominion and it will simply have to go.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman proposes an

amendment to the present old age pensions legislation to reduce the eligible age to sixty years, to increase the amount of the pension in order to enable the recipients to live in health and self-respect, and to delete the income requirements. By the latter I suppose he means the means test. I propose to take only the same amount of time as the preceding speaker. I think the rules should be changed so that members would be allowed only ten minutes instead of forty minutes when speaking on private members' motions.

Prior to 1927, when the old age pensions legislation was first passed, these aged people were the responsibility of the municipalities. Cities had to take care of their aged and infirm in public institutions or by private and public charity. A city like the one I represent had to pay millions of dollars to establish and maintain these institutions. Many of these people were left to drift or care for themselves.

Our system in Canada has been a disgrace, and I shall refer to only two sections. When the legislation was first passed in 1927 the government reimbursed those provinces that participated in the scheme on the basis of fifty per cent. In 1931 this proportion was raised to seventy-five per cent, the increased contribution to start on November 1 of that year. Then by an order in council passed under authority of the War Measures Act the maximum amount of income allowed was increased from $240 to $300 a year. This legislation has been in operation in all the provinces and the northwest territories under the conditions set out.

The city of Toronto, in which there are so many industrial people, established a local board. However, that local board had no power; it simply passed on the applications to the provincial government. The number of Toronto residents who received pensions last year was 11,044, and the amount paid was $3,651,000. In 1944 the blind were brought under this legislation, and there were 252 blind persons in Toronto who received $83,000.

Long before 1927 the city of Toronto had established pension schemes in the police and fire departments, and the school board and other public departments under which pensions were paid at the age of sixty-five years. This scheme covered departments like the police department, the fire department, the school-teacher and others. The employees contributed from five to seven per cent. Further, $12 a week was paid by the city hall to all employees in various departments until recently.

The minister should reconsider a readjustment of the whole system. Last year an increase in pension was opposed for financial reasons, but I ask the minister to consider what happened in the old country ten years ago. They passed what is known as the determination of needs act. Under that legislation a poor person did not have to be a pauper in order to draw a pension. In 1940 the pensionable age for women was dropped from sixty-five to sixty years and some 3,000,000 women workers were able to secure these benefits. That country also inaugurated a supplementary pension scheme for the aged and widows in need.

Our system is nothing but a pauper system with its means test. It is well named. It is the meanest test that was ever applied in any civilized country. Then the government puts it up to the municipalities and the provinces to enforce this pauper rule. What was done in Great Britain in 1944 under the Churchill government? Legislation was passed to abolish the means test, and the same thing should be done in this country right now.

The determination of needs act, 1943, brought within the scope of the supplementary pensions scheme, widow pensioners under the age of sixty with children to support. As a result of regulations made in 1944, improvements were made in the method of calculating supplementary pensions, and the rates for women were made equal to those for men.

That is what should be done in Canada. We should abolish the means test and have a needs test. The physical fitness branch which has been established under the federal government should also be abolished immediately because it is useless. All the work it is doing is already being done by school boards throughout Canada and by local sporting organizations throughout the country. The money spent on this branch is absolutely wasted.

I wish to give one example of how the means test operates, and this is the meanest case I know of. It concerns the widow of what one might call the dean of the press in Canada. He died a few years ago and left a widow. I do not want to mention any names. She applied for the old age pension. She was 76 years of age, having been born in 1868, and was in poor health. She had resided in Canada since 1884, was a citizen of Toronto for twenty-five years, and was entitled to the old age pension. I quote from her letter to me:

> It came as an unpleasant surprise to be told by an investigator—
>
> They are all over our city.
>
> —that old age had nothing whatever to do with the payment "it does not matter whether you are are seventy or ninety, the pension is only for those persons who are in want."

I have only one son and he married in September, 1944. He and his wife were obliged to continue living with me in this upper duplex, 310 Wright avenue, where my husband and son and myself had lived for over five years.

It was a tentative arrangement as my son's wife naturally wanted an apartment all to herself. The acute housing situation has forced us to remain on here. The overhead expenses are too heavy for my son to carry so an arrangement was made that I would stay on and contribute towards household expenses and pay all my own personal needs without any assistance from my son, which I was able to do while I had the pension.

I do not want to be made feel that I am a pauper and have no rights as a free citizen.

That is what our old age pension scheme is—nothing but a pauper system—and it would be better to wipe it out altogether and place the onus on the municipalities and the provinces and private charity to administer, with federal aid, directly rather than this means system we have.

I know another old citizen in Toronto who owned a little bit of a house, and he got a measly pension of $28 a month and then died a few years later. The members of his family at that time were attending the university and they were asked to reimburse the government $265 which this pensioner had received over a period of a few years. The whole system should be changed. To-day we are spending one billion and a quarter dollars, and all on material needs and we have not a dollar to take these poor old people out of the poorhouse. It is a disgraceful system. The city of Toronto during the depression had to spend almost half a million dollars monthly on relief, all loaded on real estate, for the relief of those who were suffering in the depression between the two wars, and then on relief.

I ask the government and the minister in charge of old age pensions to consider the British statute and to abolish the means test and bring in a needs test, so that all people who need it will receive immediate assistance, without any deductions. It seems to me that the present system is operated on the principle of "to him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." There should be a reorganization of the whole old age pensions department, and a new agreement should be arrived at with the provinces at the dominion provincial conference next month. The amount of the pension should be increased, and there should be a needs test and not a means test applied to these aged people, and direct federal aid to many old age people's homes across Canada on a per diem basis.

Mr. BENOIT MICHAUD (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this resolution, although I am in sympathy with its principle, I do not consider it advisable that the house should adopt it at this time I realize that what I have to say will not add materially to the debate, but we have already heard a great many repetitions this afternoon and I should like to say a few words.

I consider that it would not be advisable to adopt this resolution at this time because certain proposals have been made with respect to the old age pension by the dominion government to the provinces, and we should not do anything now which might hinder the work of the conference.

My hon. friends opposite have been consistent in their demands for a more liberal old age pension, but they have not been consistent in the particulars of their demands. Since I came into this house less than one year ago I have heard a great many opinions expressed on this question of old age pensions. Some hon. members have asked that the old age pension be increased to $50 a month; others have suggested $60, payable at varying ages from 60 years upwards, and if my memory serves me aright, one hon. gentleman suggested a pension of $100 a month payable at the age of 40. If I am not mistaken, very different suggestions came from hon. gentlemen directly opposite to me.

Mr. BLACKMORE: They were all sensible suggestions.

Mr MICHAUD: We all feel that our suggestions are sensible, the most sensible, so that I am not at all surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite consider that their suggestions are logical and consistent.

As to the C.C.F. group, their views have changed on this much debated question, because I recall that in the provincial election in New Brunswick in 1944—and that is not very long ago—their party advocated an old age pension of $50 a month payable at the age of 60, and I can say with assurance that that was the main plank of their platform in New Brunswick. But their appeal to the people of my province did not get very far because they did not succeed in electing a single member, which would seem to indicate that the people of New Brunswick are not in favour of that plan. In the last federal election that party retreated to some extent because they simply advocated an old age pension at 60 years of age without stipulating any amount. This is practically what they are asking for under the present resolution.

I do not question the sincerity of those supporting the resolution, but I suggest that it is much easier to advocate advanced social security measures while in opposition. On this point I cannot avoid referring to what

happened in my province in 1930. In that year there was a provincial election. A Conservative government was seeking renewal of its mandate. During the last session, before going to the people they had enacted legislation providing for old age pensions and mothers' allowances, and an elaborate machinery had been set up to that effect and considerable information had been gathered apparently with a view of implementing that legislation. Even the opposition forces honestly believed that the government of the day was in earnest, that it meant business. Just to what extent this legislation affected the voting on that occasion is not easy to ascertain. The fact remains that the government of the day was returned, although with a decreased majority. For some reason better known to the members of that government the people of New Brunswick never got the benefit of this legislation, which was never proclaimed by the then government. It was not until the return of the Liberal government to power in 1935 that old age pensions came into operation in New Brunswick.

I mention these facts to point out that it is much easier to promise social security measures while sitting in opposition than it is to put them into operation after attaining power. For that reason I am wondering whether our good friends who sponsored this generous resolution could actually implement it if they were in power.

Mr. MacINNIS: Why not?

Mr. BURTON: You are afraid to give us the chance.

Mr. MICHAUD: It is up to the people to give you the chance, I should say.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Is the hon. member aware of the legislation which has been passed by the Saskatchewan government in regard to health, medical and hospital services?

Mr. MICHAUD: We have heard different things from Saskatchewan.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I ask the hon. member if he is aware of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order .

Mr. MICHAUD: Well, during the last provincial election I read C.C.F. propaganda circulated in Nova Scotia giving details as to this wonderful programme of social reform. I am also aware of the fact that a former minister of the previous Saskatchewan government has issued a statement denying practically all that was said in that C.C.F. statement; and, not being in Saskatchewan, I am not in a position to tell who is wrong and who is right.

[Mr. Michaud.]

Mr. CASTLEDEN: But is the hon. member aware of the facts?

Br. BURTON: He does not need to read only the Liberal papers.

Mr. MacINNIS: Better look up the statutes.

Mr. MICHAUD: I am prepared to give the government of Saskatchewan a chance, but let us see what we can do or should do in this house on this important question.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Well said.

Mr. MICHAUD: I come to another aspect of the problem, which is, what is the attitude of the old people to the present scale of pensions? In my profession and, shall I say, on account of my political activities for the past ten years, I have been in touch with a number of old people seeking to obtain a pension, or an increased pension, and I must say that I have always found them most reasonable. I have yet to meet a single pensioner who is dissatisfied with the amount which the law provides for him at the present time.

Mr. GRAYDON: Better be careful with that statement.

Mr. MICHAUD: I am careful with that statement.

Mr. MacINNIS: They are getting far too much if that is the case.

Mr. MICHAUD: A statement was made this afternoon by an hon. member as to the "humiliation" of filling up these forms. I have helped a number of people to fill up application forms for the old age pension and I have never noticed the feeling expressed by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). Some difficulties have been mentioned by old people with respect to getting the pension. In certain instances they have complained about delays, and they have complained about certain other things; but I reiterate the statement I made a moment ago. Two years ago an additional $5 was granted. I think one hon. member said in the course of his remarks this afternoon that the Liberal government had not done anything for these people since the act came into operation. He must have forgotten for the time being that an increase of $5 a month was brought about two years ago. I can say that the people of my province, of my town and the vicinity were pleased when this came along, and if the present proposals go through and there is a further increase of $5 I am sure they will be pleased.

Mr. MacINNIS: But they are satisfied now. How can they be more pleased than that?

Mr. MICHAUD: I stated that I have yet to have one old pensioner come to me and

say that he is dissatisfied with the amount he gets when he is receiving the full amount. Some have come making representations that they were not in receipt of the full amount and have asked me to intercede for them in order that they may get the full pension, but in most instances the full amount of the pension was granted, and they were highly pleased.

Mr. IRVINE: I wish the hon. member would write about all mine.

Mr. MICHAUD: As has been stated this afternoon, the old age pension was never meant to be a cure-all; it is in the nature of assistance, to meet the bare subsistence requirements of life. In my province, and I suppose in other provinces, there are institutions which take old people for the amount of their pension and look after them, and as far as I have been able to ascertain they have been well looked after. An old gentleman well known to me, who is a widower, went into one of these institutions. He managed so well that after five or six months he married an old lady living in the same institution, and they seem to be very happy.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is he raising a family?

Mr. MICHAUD: I dare say that if he does not it is not because the amount of the pension is insufficient.

On the point of reduction of the age requirement from seventy to sixty years, I consider that a desirable suggestion. A number of people, particularly those between the ages of sixty-five and seventy, people unable to engage in a gainful occupation, have come to me asking for the old age pension. This is also provided for in the proposals made by the federal government to the provinces; and we should not pass any resolution which might jeopardize the success of those proposals. As far as I can recall, people looking for the social security measure are people between sixty-five and seventy years of age who are suffering from some sort of disability, and for that reason I consider that legislation along the lines of the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand) would serve a very useful purpose.

With the third point of the resolution as to the means test I am heartily in agreement. It will certainly improve the situation. There are a number of old people who make transfers of property when they reach the age of, say sixty-five, with a view to being in a position to draw the full amount of the pension. This is undesirable and with the disappearance of the means tset there would be no reason for doing that. Moreover, the means test to a certain extent destroys the initiative for thrift and it should be done away with. There are many people even over the age of seventy years who keep on working. I know some. One in particular made application for his old age pension. He had his papers prepared and everything was set, but he would not take it. He kept on working. I daresay most of those between sixty and seventy years of age, if they are in good health, would rather keep on working.

An hon. MEMBER: If they can get jobs.

Mr. MICHAUD: Yes, if they can get suitable jobs.

An hon. MEMBER: Not much money in it.

Mr. MICHAUD: The usual good wages.

If the resolution is put to the vote I shall vote against it because I do not think it is advisable to pass upon it while the proposals are before the dominion-provincial conference, being somewhat in the position of a case before the courts, designated as *sub judice*.

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Health and Welfare): There are still several hon. members who would like to speak on the motion, and I am obliged to them for letting me have the ten minutes remaining before the house rises at six o'clock to submit some facts that have a definite bearing not only on this resolution but on questions of social security in general.

As I believe hon. members will appreciate, the officers of the Department of National Health and Welfare have had under consideration types of social security legislation in every part of the world, and have been studying these matters ever since the department came into existence. Before that, social security legislation was studied by other branches of the government and in consequence the proposals made by the federal government to the dominion-provincial conference were worked out. They are proposals which we believe can be carried out by the Canadian people and which will work to their advantage. We also believe that the burden can be carried by the Canadian economy.

When we come to consider a single item of social security legislation we should take it in relation to the total picture to see what can be done and what it would cost. If the house would permit me I would put on *Hansard* costs of old age pensions of different types and different amounts at different ages. With the unanimous consent of the house I would like to put on *Hansard* estimates of costs of old age pensions, estimated for the years 1948, 1951, 1961 and 1971 on various plans. The plan proposed by the federal

government to the provinces would provide for the payment of $30 a month without a means test to everyone at the age of seventy, and that it is estimated would cost $200,000,000 in 1948.

Mr. MacNICOL: To every person?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes, over seventy. In addition, we propose to contribute on a fifty-fifty basis to the payment of old age pensions with means test to everyone from sixty-five to sixty-nine years of age, and the cost would be certainly not less than $34,000,000, and probably $40,000,000.

Mr. GREEN: For a $30 pension?

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes. The table is as follows:

ESTIMATES OF COSTS OF OLD AGE PENSIONS
1948, 1951, 1961, 1971

Amount per Month	Basis	Sex	Age	Percentage on means test	Total Cost in $ Millions			
					1948	1951	1961	1971
$	(A)			%				
25	Means test *(a)*..... (Present system including war bonus)	M & F	70 plus	40	64			
	(B)							
30	Means test *(a)*..... (Present system plus $5 per month)	M & F	70 plus	40	80			
	(C)							
30	Without means test..... (Present age, $5 per month more, payable to all)	M & F	70 plus	.....	200	220	291	350
	(D)							
30	Without means test.....	M & F	70 plus	.....	200			
	Means test *(a)*.....	M & F	65-69	25	34*(b)*			
	(Dominion proposal of August, 1945)				234			
	(E)							
25	Without means test.....	M & F	65 plus	.....	280	305	384	457
	(F)							
30	Without means test.....	M & F	65 plus	.....	336	366	461	548
	(G)							
30	Without means test.....	M & F	65 plus	.....	336	366	461	548
	Without means test.....	F	60-64	.....	82	88	99	124
					418	454	560	672
	(H)							
50	Without means test.....	M & F	60 plus	.....	851	919	1,105	1,330

(a) Where means test operates, the amount per month used n calculations is the maximum, not the average pension, except in Basis A where March, 1945, averages are used in the calculation of cost.
(b) As noted on page 40 of the Dominion's Proposals, the figure of $34 million may reach $40 million.
SOURCE: Calculations based upon population data supplied by Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

There is no country in the world, of all those that have old age pension legislation, where there is a non-contributory system that is not on a means test. Either you have a contributory system of insurance and no means test, the people receiving the pension as of right, or else you have a non-contributory system on a means test. That is the invariable rule. In other words, there is no system in the world along the lines of that suggested, as I understand his proposal, by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis).

Further, there is no system of old age pensions in the world which provides for a pension of anything like $50 a month. The rates at the present time are these—

Mr. MacNICOL: Put that on *Hansard* too.

Mr. CLAXTON: This table is not in a form in which I can put it on *Hansard*. In Canada, under the means test, the rate proposed is $30 a month maximum; in the United Kingdom, they are putting into effect a plan which is going to come gradually into operation, by which twenty-six shillings a week or $5.77, or $300 a year will be paid as of right to those who contribute. This will be supplemented by a means test plan which has not, I believe, yet been announced by the present labour government. In Australia there is a means test plan only, under which there is a payment of 32 shillings and sixpence a week, or $5.77, or a total of $300 a year. In New Zealand the new plan for payment without a means test, which is just beginning—in 1945—and which is a modification of their previous plan—

Mr. MacINNIS: It is 1941.

Mr. CLAXTON: The 1945 plan is a modification of the one they have had there for a great number of years and it comes into effect by degrees. The annual benefit is today 22 pounds, 10 shillings or $79.88, working up to a maximum of two pounds a week, which is $8.88, or $369.20 a year, which will be achieved in 1978. That is supplemented by a means test plan payable to men and women at the age of sixty of two pounds a week, with a maximum of $369.20. They will have a combination of both plans until 1978, when they will have worked out, they hope, on a basis without the means test. People pay for this in New Zealand out of the security tax of 7½ per cent of the income payable by the employer and the employee—7½ per cent by each.

Mrs. STRUM: May I ask the minister a question?

Mr. CLAXTON: I have only a minute before six o'clock and I am afraid I cannot answer any questions at the moment. In the United States, they have a contributory plan, without a means test, under which payments and benefits are related to average wages and it covers three-fifths of the gainfully employed civilians. They also have a means test plan under which the average payment per month is $29.46.

The total picture presented by these plans is that the Canadian proposal put before the provinces is a fair and workable one in line with what is in effect in other countries. It has been suggested by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) that we might have proceeded before discussing it with the provinces. I ask him seriously if that is the policy of his party.

Mr. GREEN: I did not say that.

Mr. CLAXTON: I understood the hon. member to say that we should proceed at this session to put on the statute books legislation to provide for old age pensions along the lines he suggested. There is no more certain way of retarding progress than to proceed by any means other than constitutional process and by consultation with the provinces, as we propose to do when we meet on April 25 to continue our discussions.

One further word. We can have old age pensions of this size, but we can meet the cost only out of taxes or out of borrowings or out of printed money.

Mr. MacINNIS: Or out of production.

Mr. CLAXTON: There are only three ways, and if the people of Canada want to pay taxes on the scale required, or to contribute to loans or to see their money go to pot through inflation, then I think they should arrive at that decision after they really size up the facts.

The budget estimate of the total revenue to be obtained by the federal government from income tax in 1945-1946 is $680 million.

An hon. MEMBER: On individuals.

Mr. CLAXTON: Yes. Hon. members can see something of the magnitude of the proposal to pay an old age pension of $50 at age sixty without a means test, which we estimate would cost $851 millions or more than the total sum raised by personal income tax. When this matter comes up again at this session I should like to continue these remarks and develop the general ideas behind the federal government's proposals, the reasons why we have chosen this figure of $30 payable at age seventy, and also the reasons for

the particular type of contributory plan that we have in mind. I believe that when that is done hon. members, as well as the country, will appreciate that the steps we propose are the most constructive, the most reasonable and the effective way in which to do what we all have at heart, namely to secure more to benefit those people who need it.

There is another table I should like to place on *Hansard*. This is a table showing the proportion of gainfully employed and non-gainfully employed in 1941 as fixed at the census of that year. From that it will be seen that in the age group from sixty to sixty-four, only fifteen per cent of the males in the population were not gainfully employed. From sixty-five to sixty nine, 31 per cent, and seventy and over, 69 per cent. In other words, if you extended the non-means test plan down to the age of sixty you would be paying money to a large group of people who were gainfully employed. The table is a follows:

Age Group	Gainfully Occupied	Others	Total
		(Males)	
60-64	186,033 (85%)	32,524 (15%)	218,557 (100%)
65-69	112,627 (69%)	49,890 (31%)	162,517 (100%)
70 and over	71,716 (31%)	156,676 (69%)	228,392 (100%)
Total	370,376 (61%)	239,090 (39%)	609,466 (100%)
		(Females)	
60-64	19,215 (10%)	169,379 (90%)	188,594 (100%)
65-69	12,268 (8%)	132,939 (92%)	145,207 (100%)
70 and over	8,477 (4%)	223,222 (96%)	231,699 (100%)
Total	39,960 (7%)	525,540 (93%)	565,500 (100%)

Mr. MacNICOL: Has the minister a later year than 1941?

Mr. CLAXTON: No, it is based on the census of 1941 and there are no later figures.

On motion of Mr. Claxton the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, April 11, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

PENITENTIARIES

CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF ACT EFFECTIVE BY PROCLAMATION—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, may I inform the house that by proclamation issued on April 5 and published in an extra of the official gazette of that date certain portions of the Penitentiary Act which were to come into force by proclamation, have been brought into force. These are subsection 6 of section 4; section 4A and part of subsection 2 of section 13, which relate to commissioners. Immediately thereafter order in council P.C. 1313 was passed appointing Major-General Ralph B. Gibson, of the city of Toronto, former vice chief of staff of the Canadian army, a commissioner under the act. I now table a copy of the order in council.

Mr. COLDWELL: Has Major-General Gibson had any special training or experience in penology?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No particular training in penology, but considerable experience in administration and the handling of men. After careful consideration we came to the conclusion that he had the qualifications which would fit him for this particular commission.

CRIMINAL CODE

FATAL ACCIDENTS AND INJURIES FROM HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AND LEVEL CROSSINGS

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 27 to amend the criminal code (motor cars).

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. CHURCH: The object of the bill is to call the attention of the people of Canada to the number of fatal accidents which are occurring in increasing numbers in this country. A return to an order of the house of April 3 shows that there were 149,000 accidents, and nearly 10,000 people were killed during the period covered by the return. This rate of motor car accidents on the highways is becoming a public scandal. The sections of the bill are modern and constructive in character and I hope the Minister of Justice

(Mr. St. Laurent) will consider them when he is bringing in amendments to the criminal code. I shall not read the sections, but will refer only to the marginal notes.

The first section deals with the requirement that the driver of a car shall stop after an accident. Some children were killed in the riding of the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) down near the beach by a cowardly hit-and-run driver. These hit-and-run drivers are a menace all over the country. The bill provides for imprisonment for a term not less than six months without the option of a fine.

Section 2 deals with driving while under the influence of alcohol or a narcotic. The object of this section is to add the words "under the influence of alcohol" to the section as it now stands. The next section deals also with hit-and-run drivers and provides for an increase in the penalties now imposed.

Section 5 brings the hit-and-run driver under subsection 7, and provides that an order may be made prohibiting the convicted person from driving a motor vehicle for any period not exceeding three years. The next clause deals with the causing of a death in a culpably negligent manner. This incorporates the law now in force in New York state. The amendment penalizes the driver where death results, if the driver is breaking by-laws—against speeding for instance—and where he may be thirty per cent the cause of the accident.

The next section deals with the trial of a female person. It seems only fair that in the trial of any female person by a jury a certain proportion of the jurors should be female persons. They voted 52 per cent in the elections as against a male total vote of only 48 per cent.

The marginal note for the next section reads:

Charge of manslaughter arising out of operation of motor vehicle, criminal or culpable negligence proved.

The purpose of the amendment is to define the powers of the jury in cases of manslaughter arising out of the operation of motor vehicles.

The final section defines the powers and functions of the judge and the jury by the judge. There have been instances in which cases have been taken away from the jury. Questions of law should be matters for the judge to decide, and questions of fact should be decided by the jury. The jury should decide on the evidence whether a person is guilty or not guilty.

I hope the Minister of Justice will consider these amendments to the criminal code.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WAR ASSETS—LANDING CRAFT

Mr. PEARKES:

1. How many landing craft were issued to the Combined Operations School, Courtenay, British Columbia, during the years 1942-46?
2. What was the average cost of these craft?
3. How many of these are still retained by the army?
4. How many have been declared surplus to requirements and turned over to War Assets Corporation?
5. What disposal has been made of the balance, if any?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. 42.
2. $9,843.11.
3. 30.
4. 8.
5. Condemned and written off (hulls only) 4.

EXPORTS OF WHEAT

Mr. McCUAIG:

1. How many bushels of wheat did Canada export during 1945, basis No. 1 Northern, Fort William and Vancouver?
2. To what countries was such wheat exported?
3. Was any such exported wheat sold at over $1.55 per bushel?
4. If so (a) to what countries; (b) in what quantities; (c) at what prices?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. 329,672,842 bushels.
2.

Country	Amount bushels
United Kingdom	113,313,762
Eire	7,610,632
British South Africa	2,562,641
British India	20,356,843
Ceylon	812,503
Barbados	28,250
Jamaica	27,426
Trinidad	1,050
B.W.I. others	508
Gibraltar	207,600
Malta	2,284,405
Newfoundland	3,046
New Zealand	5,124,641
Palestine	353,334
Belgium	10,679,208
China	804,753
Colombia	449,662
Costa Rica	83,330
Cuba	69,039
Czechoslovakia	207,644
Greenland	133
Egypt	9,543,187

	Amount bushels
France	9,099,934
Fr. Africa	6,541,456
St. Pierre	292
Germany	644,974
Greece	11,181,995
Honduras	19,998
Iceland	16,449
Iraq	1,461,775
Italy	2,112,071
Mexico	88,930
Morocco	5,724,690
Netherlands	15,484,784
Norway	1,467,916
Peru	1,392,098
Portugal	448,000
Port Africa	321,198
Russia	5,654,281
Salvador	82,590
Syria	289,000
Yugoslavia	858,532
United States	92,258,282
Total	329,672,842

3 and 4. The highest export price of Canadian wheat during the crop year 1945-46 to date, has been $1.55 per bushel, basis in store Fort William/Port Arthur or Vancouver. This applies to sales made to all countries. Prices for all other grades are lower than this except for Alberta red winters, on which there has been a premium of 10 cents per bushel for No. 1 A.R.W. in comparison with No. 1 northern.

WAR ASSETS—MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. WEBB:

1. How many (a) jeeps; (b) station wagons; (c) automobiles; (d) trucks, are held for sale by the War Assets Corporation?
2. Are priorities required to purchase these vehicles?
3. If so, to whom are they issued?
4. If not, what is the proper procedure to buy one?
5. What are the names of individuals or municipalities in the county of Leeds who have purchased vehicles or materials of any kind from War Assets Corporation?
6. Is there a local office of War Assets Corporation in Leeds county?
7. If so, where is it located?

Mr. McILRAITH: Question No. 25, standing in the name of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Charlton), asks for very similar information. I would draw the attention of the house to the fact that on Monday, April 1, a question was asked by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lockhart) and passed as an order for return. That question asked for detailed information about automobiles, trucks and so on, in the possession of War Assets Corporation and held for disposal. The order for return already passed seems to cover the information asked for by paragraph No. 1 of this question and by the later question in the name of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Charlton). I would ask that paragraph 1 of this question be dropped, that the remainder of the question be allowed to stand, and that question No. 25 be dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: Answered.

(*On the question of Mr. Charlton, immediately following*:)

Mr. STIRLING: May I draw attention to the fact that Your Honour called "answered" to the rest of the question of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Webb). I think the rest of that question should stand. This is the matter referred to by the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Reconstruction on the question of the hon. member for Brant.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stand.

Mr. CHARLTON:

1. How many (1) passenger motor cars; (2) station wagons; (3) sedan delivery trucks, owned by the Department of National Defence (a) army; (b) navy; (c) air force; (i) have been declared surplus; (ii) are held for disposal by War Assets Corporation; (iii) have been disposed of by War Assets Corporation?
2. To whom were such vehicles sold and at what price?
3. Were any sold to government departments?
4. If so, to what departments and how many to each?

Mr. McILRAITH: Dropped.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is certain information asked for in this question that was not answered, nor did it come within the ambit of the order for return referred to by the parliamentary assistant. The portion that is not covered by the order for return is that which has to do with the number of the various types of vehicles owned by the Department of National Defence, army, navy and air force, that have been declared surplus.

Mr. McILRAITH: I might elaborate on my previous remarks. When the hon. member has had an opportunity of looking at the order for return, which I expect will be filed in a day or two, together with the evidence given before the war expenditures committee, to be found at pages 45 and 68 of the proceedings, if he still feels that there is further information which has not been provided, the matter can then be brought forward again.

Question stands.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS—MR. FINDLATER

Mr. JOHNSTON:

1. Has a Mr. Findlater been appointed to a position under the Department of Veterans Affairs? If so, when and to what position?
2. Who recommended this appointment?
3. What salary does he receive?
4. What moneys did he receive for expenses since his appointment?
5. What qualifications does he possess for this position?
6. Has he made any personal inspections of the veterans" houses constructed or under construction in the city of Calgary?
7. If so, how many and on what dates?
8. Did he make any recommendations to the Department of Veterans Affairs regarding these houses?
9. If so, what were such recommendations?
10. Were these recomendations put into force? If so, when?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. Mr. A. Findlater, regional supervisor at Calgary was appointed to a position of field supervisor, 26th November, 1925.

2. District superintendent of soldier settlement, Calgary.

3. $2880 plus war duties supplement of $240 per annum.

4. Information not readily available as period of employment excedes 20 years. Actual expenses paid under travelling regulations.

5. Mr. Findlater was a successful soldier settler at time of appointment, and had 14½ years' farming experience in Alberta. His satisfactory service as field supervisor, and later as chief field supervisor, led to his appointment as regional supervisor, at Calgary, under the Veterans' Land Act.

6 and 7. It is not the responsibility of the regional supervisor to carry out building inspections. For this work two qualified building inspectors are employed and are on the job continuously. One of these inspectors had 18 years experience as carpenter and carpenter foreman, and the other 25 years experience in the same line of work of which he was in business for himself for 20 years. The building inspectors report to the district construction supervisor, Edmonton.

8, 9 and 10. The condition of flooring and millwork was reported to the district construction supervisor, who, with the contractor, made a careful inspection of all houses under construction. The scarcity of lumber, particularly for wood finishes, was so great that it was necessary to decide if the work should stop, or be proceeded with, using the best materials available. In view of the housing emergency facing veterans the latter course was followed. Contractor has had instructions since last January to replace any faulty material as satisfactory material becomes available.

DEPENDENTS OF SERVICE PERSONNEL ABOVE WARRANT OFFICER CLASS 1

Mr. BENTLEY:

1. Has the dependents' board of trustees provided supplementary grants or special assistance to any dependents of armed services persons holding a rank above that of warrant officer class 1?

2. If so, to whom?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

STEEL PLATE AND BAR STEEL

Mr. ISNOR:

1. Is steel plate or bar steel being exported from Canada to the United Kingdom?

2. Has there been a recent curtailment of steel plate to shipbuilders located in Nova Scotia?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No.

2. Yes. This, however, is not confined to the province of Nova Scotia. Because Canadian shipyards have accepted orders for shipbuilding in excess of capacity of Canadian mills and the recent steel strike in the United States has made it impossible to import sufficient additional quantities from that country, it has been necessary to allocate on an equitable basis the available Canadian supply which has resulted in curtailed shipments to some yards.

ESTON, SASK., POST OFFICE

Mr. JAENICKE:

What has been the revenue of the post office in Eston, Saskatchewan in each of the years, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945?

Mr. MacKINNON:

Year	Revenue
1938	$4,087 42
1939	4,511 66
1940	5,113 25
1941	5,555 09
1942	6,148 83
1943	6,558 23
1944	7,816 16
1945	8,166 30

ESTABLISHMENT OF EMBASSY AT THE VATICAN

Mr. LaCROIX:

Has the government received any requests for the establishment of an embassy at the Vatican?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Representations as to the desirability of establishing such a diplomatic mission have been made from time to time by individuals but not officially.

DOMINION BORROWINGS

Mr. QUELCH:

1. What was the total amount of money borrowed by the dominion government in each of the years from 1939 to 1945 inclusive from (a) the chartered banks; (b) the Bank of Canada; (c) the public?

2. How much of the money borrowed from the public represented savings and how much bank credit?

3. How much money was repaid by the dominion government in each of the years from 1935 to 1945 inclusive in classes (a) (b) and (c)?

4. What was the gross national debt as at March 31, 1946?

5. How much of this debt is owed to (a) individuals; (b) corporations (other than banks); (c) the chartered banks; (d) Bank of Canada?

6. How much of this debt is payable in (a) Canadian funds; (b) funds of other nations, giving names and amounts thereof?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. Details of Dominion of Canada loan flotations for the fiscal years ended March 31, 1939 to March 31, 1945, inclusive, will be found on pages LIV to LVII of the introduction to the public accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945.

2. The wording of this question is not clear. If the question means how much was borrowed from the chartered banks to finance the purchase of Victory loan bonds, the answer is that approximately all of such loans made in the period 1939-45 have been liquidated.

3. Details of Dominion of Canada domestic bond redemptions for the fiscal years ended March 31, 1939 to March 31, 1945, inclusive, will be found on pages LVIII and LIX of the introduction to the public accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945. No information is available as to the distribution of holdings of maturing issues.

4. The figures for total liabilities of Canada as at March 31, 1946, are not yet available. At March 31, 1945, total liabilities were $15,712,181,527.26.

5. (a) No information.

(b) No information.

(c) No information. The monthly return of liabilities and assets of the chartered banks of Canada shows dominion direct and guaranteed securities held by each bank. The amount of such securities held on March 31, 1945, was $2,916,559,650.

5. (d) No information. The monthly return of liabilities and assets of the Bank of Canada shows dominion and provincial direct and guaranteed securities held by the Bank of Canada. The amount of such securities held on March 31, 1945, was $1,535,247,139.65.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

6. Of the total liabilities of Canada, $13,983,763,574.91 is in the form of unmatured funded debt. On March 31, 1945, the unmatured funded debt was payable as follows:

In Canadian dollars ..	$13,638,698,042 05
In pounds sterling	12,065,532 86
In United States dollars	333,000,000 00

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—FIELD INSPECTORS AND SUPERVISORS, ALBERTA

Mr. WYLIE:

1. What are the names of field inspectors and supervisors who operated in the province of Alberta under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act in the year 1945?

2. How long was each of them employed in the said year?

3. What salary did each receive during the said year?

4. What amount of travelling expenses was paid to each during the year 1945?

MOTOR VEHICLES—PURCHASE OF 1946 PASSENGER CARS

Mr. CHARLTON:

1. How many 1946 model passenger cars have been purchased by the government?

2. By what departments have such purchases been made?

3. What (a) number; (b) make and/or model were purchased by each department?

PUBLIC SERVICE—TOTAL NUMBER OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's):

1. What is the total number of employees of the government of Canada, including employees of boards and commissions, appointed by federal authority as of March 31, 1946?

2. What is the total amount of salaries, wages and allowances paid to such employees in March, 1946?

PRIVILEGE

MR. POULIOT—REFERENCE TO ARTICLE IN "SATURDAY NIGHT"

On the orders of the day.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, on March 30 last a Toronto Weekly, *Saturday Night,* complained about the member for Temiscouata having called some professors seditious. The editors of that paper, who belong to the petrified brain-trust of desiccated bachelors and spinsters that form the Civil Liberties League of Toronto, have complained that I was guilty of contempt of court for recalling certain events of ten or twelve years ago in what I then said in the house. Ten or twelve years

ago is quite a distance in the past, and I have had to check my notes. I find that King Gordon was on the F.B.I. list of J. Edgar Hoover when Mr. Bennett was prime minister, and here the paper says—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. gentleman to be as brief as possible in raising his question of privilege.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, it is a question of privilege. That sheet has said in the first place that I was guilty of contempt of court, which is an offence, for having made the statement in the House of Commons; and it said further that I would be afraid to repeat it outside of the house where I had not the protection enjoyed by a member of parliament when speaking in the house. I shall speak outside of the house on April 13 in eastern Ontario. I shall be ready to repeat then what I have said, if they are not satisfied, and I will prove it too.

BUTTER

INQUIRY AS TO EXTENSION OF PRICE INCREASE TO DAIRY BUTTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. MARK C. SENN (Haldimand): I would ask either the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Finance whether the wartime prices and trade board is giving consideration to an extension to dairy butter of the four cents per pound increase in the price ceiling on creamery butter, and if so when we may expect a decision.

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, consideration is being given to such an extension. I do not know when a decision will be arrived at, but I expect soon.

INCOME TAX

INQUIRY AS TO APPLICATION OF CONTRIBUTORY SAVINGS PORTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue, arising out of numerous inquiries that I am receiving from persons at present unemployed who still have a substantial portion of their 1945 income tax to meet at the end of April. Will the government consider applying the savings portion of their tax to liquidate what is owing at the end of April on the 1945 income tax?

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for having given me notice of his question. The matter has been given the serious consideration of the government. It is not the policy of the government to allow application of the savings portion of the income tax to liquidate the balance of the 1945 payments. This is done on the ground that it would be discriminating in favour of one class of people.

Mr. GILLIS: The unemployed without an income can surely not be expected to meet their payments at the end of April. That would not be discrimination; I think it would be in the best interests of the government.

REPEATER CRIMINALS

RESOLUTION OF THE CHIEF CONSTABLES' ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. At the fortieth annual conference of the Chief Constables' Association of Canada, it was resolved:

> That, in the opinion of the conference, there is a definite need for a policy to be formulated by the government of Canada in respect to the serious problem of the repeater criminal, whose activities are so largely responsible for crime in the dominion.

I understand that this resolution was presented to the Minister of Justice by a delegation of this association on November 7, 1945. Will the Minister of Justice kindly indicate to the house if the government is giving consideration to this resolution and, if so, what steps are being taken in the matter?

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): My understanding of the resolution was that it contained no suggestion; it wanted a result to be achieved. The matter is one which it is my intention to ask the new commissioner of penitentiaries to investigate and report upon.

CANADIAN NAVY

FURTHER STATEMENT RESPECTING LIEUTENANT FRANK B. LEE

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): May I ask the Minister of National Defence if the answer he gave to me yesterday, *Hansard*, page 730, while it may have been technically correct, is actually in accordance with the facts, and if any intimation was given Mr. Lee that his racial origin would prevent his application from receiving consideration?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very glad to elaborate on the answer I gave yesterday; perhaps it was too brief. I can best do so by reading a copy of a letter which I addressed to Mr. Lee:

Ottawa, April 10, 1946.

Frank B. Lee, Esq.,
c/o Queen's University,
Kingston, Ontario

Dear Mr. Lee:

Your letter dated March 27, addressed to the Prime Minister, has been sent to me for reply.

The regulations concerning entry into the Royal Canadian Navy permit the entry of any British subject provided he fulfils the requirements prescribed from time to time as to age, education, physical fitness, character and technical knowledge for entry into the branch or component selected. All such applications must be made to Naval Service Headquarters at Ottawa and passed on here. In connection with the examination of applications, a selection board has been created, of which Captain J. M. Grant is the president.

I have made inquiries concerning the matters dealt with in your letter of March 27 and am informed that on that date the selection board interviewed candidates from Queen's University at H.M.C.S. *Cataraqui*. I understand that you had made no previous application for an interview by the board and did not appear for such an interview until the board was preparing to leave H.M.C.S. *Cataraqui* to catch a Toronto train and that you then approached Captain Grant as the latter was actually leaving the establishment to enter a motor car and asked him if there was any possibility of your application for entry into the electrical branch being considered.

It appeared to Captain Grant that you were somewhat older than the average candidate, and he reports that he advised you that it was doubtful whether your application would be considered and that in any case there was then no time for an interview. You then asked if your racial origin would be a cause for rejection and Captain Grant informs me he replied that it might be but that, in any event, final approval or rejection of a candidate is made by Naval Service Headquarters.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to say that in voicing the view that your racial origin might be a cause for rejection Captain Grant was merely expressing his own personal opinion and in no way reflecting the policy of the Department. He was quite correct in stating that applications must be made to Naval Service Headquarters and that the final approval or rejection of any candidate must be made here.

If you desire to make application to the Naval Secretary, Naval Service Headquarters, Ottawa, for entry into the Royal Canadian Navy, I wish personally to assure you that your application will receive every consideration.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) D. C. Abbott.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

TRAIN TRAVEL

INQUIRY AS TO REMOVAL OF FURTHER RESTRICTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. O. BREITHAUPT (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Transport what restrictions on train travel and sleeping car service have recently been lifted on Canadian railroads, and when further improvements will be made in this respect?

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): I have not yet been able to obtain a report from the transport controller on this matter, and I have to draw upon my memory. So far as I remember there are but three orders left under the jurisdiction of the transport controller, and none of them has to do with restrictions on train travel and sleeping car service. Some time ago I announced that restrictions on reduced rates for week-end travel for parties of ten or more, and covering dominion and provincial public holidays, would be lifted, and that has been done, effective as of March 15.

WAR CRIMES

CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE IN TRIALS AT HONG KONG

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): I have a question to address to the Prime Minister in his capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will he tell the house whether a Canadian representative has been appointed for the trials of Japanese war criminals at Hong Kong which are now proceeding, and can he say when that representative will be dispatched?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): My hon. friend did not give me notice of his question. I will take this as notice, and have it replied to to-morrow.

GASOLINE

INQUIRY AS TO REMOVAL OF WAR TAXES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): I have a question to ask the Minister of Finance. For the purpose of encouraging increased production of much-needed food supplies, has the government taken action to remove the three cent war tax on gasoline, and the recently-imposed two cent tax on motor fuels?

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the answer is in the negative, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. FAIR: Then my subsequent question is, why is this action not taken?

Mr. ILSLEY: That question is out of order.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE ON RESOLUTION PRECEDING MONEY BILL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As announced last night, the first order for to-day is the consideration of the resolution respecting the loan to the United Kingdom. Before the item is called I feel that I should like to say a few words to hon. members about the procedure in debate on a resolution preceding a money bill. My reason for doing so is that the house having departed from its rules on some occasions during the last few years, the debates have been much longer than they otherwise would have been, and the public business has been delayed as a result. What I wish to say is that the rule is that a resolution must precede a money bill, but the resolution is intended merely as a notice to the house that a money bill is about to be introduced. It is not intended that the notice should be debatable; rather, the correct practice is that the resolution should be allowed to pass, the house go into committee and that, in committee, a statement be made on essential features of the bill which is later to be introduced, this to be followed if so desired by some brief discussion. It is not intended that a lengthy discussion should take place at that stage. The discussion on the bill should come after the bill itself is introduced.

I have spoken of this in previous sessions; if I recall aright, in 1943, when I think the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) who was then leading the opposition, agreed with me, at least in part, that it was desirable that discussion at the resolution stage should not be prolonged unduly: In 1944 I again drew the attention of the house to the position of a resolution preceding the introduction of a money bill. I again pointed out what I have said a moment or two ago. In that year, if I am not mistaken, the leader of the C.C.F. party expressed agreement with that view. Last year I was absent from the country at the time the resolution on the appropriation bill was before the house and I did not, therefore, speak of this particular aspect at the time, but I did notice that, by not following the rules, a very long debate took place in committee on the resolution. In fact, this is what also occurred on the war appropriations bills in the other years I have referred to, with the result that, after weeks of discussion in committee on the resolution, the bill was introduced, and then the bill itself—I have forgotten whether this was the case last year or not, but I know it was the case in some years—went through with practically no discussion at all, but with some comment in the press thereafter that it seemed unwise for the house to be voting millions of dollars with little or no discussion on the second reading of the bill.

One of two things is certain to follow if we do not observe the rule; either the discussion which takes place on the resolution, and which may run along for days, may be repeated at great length in the debate on the bill, or, as I have just indicated, there will be a lengthy discussion on the resolution and then the house will take the view that, as the matter has already been discussed at length the bill itself should be allowed to go through with little or no discussion and, as a consequence thereof with some misunderstanding thereafter on the part of the public.

This morning, in order that I might give the house an official word, I took up this matter with the Clerk. I have from him a statement which I shall read as authoritative in the matter. It is as follows:

> The motion for referring money resolutions to the committee of the whole is similar to the first reading of a bill which is not debatable under our standing order 71. The object of the resolution recommended by the crown is to give the house a first opportunity to decide if there is a prima facie case for introduction of a bill. The details of the projected measure are not then disclosed and the resolution is necessarily short although care is always taken that the terms used are sufficiently wide to cover the whole of the bill which will be subsequently introduced.
>
> This house confirmed on June 1, 1936, the Speaker's decision to the effect that the fundamental terms of the resolution submitted to the house with the governor general's recommendation cannot be amended. In the United Kingdom parliament, where the standing order governing the case is the same as ours, no motion is made for the Speaker to leave the Chair when the order is called. May says, page 506:
>
> > "If a resolution appears on the notice paper to be considered in committee of the whole house under this standing order, and a minister of the crown signifies the royal recommendation, the Speaker leaves the Chair forthwith and the house resloves itself into committee."

As hon. members know, the Clerk has been a long time in the house and has followed its proceedings closely. Moreover he is an authority on the rules. He adds this paragraph:

When Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Robert Borden led political parties in this house either on the treasury benches or in opposition they always took a firm stand against the discussion of a money resolution when the Speaker was in the chair. Their contention was that the motion was formal, and was only made because there was no other way for the house to go into committee of the whole.

As hon. members are aware, a committee of the house is considering the rules, and considering them with a view to making the proceedings somewhat less lengthy than they have been at times. I should think the best way to further the object we had in appointing that committee is to abide by such rules as we have already, and make such further amendments to them as may be necessary.

I am only explaining the situation to the house: I am sure what I have suggested is the correct practice, and that, if followed, it will preserve all that the house may wish to preserve of the rights of members and will help materially to expedite its business.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: there are two things to consider. There is the motion that you put for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole, and there is the discussion of the resolution in the committee. If we do not discuss the motion when the chair puts it to the house, there is nothing in our rules which prevents a member from discussing the matter when the chairman of the committee of the whole is in the chair. These are two entirely different matters. The leader of the house knows that very well. But I just bring to the attention of hon. members the necessary distinction between both discussions—the debate before Mr. Speaker, before the full house; and the discussion when the chairman or the deputy speaker is in the chair in committee of the whole.

LOAN TO UNITED KINGDOM

APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL AGREEMENT SIGNED MARCH 6, 1946

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to come into force in whole or in part on proclamation for the purpose of approving the financial agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the United Kingdom signed on March 6, 1946, and of granting authority, (a) to advance to the government of the United Kingdom before December 31, 1951, amounts not exceeding in the aggregate one thousand two hundred and fifty million dollars ($1,250,000,000); (b) to continue until January 1, 1951, the interest-free provision of the loan to the government of the United Kingdom under The War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act, 1942; (c) to cancel the amount owing by the government of the United Kingdom to the government of Canada with respect to the British Commonwealth air training plan being the sum of four hundred and twenty-five million dollars ($425,000,000); (d) to borrow for the purpose of paragraph (a) under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, 1931, sums not exceeding one thousand two hundred and fifty million dollars ($1,250,000,000); and (e) to carry out the other provisions of the said agreement.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Despite the speech which we have just heard from the Prime Minister, I am quite sure that at least the Minister of Finance, who is charged with piloting this resolution through the house, will undoubtedly be expected to make out the prima facie case of which the Prime Minister spoke. I suggest that this is the time for him to do so, in case there are others who desire to speak before Mr. Speaker leaves the chair.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Perhaps the house will allow me to make a brief reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Peel. The prima facie case appears in the notice itself. I am simply interpreting the rules. If I have given the wrong interpretation, I am prepared to stand corrected; but what I say to my hon. friend is this. If the Minister of Finance now makes his statement at length, while the Speaker is in the chair, in all probability he will be followed by several others before the house goes into committee and before we get down to the resolution stage of the discussion. When the bill itself is before the house, hon. members will be in a position to debate it on second reading and to discuss its details in committee of the whole. We may follow one of two courses. We may proceed in the manner suggested by my hon. friend, and have a debate on the resolution while the Speaker is in the chair, and then a lengthy discussion in committee on the resolution; then when we come to the bill the house will have debated the whole question and the bill will probably pass in a very short time. Or when we come to the second reading of the bill, if there is a desire on the part of some in the house to block the measure, there will probably be endless repetition of what has taken place on the resolution while the Speaker was in the chair.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is the Prime Minister really interpreting a rule, or is he telling us what was the custom prior to the war? So far as his statement goes, I think it is quite sound that we should avoid two or three

discussions on the same matter. But I should like to know whether we have a rule, or whether what the Prime Minister is suggesting is that we follow a custom which was in vogue before the war. I can find no rule, I may say.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend's observations suggest precisely the reason I had for conferring with the Clerk of the House, who is an authority on the rules, and asking for a written opinion from him before speaking again on this in the house. I have read the Clerk's opinion to the house. I could not put my hand on a particular rule, but there is a rule in the sense that it is a practice which the house has followed, and which authorities on procedure set forth. The other method of proceeding has been a departure from the correct practice.

Mr. POULIOT: If there is no rule, there cannot be an authority. He could not be an authority on nil.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

Mr. ILSLEY: I presume it will be appropriate for me to make a full explanation of this resolution, even though we are in committee.

Mr. BRACKEN: Before the minister proceeds, may I ask him a question? I do not know whether we fully understand what the Prime Minister had in view in his statement a few moments ago. The Minister of Finance is now proposing to make a full statement on the measure. That, I agree, is quite proper and necessary, but I trust that if the minister is allowed to make a full statement there will be no desire on the part of the government that others shall be denied an opportunity to make full statements also.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In committee there is opportunity for full discussion.

Mr. ILSLEY: As I understand it, there can be the fullest discussion in committee; indeed the committee is the proper place for a discussion of details of a measure such as this. In order to introduce the discussion and the details it will be necessary for me to say something about the agreement itself and the principles underlying it, together with the reasons for it.

The financial agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the United Kingdom, signed on March 6th, was made public immediately after its signature and was made available to the members of the house in printed form at the beginning of the session. In moving this resolution, I wish to explain as briefly as I can the essential purpose of the agreement as a whole and its various provisions.

This agreement is the keystone in the financial measures and arrangements made by this country for international trade and reconstruction.

The need for a credit of this magnitude and on these terms springs not only from the effects of the war upon Britain, but also from the vital importance to Canada of the re-establishment, expansion and continued development of foreign trade. As compared with others, Canadians enjoy a high standard of living. We look forward to a higher standard. We are making our plans to achieve that higher standard, but our country is so specialized in its resources and its development that it can provide high standards of living only by trade and exchange. Cut off from trade or faced with a severe loss of markets abroad, we could not maintain even our present standards, despite whatever success we might have in securing full employment. Given access to expanding foreign markets and to imports of things we require, we can make our own employment effective in yielding us living standards far beyond any that the average Canadian enjoyed before the war. Exporting the products of our farms, forests, mines and factories, utilizing cheap hydro power, Canadians can earn a living second only to that enjoyed by our neighbours in the United States. Denied the opportunity of exporting and importing on a large scale, however, we would become increasingly conscious that we are a small, northern country, lacking many of the resources and advantages which are necessary if a country is to live well within itself.

In normal times our employment, as well as our living standards, depends upon trade. When our export markets are depressed, Canadians are thrown out of work. Without a revival in exports, work can be found for them only on less productive jobs than those in the export trades. Our farmers and our other primary producers are vitally dependent upon foreign markets. The prices they receive and the amount which they can sell must, over the long run, be determined mainly by the markets outside of Canada for our wheat, our bacon, our cheese, our apples, our fish, our lumber and our metals. In the short run we can give some protection to our farmers and our fishermen by floor prices and other such artificial devices; over the long run, however, nothing can protect their real interests against a loss of markets abroad.

Our financial strength, as well as our economic prosperity, now requires high levels of national income, and therefore of foreign trade, to maintain the level of Government revenues that are required if the Government is going to meet all the commitments which have been undertaken, both as a result of the war and as a result of the changing views of the Canadian public on the responsibilities that any government should assume in conditions of to-day. If we are to be successful in our public finance, we cannot afford to be hesitant and half-hearted in promoting the foreign trade which is the basis of our prosperity.

Our interest is not simply in finding some place to put our surpluses; we must receive payment for our exports that can be used in discharging our own debts and in purchasing the imports which we require, and which we want for our higher standard of living. To accomplish this purpose we must be able to use the proceeds of our exports to the United Kingdom and the continent of Europe in paying our own bills and debts in the United States and in making purchases wherever we can best obtain the goods we need. We have a special interest in being able to use the currency that we receive for our exports, to obtain other currencies that we need for the payments we must make.

Already the government, with the support of parliament, has undertaken many measures to restore, expand and develop Canada's trade. The principal one to which I shall refer at present is our programme of export credits, which is serving to finance a large part of our current exports. In the last session of parliament, on December 3, I made a detailed statement on our policies and operations in this field, and I shall not repeat here the substance of what I said at that time. As the leader of the opposition and others have asked me to review our foreign lending operations at this time, however, I wish to give the house a brief summary of the position up to the present.

Under part II of the Export Credits Insurance Act, as amended at the last session of parliament, our total authority for making direct loans to other governments is $750 million and our authority for giving guarantees is $200 million—and by that I mean I think it is two or three million dollars, or something like that—and no guarantees have been given since my review in December. Against our $750 million authority for direct loans we have now entered into agreements to lend $502,500,000. including the agreement with the government of France which was signed this week, and we have undertaken to lend additional amounts of $142,000,000 to those with whom we have already made agreements. This makes our total commitment $644,500,000 at present. Of this an amount of $67,412,051 had actually been advanced up to March 31.

The amounts and terms of the individual loans can most conveniently be given in a short table, which, with the permission of the house, I will place on *Hansard* at this point:

Credits Under Part II of The Export Credits Insurance Act

Country	Amount of Credit	Time of Repayment	Interest Rate	Amount Used by March 31/46
Belgium	$ 25,000,000[1]	1947-1976	3%	$25,000,000
China	60,000,000	1948-1977	3%	nil
Czechoslovakia	19,000,000	1950-1954	2½%	3,191,551
France	242,500,000	1947-1976	3%	nil
Netherlands	125,000,000	1950-1976	3·05%	25,150,000
Netherlands East Indies	15,000,000[2]	1950-1954	2¼%	1,800,000
Norway	13,000,000[3]	1951-1959	2¾%	9,495,000
U.S.S.R.	3,000,000	1950	2%	2,775,500
Total	$502,500,000			$67,412,051

Add: Additional amounts committed (see footnotes) $142,000,000

Total commitments: $644,500,000

[1] An additional amount of $75,000,000 has been tentatively agreed with Belgium on the same terms.

[2] An additional amount of $50,000,000 has been promised to the Netherlands East Indies on the same terms.

[3] An additional amount of $17,000,000 has been promised to Norway on the same terms.

I should add that some advances have been made to France under section 3, which I shall point out later. Those advances will be transferred to the agreements, so to speak, in the near future.

I shall have a little more to say later about the U.S.S.R. This amount is not the whole amount that the U.S.S.R. owes Canada. Advances have been made to the extent of perhaps another $9 million, under other authorities. However, I shall deal with that later.

Mr. BRACKEN: When was this credit extended to Russia?

Mr. ILSLEY: During the latter part of 1945. In respect of some of the items it was agreed that it should be extended long before that. But there are so many transactions—some dealing with wheat, some with industrial equipment, and some with mutual aid supplies which were not delivered before the end of the war—that it is almost impossible to give a summary explanation in a few words.

So the total of the amount of credits covered by the agreements is $502,500,000; the amount of cash used up to March 31, 1946, is $67,412,051. Additional amounts committed for, which I have mentioned, amount to $142 million, making a total commitment of $644,500,000.

Then, as I started to say, for the sake of completeness, I should also mention that temporary advances have been made on behalf of allied governments under section 3 of the War Expenditure and Demobilization Appropriation Acts and previous War Appropriation Acts. During the past year these have served as temporary loans to certain of the governments to whom we are providing credits under The Export Credits Insurance Act. A table of these advances as of February 28 was given in answer to a question and appears on page 417 of *Hansard*. It has not been possible to provide a complete table as yet for the same items as of March 31, as a number of the accounting transactions are not yet completed. I should mention, however, that the list for the end of March includes amounts of approximately $80 million on behalf of France, which will be repaid shortly from the export credit which has just been provided to that country, approximately $30 million on behalf of the United Kingdom, representing costs incurred subsequent to February 28 and therefore not covered by the claims agreement, approximately $14 million for the Netherlands, $9 million for the U.S.S.R., $8 million for Australia, and $5 million for Belgium. These figures do not include the items that have been settled by the claims agreement with the United Kingdom, nor do they include certain expenditures made out of appropriated funds which it is expected to recover in whole or in part from other countries, such as military relief, for example, and costs of production of some supplies originally ordered for Mutual Aid and which are now being sold.

A detailed report on operations under part II of the Export Credits Insurance Act will be presented to the house later this month, and the house will have an opportunity to discuss them, as it is planned to bring into the house a bill amending certain provisions of that act, although not altering the amount that may be loaned under it.

Turning now to the special case of Britain, we should note first that her need for credits is huge in comparison with the other countries with which we have dealt. Moreover, there are special factors in the case of the United Kingdom, which I shall discuss in a moment, that necessitate and justify different terms from those we have offered as a matter of policy in other cases. The government is, therefore, not proposing to deal with the credit to the United Kingdom under the Export Credits Insurance Act, but instead is seeking the specific approval of parliament for this financial agreement that has been concluded with the British government.

During the five years from 1946 to 1950, the United Kingdom will be going through a period of transition and reconstruction, both in its domestic and in its international economic affairs. In this period it will be endeavouring to revive and establish its export trade, which was so seriously curtailed during the war when all Britain's manpower was mobilized for war service, war production and only the most essential civilian purposes. It will take time for British exports to get back to their pre-war volume, although the progress made over the past few months is encouraging. It is necessary for Britain to do much more than to regain the pre-war levels, however, if she is to pay her way internationally. She has had to sacrifice many of the overseas investments she had made, and will no longer be able to count on as much income from this source as before to help her pay for imports. This must be replaced by increased exports. Moreover, the losses incurred in shipping during the war have reduced, at least temporarily, the income from her merchant marine, while the general dislocation of trade and finance caused by the war has interfered with the British overseas earnings in respect of insurance and financing services, which also helped to pay for imports.

I am now going to speak about deficits, and I do not want confusion between domestic deficits, budget deficits and deficits in international accounts.

Britain is confronted with a very serious deficit in her international accounts which she is trying to keep down by the utmost economy in her purchases and expenditures abroad, and by the utmost efforts in promoting her exports. This deficit, however, must be financed by borrowing in one form or another. The British authorities have estimated that the deficit for the current year 1946 will be no less than £750 million, which is equivalent to $3,300 million Canadian. This deficit will decline during 1947 and 1948, and it is expected that for these two years together it will amount to about £500 million, or $2,220 million Canadian. What the figures will be in 1949 and 1950 is, of course, very difficult to predict at this time, but unless completely unforeseen developments occur, the deficit in 1949 should be small and a balance should be achieved by 1950. This is what the British refer to as getting back to equilibrium.

Thus for the period as a whole it seems likely that Britain will need to borrow abroad a total amount which will exceed the equivalent of about 5½ billion Canadian dollars. The United States loan will provide her with the equivalent of 4,120,000,000 Canadian dollars for future purchases, and this loan which we are proposing to make would bring the total up to $5,375,000,000. The remainder the United Kingdom will need to find elsewhere, together with such amounts as are required to discharge existing indebtedness, which, of course, is not included in the estimate of her deficit on current account.

The figures I have given apply to Britain's total position and not her position *vis-à-vis* Canada alone. We expect that the excess of what Britain pays to Canada for supplies and services during 1946 over what she receives from us currently for supplies and services, will amount to approximately $600 million. Next year, that is in 1947, the amount of this deficit with Canada will be reduced both because of lower expenditures of Britain here and because British exports to Canada will be at higher levels. The total may be expected to amount to about $400 or $500 million. From that figure, the deficit may decline gradually in subsequent years to some more or less permanent normal figure, which it is difficult to forecast at this time. Of course before the war there was always a heavy British deficit *vis-à-vis Canada*. The exports of Canada to Great Britain were very much greater than the exports of Great Britain to Canada. The essential point, however, is that in meeting her own requirements in Canada, Britain will probably need to use within the next three years this $1,250 million which we are proposing to lend her. In the meantime she may need to use some of it in providing Canadian dollars to other countries in the sterling area in exchange for their receipts in sterling which they wish to spend in Canada, and which we, of course, are most anxious that they should be free to spend here. Consequently, I would expect this credit that we are proposing to make available to Britain will be fully drawn upon by the end of 1948, and thereafter she will be financing her deficit in Canada from other sources, for example, by selling us gold or other foreign exchange that we require.

These figures which I have cited will make it clear that in respect of the amounts involved the case of the United Kingdom is unique. There are other and even more important reasons for regarding the British situation as a special one requiring terms and conditions in a financial agreement that are quite different to those in our other loans. This view is not ours alone. It has been expressed quite clearly and emphatically by the United States government, and perhaps I might be permitted to quote the report of the national advisory council on international, monetary and financial problems, comprising the United States secretary of the treasury, secretary of state, secretary of commerce, the chairman of the board of governors of the federal reserve system, and the chairman of the board of directors of the export-import bank of Washington. In their statement of February 21 is included the following paragraph:

> 3. The proposed loan to Britain requiring congressional authorization is a special case, but one which is an integral part of the foreign economic programme of this government. No other country has the same crucial position in world trade as England. Because of the wide use of the pound sterling in world trade, the large proportion of the world's trade which is carried on by the countries of the British empire, and the extreme dependence of England upon imports, the financial and commercial practices of Britain are of utmost significance in determining what kind of world economy we shall have. The early realization of the full objectives of the Bretton Woods programme, including the elimination of exchange restrictions and other barriers to world trade and investment, requires an immediate solution to Britain's' financial problem. The international monetary fund agreement permits the continued imposition of certain of these restrictions for as much as five years; in the financial agreement of December 6, 1945, the British agree to their removal within one year from the effective date of that agreement. It is the view of the council that the British case is unique and will not be a precedent for a loan to any other country.

These reasons for regarding the United Kingdom position as a special one requiring special treatment are much more important in relation to Canada even than they are to the United States. They are more important for two reasons: first, because we are so much more vitally interested in the future of international trade as a whole than the United States, and, secondly, because such a large proportion of our trade takes place with the United Kingdom and other countries in the sterling area and we are most concerned to continue this trade and to continue to be able to receive payment for our exports to Britain and other sterling area countries in a form that we can use for expenditures elsewhere.

Britain has for many, many years occupied a key position in international trade and in its development. For more than a century it has been the greatest importing nation in the world. Despite the enormous growth of the importance of the United States in international trade and finance after the first world war, Britain remained much the largest importer. In 1938, for example, British imports comprised approximately 19 per cent of the total imports of the world, whereas American imports amounted to only slightly over eight per cent of the total. Nor do these figures alone make clear the great importance of Britain's markets. The nature of her imports was such that she constituted the chief market for countries such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina and Denmark, as well as many smaller countries, all of which were greatly dependent upon exports for their prosperity and their general welfare.

Because of this large and central place which Britain occupies in world trade, British policies in regard to trade are of critical importance to exporting countries and particularly to Canada. In addition, British policies will influence and largely determine the policies of many other countries, including particularly the countries now in the sterling area and probably the countries of western Europe. If Britain follows one type of policy it will enable and encourage these other countries to follow it as well. Therefore, British trade policy in the next few years, when the whole pattern of postwar trade is to be determined, will be of the very greatest importance.

There are, broadly speaking, two alternative types of policy open to Britain at the present time. The first and much the more desirable policy from our point of view is the type reflected in the Bretton Woods agreements and the proposals for expansion of world trade and employment put forward by the United States government. This type of trade and exchange policy involves a minimum of restrictions on trade, tariff reductions, the elimination of discriminatory import quotas and exchange practices, and the freedom of each country to use any currency that it has obtained through trade with another country in carrying on trade with any third country. This type of policy would make possible not only a high level of trade but freedom in the direction of trade. The alternative type of policy, on the other hand, which is open to the United Kingdom is one of bilateral arrangements in which Britain would purchase goods on condition that the selling country would take British goods in exchange, one involving discrimination in both importing and exporting and substantial restrictions on the use of currency received by exporting countries. Under this type of policy if Britain were forced to follow it, she would endeavour to make the most of the bargaining power which her huge import markets give her in order to improve the terms on which she trades and to force her exports into the markets of other countries.

The choice which Britain makes between these two alternative policies is vitally important to Canada as well as to the United States and to other countries which are largely dependent upon exports. There are many in the United Kingdom, some of them in very influential positions, who contend that Britain cannot afford the risks of liberal policies under present circumstances. They propose that she should exploit the strong bargaining position that will be hers after the present shortages disappear and buyers' markets return. Some persons in Britain even seem to see virtues in the political and economical arrangements likely to result from the restricted trading blocs which would emerge from a policy of bi-lateral bargaining and discrimination. On the other hand, there are many who realize, as we realize here, the advantages to Britain of liberal policies that will encourage the maximum development of trade. Britain can follow these policies which we favour if the British government and the British people can have confidence that they will possess sufficient financial resources to engage in trade on these liberal lines, which would involve more imports and a larger temporary increase in Britain's indebtedness than would the other policies, pending a revival in British export trade.

Britain cannot afford to choose the liberal trade policy unless she gets loans from the United States and Canada on liberal terms. If she follows these policies, which we wish to see her adopt, she will have to discard

within the next year many of the defensive and discriminatory import and exchange measures which she adopted during the war to protect her financial position under the enormous strains which the war thrust upon it. She will have to go into debt to the United States and to Canada, and perhaps to others, on a large scale. Britain can only afford to undertake these debts with any confidence of being able to repay them if the terms recognize the realities of her international financial position and make allowance for the relatively narrow margin she will have available over the long run to make repayment and pay interest. This necessity for liberal terms arises on the one side from the huge amounts which it is necessary for Britain to borrow, and on the other from the effects which the war has had upon her international financial position.

We must realize that Britain is no longer a wealthy country in international terms. She has sacrificed her international financial strength in meeting the costs of the war. Before the war Britain had substantial overseas assets that yielded her, on balance, an income of approximately a billion dollars a year.

After Dunkirk, Britain, as part of her all-out mobilization, threw all of her financial resources at home and overseas into the struggle, and used her ability to borrow abroad both in North America and in the sterling area. From that time until the end of hostilities, she incurred heavy costs outside her own borders in buying supplies and in financing the conduct of warfare in many parts of the world. The United States and Canada relieved her quite rightly of a considerable part of these costs in North America by lend-lease and mutual aid. These, however, were truly part of our North American war effort rather than aid to Britain, who continued to carry more than her full share of the financial costs of the war. As a consequence of these huge overseas expenditures, Britain was forced to liquidate her overseas investments to a value equivalent to approximately five billion Canadian dollars. About twenty per cent of these liquidated investments were Canadian securities. This liquidation of assets, however, was only the beginning. Britain proceeded to borrow heavily abroad in order to finance the costs of the war outside Britain and her total external debts increased by the equivalent of 13 billion Canadian dollars. In addition, she used up practically all her foreign exchange reserves before lend-lease commenced, and has only been able to rebuild them to little more than about half of what they were prior to Munich. As a consequence of all these changes, the British are now worse off to the extent of about 20 billion Canadian dollars than they were when the war commenced. Now the war and the effects of the war upon her exports and her overseas expenditure have left Britain in the situation where she must borrow a further five or six billion dollars during the transition period. As a result of the war, therefore, she will end up with her international position worsened by the equivalent of over twenty-five billion Canadian dollars, as compared with her position in 1939.

In addition to these losses in her external position, Britain of course suffered great losses at home—losses in property, in manpower and in wealth. We are all familiar with the spectacular damage caused by bombs and rockets; we are not so familiar with the insidious losses that arose because Britain was unable to repair and maintain her equipment, her houses and all the property that goes to make possible modern civilization. In addition, of course, the British cut down their standards of living and their consumption substantially below pre-war figures on average, while we on this continent were able to raise ours. I mention these losses within Britain only in order that we shall not seem to concentrate solely on the financial side. Other allies have suffered enormous losses in their own countries. None, however, has borne the international costs that Britain has borne; none is faced with the same tremendous problem of readjustment in the balance of their international payments. Alone among the allies, Britain has suffered as a result of the war a great deterioration in her external financial position and now, in addition, she must borrow huge new sums in order to embark in peacetime upon the trade policies which are so important to us.

The government has examined the present and prospective financial situation of Britain at length. We have come to the conclusion that Britain can undertake the trade and financial policies that she would like to undertake, and that we would like to see her undertake, if we and the United States are prepared to enter into financial agreements such as those already signed with her. We have come to the conclusion, after the most serious study and discussion of the matter, that terms more onerous than those provided in this agreement would not enable Britain to follow the policies which are in the long-run interests of both countries, and indeed of all countries. We have also come to the conclusion that the British government will be able to meet the terms of this agreement over the next fifty-five years. The British authorities themselves considered

this aspect of the matter most thoroughly and they have taken the most careful and responsible attitude possible in regard to the obligations which they have incurred under this agreement and the Anglo-American agreement. They have been determined from the outset, and indeed they made this determination clear to us as early as 1944, that they would not incur debts which they could not honestly believe they would be able to discharge.

I should like now to outline the main provisions of the agreement and to make some comments upon them that may help the house to understand their meaning and purpose.

In the first place, I should like to explain that this financial agreement and the other agreement on the settlement of war claims are separate and distinct. The agreement on the settlement of war claims is essentially a measure to settle with precision and finality a large number of outstanding claims between the two governments, without making any concession of consequence on either side. The amounts of some of the claims which are settled by this claims agreement are open to argument, and it would have been possible to spend years in debating whether this claim or that should be one or two or three million dollars, more or less, all things considered. Both sides have come to the conclusion that the payment by the United Kingdom to Canada of $150 million would be a fair and reasonable settlement of the net balance of the claims by Canada on the United Kingdom over the claims by the United Kingdom on Canada. There should, during the consideration of the estimates, be an opportunity for discussing the details of the claims covered by this agreement, if members wish to do so. The transactions to implement the agreement are being carried out under the War Expenditures and Demobilization Appropriation Acts of the 1945-46 fiscal year. Britain has already paid us in gold the $150 million she undertook to pay in this settlement.

The first item of interest in the financial agreement itself is, of course, the amount of the credit and the way in which it may be drawn upon. The British representatives asked for this amount, and demonstrated to our satisfaction that they would in fact require this much and more to finance the purchases which they intended to make in Canada during the six-year period in which the credit may be drawn upon. In fact, as I have already indicated, the British deficit of Canadian dollars will likely be such that the total amount of this credit will be drawn before the end of 1948. The British representatives made it clear to us that they expected that Britain would need to finance additional purchases in Canada from other cash resources.

The terms of the loan relating to interest and repayment are, of course, the same as those in the agreement between Britain and the United States. During the years 1946-50 no interest is payable on the amount of the loan which will have been used. The reason for this is that this is the period during which Britain will be experiencing difficulty in her balance of payments as a result of the immediate after-effects of the war. This is the period during which she needs to use the credit, and she cannot afford to pay interest in this period without making additional credits necessary. Interest commences at the beginning of the year 1951 and for that year is payable on the whole amount outstanding at the end of the year. From that time on, interest is payable each year on the amount of the credit outstanding during that year. Principal repayments are made at the end of each year from 1951 to 2000 A.D.

We would naturally have preferred a higher rate of interest but after careful consideration of the probable British balance of payments, we reached the conclusion that two per cent was all that Britain would be in a position to pay. Indeed, she will not be able to afford even this rate of interest unless her exports expand and are maintained at a high level. It is for this reason that waiver of interest payments is provided for under certain circumstances in our agreement as in the agreement with the United States. This is needed to allow for the uncertainties and risks which the United Kingdom must face in reestablishing her export trade. Interest may be waived only if the United Kingdom's exports over the preceding five years are insufficient to pay for the pre-war volume of her imports, taking into account other current account transactions as well. In effect, therefore, we say to the United Kingdom: If your exports are sufficient to enable you to pay for a pre-war volume of imports without running further into debt, then we will demand interest from you; if, however, they are not up to this level and if, therefore, you must go into debt or liquidate your capital in order to import on the pre-war scale, or else must restrict your imports to avoid the strain upon your resources, then we are prepared to waive the interest payments.

I should point out that the waiver will only be granted if the United Kingdom states that it is necessary in view of the present and prospective conditions of international exchange and the level of her gold and foreign exchange reserves, and if the international monetary

fund certifies that the condition in respect of United Kingdom exports is fulfilled. We have also the safeguarding provision that the waiver will only be granted by Canada if it is also being granted by other countries having similar agreements, which, of course, include the United States and any further countries which may enter into agreements of this kind with the United Kingdom. This waiver clause should go a considerable distance in enabling us to avoid any possible damaging effects of the burden of large scale indebtedness upon future trade in the event of adverse economic circumstances.

The next important provision of the agreement is article 5 regarding exchange and import arrangements. It will be noted that this is reciprocal in form, and that each of the two governments agrees to accord to the other treatment not less favourable than that provided for in any instrument of agreement with the government of any other country, signed prior to the date of this agreement. Under this clause Canada binds herself to give the United Kingdom most-favoured-nation treatment in regard to the use of import quotas, which are referred to in some of our trade agreements. The United Kingdom, on the other hand, in this clause undertakes to give Canada similar treatment to that granted the United States in the Anglo-American financial agreement. This is of quite substantial importance. Hon. members will recall that there are 4 important sections of the Anglo-American agreement relating to these questions. Under certain of them the United Kingdom agrees to make sterling paid by the United Kingdom in current account transactions, or sterling released from accumlated balances, freely convertible and available for current transactions in any currency area without discrimination. On the other hand, certain of the undertakings given in the Anglo-American agreement apply specifically to the treatment of United States transactions or trade, and it is the benefit of these provisions in particular that we obtain under Article 5 of our agreement. In particular, we obtain the benefits of paragraph (i) of section 8, in which the United Kingdom undertakes not to apply exchange control in such a manner as to restrict payments or transfers in respect of current transactions between the two countries, or the use of sterling balances to the credit of residents of the United States arising out of current transactions. We also obtain the important benefits of section 9, in which the government of the United Kingdom agrees to administer any import restrictions on a basis which does not discriminate against imports from the other country in respect of any product. This assurance of non-discrimination in import control is to take effect as soon as practicable, and not later than the end of 1946. We shall obtain the benefit of this non-discrimination as a result of Article 5 of our agreement.

Article 6 of the agreement provides in effect that the arrangements already existing in respect of the loan which we made to the United Kingdom in 1942 will continue as they are at present until the beginning of 1951, and that before that date we shall discuss the question of payment of interest on, and the terms of repayment of, any balance of the loan then outstanding. Members will probably recall that this loan was made under the War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act, 1942. In substance, the actual loan was made to Britain to finance war expenditures during 1941, as we were providing Britain with dollars in 1941 in return for sterling which we accumulated and this accumulated sterling was paid off with the $700 million loan granted in 1942. The loan was, of course, a war loan, made to finance war expenditures. The act which authorized it provided that no interest shall be payable under such obligation in respect of any period prior to the termination of the war. Consequently the loan has not borne interest up to date. In view of the enormous burden of international debt which war has thrust upon Britain and the difficulty she faces in reestablishing her export trade and paying for all her current requirements, we have come to the conclusion that Britain has not the capacity to pay interest on this loan during the period from now until the end of 1950, any more than on the main loan, and that she should not be asked to do so. There has been another important arrangement concerning this loan which is being continued under the new agreement. At the time we made this loan in 1942, the United Kingdom government undertook to ensure that the proceeds of sales to persons not resident in the United Kingdom of Canadian securities payable in Canadian currency, and interests therein, held by residents of the United Kingdom, and the proceeds of the redemption or repayment of Canadian securities or interests therein held by residents of the United Kingdom were paid to the government of Canada as part repayment of this loan. This arrangement is now being extended and will continue until the end of 1950, along with the interest-free provision. Under this arrangement the loan is being paid off or reduced by the sale or redemption of Canadian securities held in Britain. This process will result in the gradual and orderly repatriation of Canadian securities

owned in the United Kingdom, and in the gradual reduction of the amount of the loan outstanding. The total repayments up to date have amounted to $161,435,596.43. Additional repayments are pending as a result of the substantial sales and redemptions of securities in the latter part of 1945, and when they are made the loan will be reduced to something in the neighbourhood of $500 millions.

Article 7 of the agreement provides for the cancellation of the amount owing by the government of the United Kingdom to Canada under the British commonwealth air training plans of 1939 and 1942. These agreements were the basic ones under which this great Canadian project, one of the most creditable aspects of our war record, was developed and financed. In broad terms, the agreements provided for the sharing of the total costs of these plans among Canada, Britain, Australia and New Zealand in proportions considered fair at the time in view of the number of pupils from the several countries to be trained under the plans, and also in view of other relevant circumstances at the time. Under both the first and second plan, the United Kingdom share was intended to be financed mainly through contributions in kind, that is, contributions of aircraft, spares, supplies and equipment. As the plans developed and as the various circumstances affecting the ability of the United Kingdom to make contributions in kind changed, for example, when the great intensification of the air war in 1940 made it difficult for the United Kingdom to send planes to Canada for training purposes, the share of the United Kingdom in the total costs came considerably to exceed the amount which she could furnish as contributions in kind. As a consequence, when the settlement of the accounts for the first plan was finally worked out, it was found that the United Kingdom's share of the cost exceeded what she had contributed and paid by $200 million. Similarly, when the details for the second plan, ending at March 31, 1945, were worked out, it was found that the United Kingdom had paid or contributed an amount that fell short of her share of the costs by $225 million. These two sums together add up to the $425 million referred to in this financial agreement. The detailed methods by which the shares of costs were determined, and the various items credited to the United Kingdom are exceedingly complicated, and if the house wishes to know more about them when considering the bill, I am sure that the Minister of National Defence for Air, with some advance notice, would be able to give an explanation of them.

In agreeing to cancel this amount owing by Britain in respect of air training, the government has been motivated by a number of strong reasons. In the first place, this service provided to Britain is one that might well have been covered by mutual aid, and perhaps would have been covered by mutual aid had not the air training agreements been entered into before mutual aid began and the accounts worked out only after mutual aid had terminated. We did provide air training services to Australia and New Zealand as mutual aid, and we furnished supplies to Britain as mutual aid that could be used for air training in Britain. Secondly, the United States government furnished air training services to Britain and to other countries as lend-lease and furnished Britain with equipment and supplies on a large scale to be used in air training, including equipment and supplies used in the British Commonwealth air training plan in Canada. Thirdly, we came to the conclusion after much consideration that repayment of this $425 million was beyond the United Kingdom's capacity to pay within any reasonable period. From what I have already said, it will be evident that the amount which the British can undertake to pay is severely limited within the next five years and, indeed, over the remainder of this century. We have taken full account of their ability to pay in setting the terms for interest and repayment on the new loan and for the 1942 loan. It seems to us futile to ask the British government to pay this $425 million some time in the next century when they have completed the payments on the loan which we are now making to them. I do not believe that either the British or the Canadian people at that time would consider it a proper transaction. I think it is far better for us to face the facts clearly and cancel this particular war debt. It should be remembered that the British have no production assets as a result of incurring this debt—nothing that will add to their ability to pay it.

I need say only a few words about the remaining articles of the agreement. Article 8 regarding consultation indicates that the two governments will work together in putting the agreement into effect, and that if major changes occur in the international situation which materially alter the prospective benefits and obligations flowing from the agreement, they will consider together what changes in its provisions they should agree to make, subject to such legislative approval as may be necessary. By consultation we shall be able to work out such things as the manner and

time at which the United Kingdom will draw upon this credit and the machinery for implementing its other provisions.

I should now refer to the exchange of notes between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and myself in regard to our understanding about the entering into force and implementation of the various provisions of the agreement. This was made necessary because the agreement has been drawn up in the expectation that the financial agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States, signed at Washington on December 6 last, will be approved by the American congress and will enter into force some time during the current year. As soon as that agreement does enter into force, we shall be prepared to implement the whole of our agreement once parliament has approved it. If, however, congress does not approve the Anglo-American agreement, we shall consider that, in the terms of article 8 of our agreement, a major change has occurred in the international financial situation which would materially alter the prospective benefits and obligations flowing from our agreement, and that consequently it would be necessary forthwith to consider what changes in the provisions of our agreement the governments of Canada and the United Kingdom should agree to make, subject to such legislative approval as may be necessary, which, of course, in our case would be approval by parliament in the event of any amendment to the agreement itself. If congress does not approve the Anglo-American agreement, we shall not benefit from the trade and exchange provisions of that agreement, either directly or through the application of article 5 of our agreement. It will, therefore, be necessary to consider some substitute for article 5 of our agreement in those circumstances. Consequently we feel that those portions of our agreement which it is not necessary to implement immediately in order to enable the United Kingdom to proceed now with its purchases in Canada should be deferred until we see the results of congressional action. For that reason, therefore, we have reached the understanding with the United Kingdom that articles 5, 6 and 7 of the agreement will not be implemented until it is known whether the United States congress has approved the Anglo-American agreement.

In conclusion Mr. Chairman I wish to say just this. The United Kingdom has always been Canada's largest and most reliable market. Upon the continuation of this market the employment and welfare of millions of Canadians depend. It must cease to be a satisfactory market for Canadian products unless the British pound is in the future both convertible and stable. The restoration of the convertibility of sterling and the maintenance of a reasonable stability of sterling depend upon the successful completion of the proposed loan agreements with the United States and Canada. If these go through, Great Britain can take her full part in the post-war period and throughout the years of the future as a great trading nation, a nation whose currency can be used by any country to buy the products of any other country; a nation whose currency will retain a stable value from year to year. Viewed in this light, this agreement is of the highest importance and value to Canada. It is not in any sense an act of charity, it is an investment in the future of Canadian trade. Together with the Anglo-American agreement and the Bretton Woods agreements, it will enable us to proceed confidently to the consideration of the commercial policy that Canada and other countries should follow after the war, and to the establishment of the international trade organization which has been proposed by the United States. As hon. members already know, it is planned to have an international conference on trade and employment some time within the next twelve months. Preceding that will be a smaller conference, sponsored by the economic and social council of UNO, for the purpose of drawing up specific proposals for the consideration of the larger conference and, more particularly, for the negotiation of specific proposals for the reduction of tariffs. These measures, relating to international trade and the barriers to such trade, are of the utmost importance to Canada. We can proceed to a proper consideration of them and to the action that will be based upon such consideration only if the financial resources that will make trade possible are provided by agreements such as that which has been placed before the committee for approval.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I shall not attempt this afternoon to make any detailed observations on the very complete statement which we have received from the Minister of Finance, but I should like to make some general remarks on this resolution, which seems to me to be one of the most important that we have ever considered in this house or that we shall have to consider for some time. In the first place it seems to me that the time at which we are considering this resolution is rather apt, perhaps even critical, because it so happens, as you know, Mr. Chairman, that this matter has now reached the stage of impending decision in the United States. I suppose it is no exaggeration to say that what we do in this house at the present time may have an influ-

ence far beyond ourselves. What we are being asked to do, as the Minister of Finance has pointed out, is to take part in what may be described as a piece of global economic strategy. We heard a great deal about global strategy during the war, and I take it we must have global strategy to-day, in times of peace, when we face questions just as difficult as we faced in the war, if not more so, and in an atmosphere more difficult because we have not now that inspiration, urgency and common feeling which come from sharing a common danger which we can feel day by day in terms of human life. I believe we are facing just as great a common danger to-day, but it is not so easy to see it.

I wish to discuss this matter solely from the point of view of the economic interest of Canada. That is not because I have not any other feeling about the matter. I might speak from other points of view, but the reason I wish to speak from that point of view is that I want to put it on a basis where no Canadian fellow citizen can say to me, "you have introduced an extraneous element here." I want to put it on a basis where I can say to any Canadian citizen, "I am arguing this from the point of view of your interest and my interest, our Canadian interest, our economic interest." I have some hope that if we can all make each other believe that we are really arguing it on that basis and that there is nothing else in it, we can reach that measure of unanimity which I regard as very important.

The next observation I wish to make is that I believe every one in this house—I really said this already—realizes the enormous, the vital importance of this. If this succeeds —if we have faith we can make it succeed—we have a chance to go forward to some kind of economic cooperation comparable with what we had during the war. If we ourselves, the United States and the United Kingdom reach some kind of coordination and cooperation the rest of the world will, I am sure, be glad to follow. If we fail, then there is literally no hope for anything except the old chaos which we all got to know so well in the thirties.

I come to the bill, the first section of which says that the government of Canada will extend to the government of the United Kingdom a credit of $1,250,000,000. What do we mean by that? What does that mean in terms of the life of the ordinary Canadian citizen? We have become so accustomed to these fabulous and astronomical amounts that we are getting to feel they are just figures in books, and some people tell us that they are just figures in books. I should like to describe what it means to me in as simple words as I can. What it means is that the citizens of Canada are to be asked either to pay taxes or to lend money to that amount, to make that amount available to the people of Great Britain and of other places, as the Minister of Finance pointed out, to buy goods in this country. Why do we do that? Do we do that just to make ourselves good fellows, because we are generous-hearted? No. Why do we do it? All hon. members know why we do it. I ventured to say last autumn when the exports credits were up that we could not afford not to afford them. I say the same thing about this amount. Why do I say that? What do I mean when I say it? All hon. members need to do is to look back over the last fifteen years. They do not need to go another step backward to see what foreign trade means in the life of this country. We remember the figures of 1929. Our exports amounted to something like $1,400 million. Then it went down in 1933 to little more than one-third of that amount. I believe it was $534 million. We all know what that meant. Then by uncertain, rather anxious and slow degrees it mounted up in 1939 until it was something over $900 million, just under a billion, if I remember rightly. We all know what happened since that time. It mounted up and up until it got to about $5 billion. We know how that happened. We know that we borrowed, that we taxed ourselves as we never believed we could. The Minister of Finance almost made us like it. We taxed ourselves to the extent of about two and a half billion dollars, and on top of that we borrowed almost another two and a half billion dollars. In various other ways the minister managed to raise about another $500 million. Altogether we took out of our pockets about $5,500 million. The result was we were all rich. We all had money in our pockets. There is great danger lest we feel somehow or another that these good times with these fabulous amounts can just go on. The truth of the matter is that we are like a man who had an income of $2,500 and then borrowed $2,500 and spent the whole $5,000 in one year and said, "This is grand", and did not bother very much about what is to come afterwards.

The Minister of Finance smiles. He knows better than that, and we are going to know better when we look at it. The longer the spree, the sorer our heads will be when we wake up. I do not think many of us believe there is some magic which enables us to go on borrowing and borrowing and never have to pay the piper. Incidentally I am glad that

we got a very fine lead this week from the Chancellor of the British Exchequer, who, I suppose, is a socialist.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, and it was a socialist budget.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I like to be able to praise a socialist when I can. I want to point out that no one is more orthodox in the arranging of a budget than Doctor Dalton. He made it clear that a balanced budget is essential. He is a model for us here. I hope the Minister of Finance is following very closely what he is doing.

I come back to exports, because I think we should regard this matter in that light and not let ourselves get confused with this, that or the other thing. We should regard this simply and clearly as a matter which affects us through our export trade. The Minister of Finance has already made that clear and I wish to underline it. It affects us in our export trade. That brings us to Britain. When we look at the continent of Europe which was our great market, and when we consider the extent to which that market is shattered—we realize that from the loans to European countries we heard of this afternoon—I suppose there never was a time when the British market was more important than it is now.

I do not like to think of what would happen, first of all to Europe, and then to us, if Britain is not able to restore her economy. Therefore it seems to me that when we are talking about assisting her to restore her economy we are talking about something which is very close to ourselves. I should like to read a few words from a speech of Lord Keynes which was delivered in the British House of Commons. He was speaking about his trip to the United States and the negotiations that were carried on last autumn. He referred to the attitude which they had to take in the United States. He was answering some people in Britain who felt, I suppose naturally, that since they had been in the war for two and a quarter years before the United States there might have been a somewhat different attitude taken toward all the amounts which were spent, and spent in the United States, during those two and a quarter years. But Keynes told them to forget all about that, and he had one or two important remarks to make on it. I should like to read one or two of them. It is, I think, put in rather clever wording. This is what he said:

> We soon discovered that it was not our past performance or our present weakness, but our future prospects of recovery and our intention to face the world boldly that we had to demonstrate.

He went on to say:

> In every circle in which I moved during my stay in Washington, it was when I was able to enlarge on the strength of our future competitive position, if only we were allowed a breather, that I won most sympathy.

Why do I read this to the house? I do so for two reasons: first of all, to try to underline the argument that I am making. If I succeed in nothing else I hope I shall succeed in showing that I am arguing this from the point of view of the interest of Canada. My second reason for reading it is to draw to the attention of the house what Mr. Keynes said, who, I suppose, on his record of the last twenty-five years can clearly be regarded not only as the greatest economist, but the most successful prophet that we have had in economic matters. In case I forget later, I should like to remind the house of that astounding book he wrote in 1919 called "The Economic Consequences of the Peace," in which he repeated everything that has happened since; at any rate, everything that has happened with respect to the indemnities of the first war. He said they could not be paid. Keynes pointed out the whole thing. Here is the man who was in Washington. Here is the man who told the British that in dealing with the United States they had to satisfy the people of that country that they would be able to recover; that this global strategy of economics would succeed, that if they were given this breathing space they could get on their feet and be able to fit again into a freer world economy, and that this would be to the advantage of the United States and ourselves.

Let us remember when we are talking about this that the negotiations in the United States—and Keynes pointed this out in the British House of Commons—were always carried out with congress in mind. There was congress; and congress was considered to be representative chiefly of the people of the middle west. In other words, they wanted to get down to hard-boiled people who considered nothing about sentiment, but who were looking to their own advantage.

To me the matter is very simple. I shall give a simple illustration drawn from business. I do not know if I have used it before in the house; but if you have escaped it, there are a lot of other people who have not. It is this: We all know that in business, the wise businessman very often finds it necessary to give credit. The wholesaler may give credit to the retailer, and he may not pay for a year or two years, or even three or more. Why does the wholesaler give credit to the retailer? Does he do it because he likes the

retailer? Indeed not; he may dislike him. He does it because he thinks this man is a sound businessman, and he hopes to set up a good customer. That is why we should make this loan to Great Britain.

I wish now to say a word—and no more than a word, because the Minister of Finance has covered it, and I do not wish to labour it—about another phase of the matter. It is well for us to remember two things that happened during the war. It is well for us to remember why these people need help. It is not because they are a lot of poor weaklings who have mismanaged their own affairs. It is not because of that at all. It is because they have fought a war for six years. It is because they had to take their savings for generations—perhaps centuries—and use them, as we know, to buy astronomical amounts of supplies in the United States.

The result is that that great source of income is just about cut in two. But that is not the worst. The worst is that after the United States came into the war, and when things seemed to be going better, when prospects were better, in the last years of the war Great Britain had to make this great distortion in her economy, namely, that she had practically to give up her foreign trade. She had to make the things that she could make at home, for use at home; and the United States and other countries took over the foreign trade. This was necessary to save shipping, and to prevent so far as possible the unnecessary use of shipping in submarine infested waters. The fact of the matter is that these unfortunate people, while fighting for their lives, saw their trade drop to about thirty per cent of what it was in 1939—and it was nothing to boast about even in 1939. That is the reason why we are faced with this situation.

There are two alternatives, and, I think, only two. The first is that of multilateral trade, to which the Minister of Finance has referred, and which we hope will become real under this International Conference of Trade and Employment which is to meet during the current year.

What is it hoped that may do? It is hoped that may get us away from the multitudinous restrictions we have, and about which we all know so much. We would all like to get away from them if we can. I do not think there is any doubt about that. It is a policy to free sterling currency, which at the present time is not free. They have had to stipulate in England that people who sell there have to leave their money in England, so that sterling could be used and marshalled and the small amount of United States exchange could be kept in a pool, which was managed by Great Britain.

The whole aim of loans by the United States and ourselves is to set that free and, as the Minister of Finance said, so that money can be used freely throughout the world, so that we can get back to the method left behind, so that we can do business again without being hampered with all these numerous checks and balances.

What is the alternative? The alternative is a very simple one. I shall read again the words of Keynes, and I would ask hon. members to note carefully what he says. The alternative, of course, is to go on with the sterling bloc. The alternative is for Great Britain to seek more credits from the countries in the sterling block to whom she already owes a lot, particularly those in the sterling bloc who have not the goods that we in Canada and the United States have, and who have not the materials which are needed by the United Kingdom in order to get its business under way.

This is what Keynes said in the debate in the House of Lords:

> The alternative is to build up a separate economic bloc which excludes Canada and consists of countries to which we already owe more than we can pay, on the basis of their agreeing to lend us money they have not got, and buy only from us and one another goods we are unable to supply.

May I read it again, because it is true. Perhaps it sounds like a clever epigram; but let me read it again:

> The alternative is to build up a separate economic bloc which excludes Canada and consists of countries to which we already owe more than we can pay—

That is, each country in the sterling bloc.

> —on the basis of their agreeing to lend us money that they have not got—

They have already extended credit beyond their means.

> —and buy only from us and one another goods we are unable to supply.

Because the people who can supply them are the United States and Canada.

I want now to come back to one observation he makes here which, to my mind, is vital, when he says, "This economic bloc which excludes Canada." I believe there is an argument for Australia or New Zealand or South Africa, or France or Belgium. I think there is an argument in the case of these countries that they might flourish under a sterling bloc. But I cannot see how there is an argument that

we can flourish in it, because we cannot get into it. The reason for that is that nature has put us in North America. We are inescapably north American—as a distinguished leader of my party said about ten years ago. We are inescapably, geographically north American.

If we are not in the sterling bloc, then will hon. members and will the people of this country please reflect upon what that means? It means that if we are unfortunate enough to have the economic world divided into two blocs, one presided over by the United States and the other presided over by the United Kingdom, we are not in either one. We are in some unpleasant no-man's-land, some middle ground I do not know anything about. Therefore I feel, and I believe every man who will think it over will feel, that what we should hope for in all our hearts is that this trade agreement may succeed, and that therefore we should now take the means of giving it a chance of success.

As the Minister of Finance has said, one of the aims is that we should give the British a breathing spell; give them a chance to get on their feet; give them a chance to pay us this loan, and in doing so be able to increase and increase and increase their foreign trade, so that we shall be able to sell them more and more goods.

We shall have to take goods, too; do not forget. Nevertheless what we hope is that their trade may greatly increase, both ways.

As I said a minute ago, I believe every sensible man, if he could visualize these two alternatives, would not hesitate a moment as to which he would take. Again, if we can have multilateral trade, which means going back to the simple and sensible world—certainly it was sensible when compared with the mess we have been in since—of the nineties, or opening years of the present century. I do not mean that they were perfect; I do not mean that our social services were what they should be. I am thinking about the international situation and the likelihood that any sensible man would wish to go back to that reasonable degree of freedom.

Nobody believes we can get rid of restrictions and discriminations to-day or to-morrow. But if we could get back to those conditions, when there was a reasonable degree of freedom, trade moved, goods moved freely, and people benefited from each other's capacity to specialize, as the minister pointed out. That is what we should have again.

What reason have we to think that that may succeed? First, I would say—this may be a rather negative reason—that there are a lot of people still in places of responsibility who know the terrible results of not doing it. They remember what happened in the 1930's. I was reading a book this morning which pointed out the awful effects of economic nationalism running mad. It pointed out that in 1929 Germany, Italy and France imposed tariffs on wheat amounting to as much as $1.83 a bushel. The result was that in the succeeding five years 600,000,000 bushels less wheat were imported into those countries than in the previous five. The competent writer of this book reckoned that that cut down the purchasing power in this country by some $200 million per annum.

We remember these fantastic things and any sensible man wants to do everything possible to get away from them.

In the second place we have moved into a world where, although there are perhaps a lot of grandiloquent and more or less irresponsible things said about full employment, not only public conscience but political necessity demand that the state shall never stand by again and see unemployment in a big way without using all the resources of the state to prevent it. We have this great hope, particularly when we look at the United States—if you have prosperity in the United States, then the thing will go. If you have prosperity in the United States you will have big imports into the United States; if you have big imports into the United States, that is half the battle because that will get the wheel turning everywhere.

You have only to look back to see what happened to British exports in 1929, 1930 and 1931 when the United States went flat. British exports went down by fifty per cent. There you have it.

May I come back to Keynes; I do not want to be tiresome by quoting him but, after all, Keynes is considered, as I said a few minutes ago, to be a very great expert. He has been the best prophet on these matters that we have had and he has the great advantage of having lived last year for several months in the United States. He says:

> All the most responsible people in the United States and particularly in the state department and the treasury, have entirely departed from the high tariff, export subsidy, conception of things, and will do their utmost with, they believe, the support of public opinion in the opposite direction. That is why this international trade convention presents us with such a tremendous opportunity. For the first time in modern history the United States is going to exert its full powerful influence in the direction of reduction of tariffs, not only of itself, but by all others.

I should like to give one little illustration culled from yesterday's press which shows the difficulty we are running into, because of

the mixed-up world we have now where the individual who is trying to do business finds himself cribbed, cabined and confined at every turn. I read in the New York *Times* an unfavourable reference to a stepchild of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon), the Canadian Commercial Corporation. The New York *Times* takes a rather dark view of that, the minister will be glad to know. This article states that the operations of this corporation will be unfair in connection with ordinary trade movements, and it quotes one individual as follows:

> The important thing, one exporter declared, "is not what the Canadian corporation is set up to do, but that it is set up at all."

I am not going to labour this, and incidentally I should point out that the report is quite fair because it gives the minister's explanation when it says:

> According to the Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, the commercial corporation is intended to take over the various functions of making purchases in that country for foreign governments and UNRRA; to assist private enterprise in obtaining essential supplies from former enemy territories, and to provide machinery to purchase sugar, tea, oils and fats, which are under international allocation or foreign government control.

I am not complaining about that; I am only mentioning it to show what a fantastic world we live in. This morning I talked to an exporter who had been groaning under these restrictions. He said, "We exporters are not a lot of dumbells; we are ready to do business, but when we want to we have to go to this board and we get wound round and round with red tape." Perhaps that is not a criticism of the board, because what else can it do? We all know that when you get a board and put a man at the head of it with a lot of people underneath him, the rest of them cannot assume any responsibility. Do not let us fool ourselves about what happens when you get a board like this. What you do is to set up a little kingdom—perhaps it will become a government secret and be forgotten by the cabinet. I understand that this board is presided over by an able and energetic man who got his training under the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe).

Mr. BREITHAUPT: Probably a good Tory.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): All the better if he is, except that if he is a good Tory he will be a man of energy who will want to do a good job, and doing a good job will mean doing a big job. Whoever this gentleman is, and I do not know his politics, no doubt he will be faithful to his minister. If that is so he will have a great desire to exercise power; he will have a great desire to push other people around. My feeling is that that board will go on and on acquiring more and more power, unless some strong person, unless the Minister of Trade and Commerce keeps his hand on it and prevents it from doing so. I am not joking; that is what happens when you put a man on a board who wants to do a job. When you have a man who thinks he can very easily make himself believe that he knows more about it than anyone else, especially when other people have to come and do double handsprings before him. He may begin to believe that all these business men know nothing at all and he will want to stay there as long as possible. That is the sort of thing we should be trying to get away from. That is the sort of thing we shall begin to get away from if this agreement, which permits a reasonable freedom of action, is carried.

I want to repeat myself just briefly and I promise not to say it all over again. There will be difficulties; there will be objections raised. Incidentally, I am only discussing the principle and I may be raising objections to certain details. The alternative which Keynes outlined is, to me, unthinkable. It is an alternative which leaves Canada, as I say, to be ground between the upper and nether millstones. I hope with all my heart that in this debate we shall be able to consider this matter from the point of view of the true economic interests of Canada. I believe that if it is rightly considered in that way there is only one answer.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to make any extended remarks this afternoon in connection with the statement that has been placed before us by the minister, except to say that I believe that the putting into effect of these agreements will be beneficial, not only to Canada but to the entire world. Therefore we are prepared to support this agreement, reserving to ourselves the right to make inquiry into details to understand it better. We should, not only in this house but throughout the country, consider agreements of this sort in a more realistic way.

It seems to me that all of us at times are under what I might call a money illusion. We think in terms of money and we think in terms of financial agreements and financial returns from those agreements. As a matter of fact, what we are actually doing is to send, in this case to the United Kingdom, certain goods which she requires and which she cannot herself produce. If we are to do the same thing for the other nations whose loans have been mentioned this afternoon, and these loans are to be repaid from 1946 to 1976 or from 1949 to 1979, as the case may be,

we shall if we are wise, if we have the ability to do so in spite of the contradictions of our present economic system, import into our country not pounds and shillings and pence or francs or any other foreign currency, but quantities of goods which will enable us to raise our own standards of living. That is what agreements of this sort should mean. In this time of necessity we need to help rebuild the economy of the world and to assist our best customer to place herself once more in the position of being able to take from this country goods which she will ultimately repay in goods which we shall receive from her or from some other country obligated to make payments to her, and we should so arrange our affairs that we shall be able to take these goods and use them for improving our own standards of living.

The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell), who has just made a very fine speech about the matter, said a few moments ago that during the war we taxed ourselves and borrowed from ourselves as we never taxed and borrowed before. But is it really true that we accomplished the miracles we accomplished during the war just by taxing and borrowing from ourselves as we never did before? That is not true. We accomplished those miracles by producing as we never produced before. Taxing and borrowing money? Money meant nothing at all during the war. It was the production of goods for the winning of the war that counted; because we produced as we never produced before we were able to accomplish the wonders we achieved during the war, and so long as we are able to maintain those high levels of production we can continue to perform miracles in supplying the nations with the goods which they need in order to recover their economy and at the same time help to raise our own standards of living in this country by improving the housing situation and supplying the various other things we ourselves need at the present time.

One of the difficulties is this. Never at any time have the producers of our country had the means to use the goods which they produced or the goods that are returned to us in exchange for the goods which we produce and export, and consequently the time comes when we find ourselves in the position of having to safeguard our economy, as it is called, and we endeavour to build a wall around ourselves. I was delighted to hear the hon. member from Muskoka-Ontario speak in the way he did this afternoon about opening up the channels of trade. That is indeed refreshing coming from the party with which he is associated. But may I add that even to-day when I pick up articles or read speeches by friends of my hon. friend I see that they insist on the necessity of retaining the imperial preferences and the Ottawa agreements. Yet, if ever agreements were made that were restrictive of international commerce it was the Ottawa agreements.

An hon. MEMBER: They made reductions.

Mr. COLDWELL: There we have an interruption from the same party discounting the words used this afternoon by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario. If we are to have a free flow of trade, we can never have it by building a wall around Canada or around the association of nations known as the British commonwealth, and one of the reasons why I am prepared to support these loan agreements is that they will tend to open up world trade.

I am not unmindful of the fact that these agreements, so far as Canada is concerned, can be successful only in so far as our great neighbour to the south follows intelligent international economic policies. Here I believe is the great danger, because the United States remains to-day an island of capitalism in a world that tends ever more to socialization or socialism, or whatever you like to call it. Those contradictions in the capitalist system in the United States will compel her in the long run to try to protect her own economy and her own standards, as she calls them, by keeping out goods from the rest of the world, with the result that we shall have deepening unemployment.

I did not want to introduce any discussion of the United Kingdom budget but my hon. friend asked if Mr. Dalton was a socialist. I have known Hugh Dalton for a long time and I would say he is a pretty thorough-going socialist in his thinking and in his views. Let me point out to my hon. friend that I shall be quite content if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) here in his first full year's budget after the war follows Mr. Dalton's example. Mr. Dalton has relieved entirely British income tax payers in the lower brackets to the number of two and a half million people, and if the Minister of Finance here will relieve our income tax payers in the lower brackets and restore the pre-war income tax exemptions in this country, that will be an instalment of income tax relief which we shall be very glad to welcome in this house.

Mr. ILSLEY: Would the hon. member be content if I took the English exemptions and took the excess profits tax off?

Mr. COLDWELL: No. My right hon. friend asks me if I am prepared to accept the English income tax exemptions and I answer no, because our economies and social services are so different and always have been.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes. We are making loans to Britain at the present time. Do not forget that we are a rich country and that the British people are compelled to dig down deeper than we are. Nevertheless they have restored the pre-war level, at least of income tax exemptions, and yet we, a rich country, have not restored the pre-war levels. I say that if the Minister of Finance will do that in his budget we shall have a word of commendation for him. Let me point out, too, that the British have retained the super-taxes on high incomes; let us retain them too. They have increased their succession duties; let us increase them too. Then see how my hon. friends to my right will greet such a budget. It is true that the British budget provides that the excess profits tax will be removed at the end of the year, but it retains the war profits tax of five per cent. Let my hon. friends approve the taxation of profits too, and then we shall be more on common ground. It is no good to cite Britain as an example unless one states exactly what is happening there, and it is time we understood just exactly what they are doing to implement their policies.

In almost the same breath the hon. member made the statement that we dare not go back to the conditions of 1930. It is true that we dare not go back, but I believe that we are headed for those conditions under the policies now being put into effect in North America. The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario says that if there is any tendency to go back to the conditions of 1930 we must use all the powers of the state to see that that does not happen. "Use all the powers of the state"? But we find my hon. friends demanding at the same time that controls shall be removed, that the powers of the state shall be curtailed. That would prevent us from doing the very thing he wants, using the power of the state to prevent a recurrence of the conditions of 1930. I find it very difficult to understand the logic of some of my hon. friends.

Mr. GRAYDON: Do not blame that on the logic.

Mr. COLDWELL: There is no logic in it. It sounds well, but when you pick up the speech and read it the day after, it will appear like a good many things that you have said the night before appear the day after.

So, Mr. Chairman, all I want to do is to say that when the proper occasion arrives we shall have more to say about this, but meantime I believe that the agreement entered into is, in the main, a good agreement and we are prepared to give it our support.

Mr. BLACKMORE: First of all may I congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) on the excellent presentation which he has made. Since I have been here I do not think he has ever said anything in the house which I could so heartily support as the speech which he has just delivered. One of the main reasons why I can support so enthusiastically what he has said is that he is finally, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) points out, on a goods and services basis.

If I recall correctly, the minister did point out that it would be impossible for the British people to get their pound up to value and keep it stable unless they had this loan; and this loan is a loan of goods. It is the goods and services which a people can produce that make for the stability of their money. Once the whole world begins to see that, it will begin to look at this situation which so grieves the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell), not as a completely bewildering and incomprehensible puzzle, but as a labyrinth from which there is a way out to be found.

I do not propose to discuss this matter at length because, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar points out, there will be plenty of opoprtunities to have much more to say as we go forward. But I should like to point out three matters which, in my judgment, ought to be borne in mind in dealing with this loan. I will discuss it briefly from three points of view: first of all, from the point of view of defence; second, from the point of view of good business; and third, from the point of view of common decency and national self-respect.

We are in a world of grim realities. In our own lives we have seen two wars. Who can say that we shall not yet in our own lives see a third war? Britain has saved us twice in the memory of those in this chamber. Who is to say that we shall not need to have Britain save us a third time?

Canada is a member—if one may use an athletic expression—of the British commonwealth and empire team. Thus far this team has won every series. The United States has thus far played in our team as a star, and Great Britain has also been a star player in the team. Great Britain has been seriously injured in the last series, and we must get

her back into good condition; we must make her fighting fit again. Fighting strength in these days depends more and more upon productive capacity, economic strength and financial strength. If, then, we are to restore Great Britain to a condition of fighting fitness we must restore her economically and financially.

Just a few words regarding the general situation which Britain faces. What do the British people do to make their living? There are in the neighbourhood of forty-seven millions of them in a small island which has not the resources to support them. What do they have to do? Well, there are several lines of activities in which they engage to make their living. First of all, they produce what they can from their own resources and they manufacture what they can from their own resources. Next, they export as much goods as they can manage to manufacture and sell to pay for imports. Next, they depend on income from foreign investments. Next, they depend on income from carrying services which they have rendered with their merchant ships. Finally, they depend on the interest on financial loans and on insurance which the British have a good deal to do with.

What has happened to Britain? The Minister of Finance gave, I thought, a very fine and comprehensive picture of what has happened to Britain. He could have gone into great quantities of detail, which perhaps it was unnecessary to go into because hon. members, generally speaking, are well informed. But it would be a good thing to recall at this time that a tremendous amount of Britain's industrial capacity was destroyed during the last war. Many of the plants were actually bombed. A great number of British industries were changed over from a peace-time basis to a war-time basis; and the British were given as their part in the team the very task of changing their industries over from a peace-time basis to a war-time basis and were dependent upon the United States for their peace-time production. This is why the British were hurt so seriously when lease-lend was cancelled immediately at the close of the war.

Another important matter is this, that for about six years the youth of Great Britain have been trained in producing war material and consequently lack the skills and the facilities necessary to produce peace-time goods. Meanwhile a good many of the techniques in connection with peace-time production have been changed, so that even some who were skilled do not find themselves exactly qualified to produce at the present time. That is the first thing.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

Then, with respect to British foreign investments, they have lost a tremendous amount of those foreign investments because they had to liquidate them to get raw materials with which to fight the war. Consequently, as the Minister of Finance points out, they can no longer depend on them to anything like the same degree as a source of income.

Then, at least one-third of the carrying ships of Great Britain have been destroyed in the war. They have been sunk or otherwise lost; they are not there; consequently the British are not able to use them as a means of deriving income.

This is only a part of all that has gone on. One could go into much greater detail. But the result of the whole study would be to show that the British capacity to produce goods is seriously impaired; and if we are to restore the British to the position in which they will be able to fight again in case they have the need to fight—and they may have to, in a very short time—we shall have to make every possible effort to see that they have the goods necessary to enable them to restore themselves to a high degree of productive capacity and financial strength.

What can Canada do about this whole matter? Some of us are beginning to suffer a little because of a shortage of goods, but I do not think many of us here in Canada have suffered much so far. There are some things we have to get along without. But the trouble in Great Britain is that the people have to get along without nearly all the things we enjoy. It is astonishing how seriously their diet is impaired. It must be borne in mind that these people have been enduring these conditions for five years. If we do not advance the goods to them they are going to have greater austerity than they had even during the war. How can one expect people who are impaired physically by malnutrition or undernutrition to be capable of a high measure of production. All that I am saying at the present time has quite obviously to do with defence. If Britain is to be strong and ready to fight again in case of need we must help to make her capable, and the only way to do that is to supply her with the goods which she cannot produce and which she can obtain only by trading exports for them.

I am going to sum up by making this statement. It is expedient that Canada should aid Britain to be strong. It is expedient that we should grant this loan, and greater loans still, if the British find that they need them. It is expedient that we should grant the loan so that Britain may be capable of being our ally

in case of another war, that she may be a good market for Canada in times of peace, and that she may contribute to the general prosperity of mankind.

I am sure that every hon. member is well aware that many of the goods Britain produces are of extreme importance to the other nations of the world, and that there is a high demand in the world for those goods. The world cannot have as high a standard of living as is possible unless Britain is able to produce such goods. If, by reason of the want of a loan such as this, Britain cannot produce those goods, the result will be an impairment of the general standard of living, of well-being and of prosperity throughout the world. The Minister of Finance pointed out that Britain was our A-1 customer. She is indeed our A-1 customer; and she was the A-1 customer of thirty-one nations before the war. How many people know that? She imported more than any other nation of the goods produced by thirty-one countries. To what a tremendous extent, then, the general prosperity of the world depends upon the prosperity of Britain, and upon her capacity to import goods and to pay for them, must be obvious to all.

Finally, I think we all agree that Canada is able to lend the money. We may be afraid of the debt—I am afraid of the debt—but there are things we all dread more than debt; otherwise this house would not have sat calmly by and encouraged the government to incur fifteen billions of debt while the country was at war. Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are things we fear more than we fear debt, and there are things in the future that we need to fear more than we fear the debt that will be incurred. If we have to raise many billions as debt to pay for goods, as long as we are struggling with the present financial system, let us raise the money and supply the goods to Britain.

There is another aspect of the question that will have a strong appeal to every member of the house; that is the moral aspect. It is morally right that Canada should make this loan to Great Britain. In the first place, the war expenditures of Great Britain were proportionately greater than those of any other allied country. Everyone knows how we naturally react to the spectacle of any one member of the team bearing a heavier burden than the rest. It is beneath our national self-respect to allow Britain to continue to bear a greater burden financially than we are bearing.

Taxation in Britain was on a scale never before reached in any country in the world, I am told. Can we sit idly by and witness such a state of affairs and do nothing about it and still feel that we can respect ourselves nationally?

Britain bore more than her share of the international financial burden of the war. She provided more goods on mutual aid to Russia, the United States and other nations of the world. She bore a greater international burden than any other one of the allied countries. Can we contemplate that without a twinge of conscience?

Britain faces a more difficult international trade position to-day than any other nation, as the minister has well pointed out. We naturally wish to help those whose ability has been impaired. Notice how readily, in any community, people contribute to the rebuilding of a home that has been destroyed by fire, especially when the sufferer is poor. Surely the same principle works internationally, especially when the country affected is a very close friend—and certainly Britain has never done anything which should deprive her of a title to the friendship of the Canadian people. For the reasons I have outlined, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the Social Credit group will enthusiastically support this loan to Britain.

Mr. CARDIN: Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being alone I wish to register my opposition to the principle embodied in the resolution. I do not propose to go into a detailed discussion of the principle of the bill which will be based on this resolution, but I desire to take this opportunity of expressing my strong opposition to that principle. I wish also to express sentiments that I have voiced in this house on previous occasions with reference to proposals of this kind.

History will have to take note of the fact that when it comes to the consideration of proposals relating to what is called the British empire there is no difference between one side of the house and the other. All the members of this House of Commons, with very few exceptions, always agree when a proposal is made to help to sustain the prestige, the grandeur and the prosperity of the United Kingdom.

We have heard during the last few days very beautiful words and strong expressions of opinion about Canadian citizenship. Well, if you bring these principles, these ideas, together with the sentiments that have been expressed this afternoon, under serious consideration, I think you will find a strong and a definite conflict of ideas and of principles.

Without any intention of offending the views or the sentiments of anyone in this house, I persist in calling this proposal

another gift which is being made by the small fellow to the big fellow. The sum involved is, $1,250,000,000. What is that in the exchequer of the United Kingdom? A drop of water in the bucket, if not in the sea; and we get all excited about it, as if the whole world were going to crumble if we did not grant this new gift to a country which is ten times, fifty times richer than we are.

One has only to look at the map of the world to see the interests that the United Kingdom holds all over the globe wherever there is something of any value in the soil. This gift that we are proposing to make is out of proportion to our capacity for paying. The last speaker said that Britain was taxed to a higher degree than any other country, and he added, "I am told". If he will look at the figures he will discover that, in proportion, Canada is the most heavily taxed country of all those that participated in the war, and we had less interest than any other participating country. It is beyond our means, beyond our capacity, to make a gift of this kind at this particular time when we need so many things to help our country to recover from the false economy of the war to a reasonable and fair and durable economy for the time of peace.

We were told by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) who made an able speech—he is always impressive when he gets on his feet and argues on any question—that if we did not agree to this proposal we might find ourselves between a financial organization at the head of which would be the United Kingdom, and the United States organization, and that Canada would be placed in a position to suffer very much if we did not agree to help the United Kingdom to revive her trade and to revive at the same time the whole trade of the world. I should like to hear any hon. member of this house state seriously that all that Canada did during the last war is to be lost if we do not agree to this last loan or gift that we are asked to make to the United Kingdom.

We were told by Britishers themselves that up to the present time Canada has done splendid work. Some of them have said, somewhat lightly, but with a large amount of truth: "We should not ask Canada to go any farther than what she has up to the present time, because the effort that Canada has made is beyond all expectation of any reasonable citizen, even of the United Kingdom." I do not propose for the moment to discuss certain arguments that have been advanced here. I reserve for a later day the right to go into more detail and make more comprehensive comparisons between our position and the position in which the United Kingdom finds itself at the present time. At the moment I do not want to delay the proceedings of the committee. If the resolution passes I ask that it be passed on division, because I do not agree with the principle embodied in it. I am convinced that there is no necessity, and no necessity has been shown, for Canada to enter into such an agreement on terms which are more favourable to the United Kingdom and more difficult for Canada than the terms of the United States loan. We still have in our ears the voices of citizens of the United Kingdom advocating that the proposed United States loan should be refused. In the circumstances I wish to make my position clear and definite. In the past I have been opposed to the renewal of such gifts. At first they were properly described as gifts. Later on, they were called by another name—mutual aid. Now it is called a loan to be reimbursed in fifty years from now. Really it all amounts to the same thing.

The agreement contains a clause waiving all interest if at a certain period in the economic life of the United Kingdom they feel that they are not in a position to pay the interest. Well, I am opposed to that.

I think it is time that Canada took a definite step and spoke for herself instead of speaking for the British empire as we are doing all the time. Where is the Canadian spirit in this house? There is none.

A few days ago some hon. members spoke about hyphenated names. Heavens, if the bill which the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) introduced to create a Canadian citizenship should pass, we shall be in the very same position of having a hyphenated name—Canadian citizen-British subject!

We are part of the British empire, and I claim, without any desire of offending the views of anyone, that we are not a sovereign country. We may be by strict interpretation of certain laws; but in practice we are to a large extent what we were before, colonials. We have somewhat increased the liberties that we have enjoyed in the past; certain things are not imposed on us any more by the front door, but suggestions are made to us through the back door and we obey them. Those things happened during the last war and there are indications that they are still continuing throughout; the order is coming from outside in all things relating to our economy, finances and commerce.

I am not afraid of the future of my country, even if my country is left alone. Even if my country is left between the sterling bloc and the United States I have enough confidence

in Canada to feel that Canada is capable of coming through her difficulties and achieving a prominent place among the important nations of the world, even though she is not assisted by the one side or the other. Let us be ourselves; let us think for ourselves, and let us think of our future, the future of Canada. It is with these views, not complete I admit, and not the result of any preparation, that I express my opposition to the principle embodied in the resolution. I would agree to the passing of the resolution, but with the conventional term of "on division".

Mr. CHURCH: I should like to see the resolution go through before six o'clock and the bill introduced. I compliment the government on this particular resolution. Notwithstanding what the preceding speaker has said, it follows out the principle laid down thirty years ago by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding when they offered aid to the mother country in the form of preferential trade, without asking anything in return. The resolution which precedes the bill will assist the mother country which suffered so terribly in the war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Six o'clock.

Mr. CHURCH: I should like to see the resolution pass. The principle of the loan is exchange of goods and services for goods and services. It is not like the United States loan, exchange of goods and services for debt or gold. I should like to see the government go farther and offer further aid later on, and with what Australia and New Zealand have done to assist the mother country at this particular time, the United States loan could be done without. I should like to see the government thus go farther if necessary. It is good business, first, last and all the time, as everybody will admit, because Britain was always our sure and best customer. The resolution has shown what Canada has done. It will give aid to the mother country as aid from Canada is being given France to recover herself.

In conclusion, I may say that under paragraph (d) I am glad Canada is cancelling the debt for the air scheme. I believe that is due the mother country. Our army, navy and air force were unprepared. Britain, save for the aid of the dominions, for two years prevented an invasion of our shores, which would have cost us much more than $400 million.

I hope the government when they borrow this sum of $1,250 million will do something to lessen the cost of these loans. As we know, we have paid heavily for some loans. We can borrow by private loans and negotiations, or we can call for tenders. The latter method has been proved most successful in Washington. We saw an example the other day where a company from Cleveland secured refunding at some cost of the debt of the whole city of Montreal.

I believe the people of Canada, Australia and New Zealand will rejoice to see that the dominions are as an economic unit, coming to the help of the mother country in her hour of trouble.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CHURCH: I have great admiration for the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres, but I am sorry that he has taken the stand which he has with regard to this particular resolution. As I see it, such a position will be regarded by others as though there was a division between us at a time when unity is necessary. We should hang together as we did during the war, and did so well, or we shall hang separately and the British empire will be no more.

I supported the cause of France and the defence loan. The Minister of Finance made very fine statements regarding both loans and the resolution is an illustration of equality of treatment. The minister should be commended for the stand he has taken. We must not forget that when the war first started we were without an army, navy or air force. Our safety depended mainly upon Britain's supremacy of the sea. That saved the St. Lawrence river and the maritimes, Quebec and Ontario and the eastern provinces from the awful invasion we might have had. Axis submarines did later get up as far as Gaspe and near Rivière du Loup.

I always rejoice in the fact that we should always learn something from the lessons of history regarding this particular resolution. As I say, I have supported both loans, the one to Britain and the one to France. It is good business to aid Britain, our best customer. As has been said by a great historian, W. McNeil Dixon:

> Civilizations arise, and continue to exist—and all history is the witness to the truth—when conditions are hard only when they are continually threatened, only when they are determined to maintain and defend their rule.

As I see it, in many places war is still going on and we have yet to win the peace. As I would say in answer to the hon. gentleman

who preceded me, history has taught us something about the stand he has taken. As this historian says:

They (the nations) decline and fall when the external pressure is removed, or rather the inner spirit decays. The surrender may disguise itself in many forms, of which humanitarian sentiment is one. "If a country," wrote F. S. Oliver, "will not stand up for its rights, it must surely lose them. The spirit of giving in is the most fatal disease to which nations are subject, and it is apt to attack them, like a cancer, when they have arrived at the meridian."

We rejoice in the many freedoms we have had in this country from time immemorial. We have had all the freedoms set out in the Atlantic charter. I wish to compliment the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres upon being such a splendid citizen of this country. I do not think anyone in the house admires him more than I do, I believe he will regret not supporting this loan. There is one lesson which he should learn and which he apparently has forgotten. As I said, I supported the French loan because I think we can help to rebuild that great country. The minister has done his duty in that connection. I support the loan to Britain because I think it is good business and will mean a great deal of business. As this great historian at Glasgow university, Mr. W. McNeil Dixon, in the Gifford Lectures, "The Human Situation," said:

You may, indeed, conclude that you will have neither part nor lot in the rivalry, you may wash your hands of responsibility for the madness and folly of mankind, you may renounce the contests, and refuse the challenges of ambitious competitors for your place and power, you may elect to leave its future to the bullies of the world.

Is that what we are going to do? We are not out of the woods yet. Are we going to leave our future to the bullies of the world? I continue:

But it should be obvious that if the heart be set on nothing the earth contains or offers, nothing in the manner of the earth will be done there.

I cannot forget how the enemy came past St. Pierre and Miquelon, how they were found in the many inlets in our great gulf. We had a closed session of the house regarding that matter. After the fall of Dunkirk and after Dieppe the United States thought Britain was done for and they asked that Britain should not surrender her fleet to Germany. I have always had a great deal of respect for hon. gentlemen from Quebec. I know nearly all of them. Many of them come to our city and they find that there is no bigotry there. There is no racial or religious jealousy, because our people are hard-working and they find they must hustle too much to make a living without bothering themselves about smaller matters. We should try to carry into peace the same unity as we had in war and not forget that we might have been invaded, only for Britain's aid and the aid of the dominions. The United States thought Great Britain was done and that Canada was done.

I believe the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres and others will regret the stand they have taken on this particular matter. The United States took the same stand at the time of Dunkirk; they thought Great Britain and her dominions were done. Let me quote one more paragraph in conclusion to show our hon. friends they are wrong and will regret their stand because history always repeats itself.

When England's day comes to an end the principles which have contributed to its coming, Christian, pacifist, or whatever they may be styled, will not thereby be strengthened. On the contrary, such is the irony which pervades things human, they will have brought about their own eclipse, their own dissolution, and the triumph of the opposing principles. The decline and fall of England, which will rejoice her enemies, will not be England's decline and fall only, but of all for which she stood, and not till then shall we know the extent of our miseries. I, at least, am not of the opinion that humanity, justice, freedom, no, nor Christianity, will be gainers in that fall.

I hope that we shall have little further discussion of this loan, although I respect and appreciate the opinions of the younger members who come from the great province of Quebec. We have always had absolute unity in this country and the people of my city will never forget the land of France, where, in the last war, over 6,000 of my fellow citizens lie buried until resurrection day. They went to the aid of France with the 1,000,000 men who went from the British dominions, 130,000 of whom fell in the war, and they went there as citizens of dominions enjoying their own sovereignty, their own autonomy, their own independent status.

We have in the Minister of Finance a gentleman who has always been very kind and courteous to all the members in the house. He has borne a lot of the burden of the day and I rejoiced to see him honoured by His Majesty on the 1st of January last. I believe that history will record that he played a noble part in trying to save the mother country by this resolution at the most acute hour in history.

I should like, in conclusion, to quote one paragraph from Mr. Churchill on empire unity:

Let no man underrate the abiding power of the British empire and commonwealth. Because you see forty-six millions on our island harassed about their food supply, or because we have

difficulty restarting our industries and export trade after six years of passionate war effort, do not suppose that we shall not come through these dark years of privation as we have come through the glorious years of agony, or that half a century from now you will not see seventy or eighty millions of Britons spread about the world and united in defence of our traditions, our way of life and of the world causes you and we espouse.

Britain and her dominions entered the war looking for nothing. They thought of nothing but the freedom of the human race, French and English. We have always, all races, got on splendidly together in this country. When this loan from Canada to Great Britain was announced in the British House of Commons the news was received with applause and it was also applauded in New Zealand and Australia. We are now on the eve of the coming of our new governor general. I believe we have in him a man who will unify all classes of people in this country. He comes straight from the battlefields where he fought side by side with our soldiers he led in the glorious cause of freedom.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that I cannot agree with my hon. friend the member for Broadview any more than he himself did agree with the speech delivered this afternoon by the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres. This loan raises no question with respect to the new governor general. What we have before us is a resolution concerning a so-called loan of $1,250,000,000 to Great Britain. I am speaking in this debate because as a member I have a right to speak and no one can deprive me of that right unless the rules of the house are changed. I will protest very strongly against any change in the rules because I enjoy my rights and I want my colleagues in this house to enjoy their rights.

I do not see why we should pass this measure without scrutinizing it, and the members who would follow that course will be blamed when they return to their constituents. Opinions are free. One may be for the measure; another may be against it, and another may be open-minded, as I am myself, waiting to decide how I should vote upon it. But my right to speak now on this measure is as unquestionable as is the right of any other hon. member, and I say again that I do not see why we should rush to put this measure through at full speed.

A lot of surprising things have been said. To-day I saw among my clippings one from a Montreal daily of February 18, 1937, and I shall read only one headline to show what bunk is talked by statesmen. I quote:

U.K. will not ask dominions to help pay defence cost, Chamberlain tells house.

Everyone cheered when he said that, just as people cheer when just as foolish utterances come from statesmen here or anywhere else. Was he a good prophet, as the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario called Lord Keynes?

Mr. COLDWELL: What paper was my hon. friend quoting from?

Mr. POULIOT: I will send it over to my hon. friend.

Mr. COLDWELL: I should like to know the name of the paper.

Mr. POULIOT: The Montreal *Gazette*. The type is big enough for my hon. friend to read it across the aisle.

Mr. COLDWELL: Almost.

Mr. POULIOT: Chamberlain was not serious. He was talking bunk to the house, and he was cheered—hurrah, hurrah, very fine! They have a curious way of understanding things in England. I will quote something else which was said by another former prime minister of Great Britain, Lord Baldwin, in a book that I will pass over to any hon. member who wants to read it. It is important that we understand their state of mind. The quotation I am about to give is from a speech delivered by the Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin at Empire day and Coronation banquet of the Combined Empire Societies, London, on May 24, 1937. It is from one of the dozen last speeches that he made before retiring as prime minister. He said:

If you will only do as I have done, study the history of the growth of the constitution from the time of the civil war until the Hanoverians came to the throne, you will see what a country can do without the aid of logic, but with the aid of common sense.

That I cannot understand—without logic but with common sense. For me, common sense is logic, but for him it had a different meaning. He went on:

Therefore my next point is: Do not let us put any part of our constitution in a strait-waistcoat, because strangulation is the ultimate fate. And I would say one more thing: Don't let us be too keen on definition.

I do not think the measure now before the house will put this country in a strait-waistcoat. I think it will put this country in a strait-jacket.

The only difference between the right hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar is that the latter is more intimate with Mr. Hugh Dalton. That is the only difference between them. They all think similarly. The hon. member for Leth-

bridge, the former leader of the Social Credit group, is, if I correctly understood what he said, even more enthusiastic about these measures.

Mr. MacINNIS: You have no doubt of that.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes. I do not wish to offend my hon. friends who are just in front of me, but I do not believe in the present government of Britain, and I believe also that all they said about the nationalization of the Old Lady of Threadneedle street is just for the gallery.

Mr. MacINNIS: Do you believe in the present government of Canada?

Mr. POULIOT: I say this for the reason that the former governor has been chosen as governor by the present government. His name is rather funny; it is Lord Catto. Never mind; Catto was good enough for Churchill and he is good enough for Attlee. The same old system continues.

The main reason why I am opposed to the finance schemes of the government is that the experts who advise them are those whom I denounced twelve, thirteen or fourteen years ago when they were appointed by Viscount Bennett, then Prime Minister. They were chosen by a Conservative prime minister and chosen by him alone. I do not know whether he consulted the leader of the Liberal party about the matter; I asked the question and Mr. Bennett said No, and that was the reason for me that it was Yes. But the fact is that those great experts were appointed under a Conservative government, and sometimes I was alone in denouncing them. I was often rebuked, even by my leader, because I denounced them. At that time there was a Conservative government in charge of the business of the country, and therefore things went wrong much sooner than they do when the party in power is the Liberal party.

Mr. MacINNIS: But still they go wrong.

Mr. POULIOT: It does not mean that they are any better. However, I will not mention them by name. My hon. friends agree with me.

An hon. MEMBER: Just at this moment.

Mr. POULIOT: But for ten years I was alone in denouncing them by name and asking the government to fire them. I had no support, and I regret deeply that the leader of the C.C.F. group never supported me in removing these obstacles from the way. He was quite ready to describe the evil situation which was created by that intelligentzia, which is similar to the one that brought revolution to Russia, but he stopped there. I notice that the hon. member for Regina City seems to be very alert; I hope he will give a tip to his leader at times to support me.

Let it be understood well, Mr. Chairman, that I am ready to support any measure to help the British people so long as that help serves that purpose. I have said so already. But I do not believe that we are now in a position to make a gift of such magnitude to a country which is called the mother country by those who describe themselves as true Canadians. I hope you will understand well what is my point.

A statement was made by one of the ministers yesterday or the day before, and last week, to the effect that it was impossible to help those who were suffering from any infirmity because it would cost too much. When the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) moved a resolution with regard to health, and the hon. member for Vancouver East moved one regarding old age pensions, they were told that we have not the means to provide this assistance. But now we have the means not only to finance the United Kingdom but to finance the sterling area. This is incredible. We cannot do it. We have not the backbone to do that; we have not at the present time the population to do it, and we have not the means to do it. When anyone wants to help those in need in this country, our own people, the answer given is, no, we cannot do it; we have not the means to do it. But when it comes to the financing of the sterling area money comes so easily. It reminds me of all the reforms we were advocating before the war; it was impossible to get a satisfactory answer. But as soon as the war came all the sluices were wide open; the money flowed. It was easy to find money for the war, but it is impossible to find money for Canadians. If it is urged that family allowances are for the benefit of our own folk, the answer given is that if this measure does not pass there will be no more family allowances, and the people who have saved money, sometimes were forced to save money, to buy victory bonds, will not get anything when they go to the bank to change their coupons. That is not the way, I believe, in which discussion should be carried on upon a matter of such magnitude. I suffered humiliation because I accused Bennett of having lent $60 million to the Canadian Pacific Railway company without consulting the members of his cabinet, and the then Speaker called me to order, without having the right to do so, in spite of the rules of the house, which I knew much better than he did. However

I made a concession for the sake of the party. At the time I denounced Bennett because he lent $60 million to the C.P.R., without consulting his cabinet. What about making a gift of a billion and a quarter to Great Britain without consulting the supporters of the government in this house? This I cannot understand, nor can I agree with it, because I am a Liberal and I believe we must stick together. We must be consulted before any matter of such importance is decided upon.

Mr. HOMUTH: I thought you had a caucus once in a while.

Mr. POULIOT: When I talk of Liberalism my hon. friend cannot understand anything.

What surprises me also is that in this time of distress, when we are told it is impossible to get any money for the poor, for those who suffer any infirmity, the Bank of Canada gets bigger and bigger. They have now bought two buildings for $1,170,000. They are growing up. Some day I will take the house into my confidence and tell my colleagues the story of the Bank of Canada, how it came on the programme of the Liberal party and how it was stolen from the Liberal party by Mr. Bennett; and if the Bank of Canada was ever amongst the fourteen points of the Liberal party I will tell you why. It was one more point to win Oxford and other by-elections. That is all. That is why the Bank of Canada has been put in the beggar's bag, with a few other things—just to offer something concrete to the electorate at the time.

An hon. MEMBER: Your party would not do anything like that, would they?

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend should not be scandalized; they do worse than that. But my hon. friends over there do not enjoy the freedom we enjoy on this side of the house in the Liberal party. If I were a C.C.F. member and spoke as I am speaking now as a Liberal I would probably be censured by the hon. member himself.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, then, the hon. gentleman is a Liberal. Now, Mr. Chairman, here we are being greatly generous. This is $1,250,000,000, and it is well arranged. There was an understanding between the United Kingdom envoys and the government and they fixed up their war claims. What it is we do not know. I did not expect the Minister of Finance to make a plea for the adoption of the resolution this afternoon; I expected him to give a complete exposé of the situation and to inform the members of the house of the situation. But after we had listened to him we knew no more than after having read the agreement. I expected more details about the matter and I will tell him the kind of details I want.

In the first place, in this country we have what is called a temperate climate. We have not a tropical climate. But Great Britain has possessions in the West Indies; it has Trinidad, Jamaica, the Bahama islands. Why should we not put in our claim for these in return, as a guarantee for what we have been doing financially for them? It is not only a question of a a billion and a quarter; it is a question of all that we have done for England since the beginning of the war. I remember the first time the first billion dollars was voted. What was the reaction in England? What appeared in the morning press was that it was taken very calmly in England, and I as a member of parliament had to remind Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden, after they had come here and forgotten to thank us for our help, our monetary help, in the very chamber that had voted these gifts. I reminded them of all this. At a meeting in the city of New York or Washington—one of them—where the Prime Minister of Canada was present, Mr. Churchill said that the help that Canada had given to the united nations, and especially to the United Kingdom, was massive. Afterwards, I said here in this house that evidently Mr. Churchill never failed to read the speeches made by Jean-François Pouliot in the House of Commons. Why should we not have Bermuda? Why should we not have Jamaica, with its rum, its sugar, its molasses? Why should we not have the bananas of Trinidad? We should have something.

An hon. MEMBER: We have no bananas.

Mr. POULIOT: No, but something should be done. The matter is too sacrosanct to be discussed as a business proposition when Englishmen come here with their brief cases in which they put everything they can get in this country. They make several trips and have larger bags and cases, and all the stores in town are empty after a delegation has been here. Well, they do not talk of business; they talk of sentiment. But sentiment, sentimentality, does not exist in the mind or heart of an Englishman when he does business with someone, and if he saw anyone acting sentimentally—and Canada is the only country in the world to-day that does so—he would say, "That fellow is crazy".

I will not say that of anyone in this country, but I think it of this measure. I think it is silly and crazy. It is not only a question of having something territorial as a guarantee of what is being done and what has been done by Canada for Great Britain.

There are other things too. There are securities, bonds and stocks now in England, controlled by foreigners. I will give a brief resume to show what they are; and every time it is the same thing. We are told that with this amount we shall redeem securities. A small amount, a small slice, a very small slice comes back to this country, and the rest stays in England—I will tell the committee why—or is sent to the United States via Toronto. Here we have nothing or very little. Mark you, sir, over a billion and a half in securities, bonds and stocks is over there. The cartels should be owned in Canada by Canadians. Cartels make colonies out of dominions, as has been stated repeatedly.

There is still a large quantity of C.N.R. stock, securities; over 60 per cent of Canadian Pacific in London, Paris and Amsterdam, and they control, mark you, sir, Consolidated Smelters and Western Lands also to a large extent. There is Hudson's Bay, Lever Brothers, Lazard Frères, who are interested in so many concerns, Canadian collieries—my hon. friends from the west know what that is—the match combine of Bryant and May of London and Sweden, H. F. Ritchie and Company who control Eno's and lots of medicines, Red Rose Tea, International Nickel, Courtauld's Rayon Companies and C.I.L., besides others. There are municipal securities and bonds of Montreal and Moose Jaw and other places. When the directors of an organization like Canadian Industries Limited are Canadian they are just stooges to international finance. My hon. friends who listen to me now would fall from their seats if they knew who is the president of Courtauld's in Montreal. They will find it in the book in the library.

British taxes are less owing to the allowance for the corporation tax and special allowances for what the company has paid. When the company pays 40 per cent it is deducted from the 60 per cent charged to the shareholder taxpayer. Here the charge is 60 per cent, without any reduction. I do not see why all that wealth which should belong to the Canadian people has not been brought back here, just as all the stocks, securities and bonds of the Indian railways have been called back to India, not by Hindus but by Englishmen engaged in business there, and just as all the South African securities have been brought back from England to South Africa by Smuts, mark you, who is a dandy imperialist.

Britain has been planning how to carry on if the loan were refused, and Britain insists that France pay all claims in gold. I kept something in reserve. It is an excerpt from the *Financial Post* quoting an interview with Keynes. Canada has been giving help to thirteen countries, owing to the advice of these experts in whom it is impossible to have any trust. It is impossible for the farmers, for those engaged in lumbering or any other occupation to have any trucks, and what do I see? I see that Finland, a country with which Canada has been at war without sending a single soldier there, now receives Ford trucks built in Canada, though from the experience of all hon. members it is impossible to secure any trucks in our own country. How is it that they are sent as far as Finland, an enemy country, while we have not even yet made peace with Finland? We send our trucks there; yet when farmers in any part of this country want trucks they have to beg them on their knees, and sometimes it is a very long time before they get a satisfactory answer. It is absurd. Why should we serve these countries outside Canada while our people are in need of these things? What I say now I could repeat anywhere in this country. I could repeat it in tory Toronto or anywhere else, and I am sure it would find an echo in the minds of all those who are patriotic enough to look at the matter reasonably.

I know some will say I am not a loyal Canadian because I want my people to be served before any stranger or foreigner. I think it is a shame that we should not look after our own people, who made such sacrifices during the war, in order to give benefits to enemies of Canada, to send help to thirteen other countries. We are supporting the sterling area. Is there anything crazier than that? It is a handicap to our trade. It is most difficult to trade with countries outside the sterling area as long as we are in it. What was the first idea of that organization? It was the German zollverein, at the time of Napoleon. It was a union between the grand duchy of Baden and Prussia, and at first it was a commercial union. There was no sense of business in all the war financing, and it is time to say so. I remember what Mr. Aberhart said about that kind of financing before he died. He said it was wrong, and he was right in saying it was wrong.

I speak with great sincerity, and the committee honours me by listening; but how is it that it is impossible to reduce taxation as it has been reduced in the United States, where last fall twelve million people were relieved from taxation by President Truman by the stroke of a pen, and in Great Britain, where taxation now has also been reduced? I wonder if the help we are giving to Great Britain now, which will increase the burden of taxation on the shoulders of our Canadian fellow citizens,

will not help to relieve the people of the United Kingdom of their own burden of taxation. I do not know if hon. members have read an editorial which appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* of April 10, but if they have not I should like to read it for them:

> The budget forecast for 1946-47 presented by the Right Hon. Hugh Dalton, chancellor of the exchequer, called for a decisive cut of approximately $7·5 billions, or thirty-one per cent in total outlay . . .
>
> The only alternative would have been continuance of deficit financing and burdensome borrowing. But a firm retreat from such policy is marked by a drop of 68 per cent in the 1946-47 deficit compared with the past year.

Then it goes on to compare the United Kingdom and Canada.

> Both countries levied the tax on a one hundred per cent basis during the war, but Britain led the way in dropping it to 60 per cent—at which level it now stand in Canada—and has now acted first to wipe it out entirely.

It will be said that Canada will meet with disaster, that it will be the end of the world if we change that agreement. No, sir. Trade must be free and it is a barter. I remember what was said by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he notified us of the appointment of our first and only consul general in the city of New York. He told us he would work in cooperation with the representatives of the United Kingdom. That is wrong, because Canada must be financially independent; Canada must be economically independent; and we are not to be under the tutelage of the United Kingdom any more than under the tutelage of the United States in regard to trade. We must be masters of our trade; and if there is any difficulty between a Canadian and an Englishman the consul and the government shall stand behind the Canadian and fight the Englishman on the trade proposition.

I find it most unfortunate to have to say this. We are told here that there are to be new contracts for Canadian foodstuffs. Mr. MacLeod of the British United Press went to England during the war and came back with this news, which is clear and obvious to all. He said after the war is over, the question of trade will not be one of gratitude; it will be one of business; and if England can find cheaper goods in other parts of the world than in Canada, she will buy them there. That is normal; I do not disagree with it. What I find childish and silly is the suggestion that Englishmen, with their sense of business, will put aside centuries of tradition to adopt the views of the Canadian government and say, "After you, my dear Alphonse; after you, my dear Gaston." One who takes that view cannot have read a line of the history of England. I have the greatest admiration for Englishmen. They come here and they are the masters of the land; Canadians must be put aside when the Englishman says, "How do you do? Ho, ho; fine country, Canada." Every hon. member laughs, but every hon. member knows that is true. They come here as conquerors. Each Englishman who comes here to make a bargain with the Canadian government is like Julius Caesar when he went to Britain for the first time. He is a conqueror. He reminds me of the child who was writing figures on the blackboard. "Il pose zéro et retient tout". That is the way it is done. It is a principle of business; it is the principle the Canadian government should have.

Is it reasonable to think there has been last fall a lowering of taxation in the United States to exempt twelve million people at the stroke of President Truman's pen, a reduction of taxation to that extent, and which is going on in England now; yet it is impossible to get a guarantee in this country that bachelors, single people, will receive some relief, that their burden will not be alleviated to $1,000, and for married couples without children to at least $2,000?

The other day when a question was asked about a reduction in expenditures a minister answered: "There is no question of reducing taxation; the question is one of reducing expenditures." We hear hon. members in the Progressive Conservative party talk about reduced expenditures. I say to them this: Support us in asking at least something in return for those agreements signed not long ago.

How much was I abused during the war; how many times have I been called traitor when I asked only for a recognition of what had been done by this country! If I put my hand in my pocket I find there a sentence uttered by the Minister of Finance either last fall or last spring. I cannot conceive of his saying this, and yet he did say that Canada was not a creditor nation; that our people owed more to other countries than other countries owed to Canada. After that, how can he say that this measure is not a pure gift. The mutual aid bill, and all those measures were gifts. They were sentimental gifts, and that was said in the house. If to-day we have some difficulty with the other united nations and if we have some difficulty with our own folk, because enemy countries are favoured at the expense of our own, it is due precisely to the fact, that not only is this country under the yoke of UNO, but it is also under the yoke of UNRRA, and we are not masters of our

own destiny. When we fight for the recognition of freedom, not of single individuals, but the freedom of the country at large, we fight for the cause of each one. We fight for the cause of liberty. We fight against that octopus which is trying to control our national resources, the octopus of international finance which I have denounced repeatedly by name in this house, but without support. However, I hope that next time I do so I shall have the support of someone—at least that of my C.C.F. friend who was so nice to me just a minute ago.

I thank the committee for having listened, and I hope that my colleagues, whom I respect, will never think that one is biased because, although not anti-British, he is pro-Canadian.

(Translation):

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Mr. Chairman, this afternoon, the Right Honourable Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) asked members to refrain from an extensive discussion of the resolution since we will have an opportunity of outlining our objections when the bill is submitted for second reading. I will therefore postpone my remarks expressing my disapproval.

However, as the resolution embodies a principle against which I struggled all through the war, and which I feel all the more justified in opposing now that the war is over, I deem it proper to register my disapproval without delay.

Looking closely at the resolution, we find that the Right Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) is introducing a measure seeking, among other things, "to cancel the amount owing by the government of the United Kingdom to the government of Canada with respect to the British commonwealth air training plan, being the sum of four hundred and twenty-five million dollars". This afternoon, discussion has taken place mainly on the loan and nothing has been said about this out-and-out gift, this direct contribution of $425 millions to a country which at the very moment it requested this gift, or should I say received it, was lending money to another country, with interest.

In the second place, we are also asked to settle for $150 million another debt the details of which we do not know and which we have reason to believe a much greater than that sum. That is another direct gift.

In the third place, we are asked to lend without interest for five years the amount of one thousand two hundred and fifty million dollars on the understanding that at the end of those five years we shall decide whether to claim interest. In other words, more money gone with the wind.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

What will these loan gifts and presents achieve? They will simply make it possible for Great Britain to advance money to other nations thus developing her commercial relations and maintaining her supremacy over world trade. To my mind we who are citizens of Canada have no right to levy taxes on our fellow countrymen in order that Great Britain may lend money to other nations.

This afternoon, the Right Hon. Minister of Finance gave the impression that the donor rather than the recipient of a gift ought to be grateful. What a strange reasoning! . . . We have now come to misrepresenting the meaning of words; gratitude is no longer expected of the recipient of a gift but of his benefactor. The borrower who is advanced an interest-free loan, that is, a worthless investment which is nothing but a gift in disguise, is no longer required to be thankful since the shoe is now on the other foot and it behooves the benefactor to show gratitude. I am not ready to accept this argument, and I wanted to register my disapproval without delay, postponing until the second reading of the bill a more detailed discussion of my objections.

(Text):

Mr. GLEASON BELZILE (Rimouski): Mr. Chairman, I think a voice from the province of Quebec should be heard to-night in defence of the resolution before us. This resolution does not represent an entirely new policy of the Liberal party. In my view it is the continuation of a policy which was adopted during the war under dire exigencies.

I consider I have a right to discuss this matter because judgment has been passed upon it by the electorate of my constituency. "Billions to England" was the cry of every Nationalist, every member of the Bloc Populaire and every independent member during the last election. In my own constituency the most forceful denunciator was the former member of parliament and he made many speeches. Previously he had separated from his party; after denouncing it in this house in the most violent terms, he crossed the floor of the chamber. During the campaign I defended the government to the best of my humble ability. The good people of the constituency of Rimouski had every opportunity to form an opinion. On polling day they gave their verdict and here I am to speak for them.

It seems to me that Canada's relations with the United Kingdom, even the purely commercial relations, are the greatest occasion for misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Our relations with other countries on

approximately the same basis are not even questioned. Under the Export Credit Insurance Act loans have been authorized and made to other countries but never a word has been said. This afternoon the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) tabled full details of all these loans. At the beginning of the session a question was asked and the answer appears in *Hansard* at page 358. The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Thatcher) asked for the details of loans and gifts made by Canada to other nations, and the following information was given:

U.S.S.R.	$13,000,000
Norway	13,000,000
Netherlands Indies	15,000,000
Czechoslovakia	19,000,000
Belgium	25,000,000
China	60,000,000
Netherlands	125,000,000
France	242,000,000
Total	$512,000,000

These loans were considered by every nationalist as good business.

(Translation):

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. BELZILE: Certainly.

Mr. RAYMOND: Did those loans which you have just mentioned bear interest or were they interest-free?

Mr. BELZILE: According to the report of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) the interest rate ranges between 2½ and 3 per cent.

Mr. LALONDE (Labelle): He was not in the house this afternoon.

(Text):

Mr. BELZILE: If these loans were considered as purely business matters, I humbly submit that the present loan should be considered in the same way although it does involve a large amount of money. As was said by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell), it should be appraised and judged solely in the light of the general interest of Canada and of its people. It should be judged from a purely selfish and egotistical point of view. In extending a loan a businessman or a man on the street has two things to consider. First, he must consider his own personal situation and. second, he must consider the solvency of the borrower. That is a good rule and it should be applied to the present case.

What is the financial situation of Canada? The statistics that I am about to give were obtained from the *Canada Year Book* for 1945. National income forms the fundamental basis of revenue. When national income is considered in relation to national revenue or taxes it faithfully portrays the economic position of a country. From 1933, the darkest year of the depression, Canada's national income has risen from $2,795 million to an estimated amount of some $9,000 million for 1945. National revenue increased from some $500 million to a total of $2,765 million. There is no doubt that our national wealth is much greater in 1946 than it ever was. In using the other method of calculating national wealth, that of working back to capital values ough income tax returns, we find that the same assertion can be made.

Of course we must consider our national debt of some $15,000 million, most of which was incurred during the war and which therefore, is not represented by corresponding assets. However, this is counterbalanced to some extent by the fact that this loan is mainly held in Canada and is payable in Canadian funds. It is said that during the war Canada repatriated Canadian securities from the United Kingdom to a value of about $1,000 million and has accumulated sterling balances, later converted into a loan, of which there is still owing to Canada some $500 million which is guaranteed by liens on Canadian securities held in the United Kingdom. Therefore our financial situation as far as the United Kingdom is concerned has been converted to our advantage to the extent of $1,500 million. I think everyone who spoke before me concurred in the opinion that our financial situation is actually quite sound.

We have assumed great responsibilities to our own people. There is the interest on our debt, the reestablishment of our veterans, the payment of family allowances and so on. We must face great problems, such as reconversion, housing, great programmes of public works and railway expansion such as has been requested from the other side. After listening to many speeches in this house, I have formed the opinion that many of us are trying to raid the treasury in order to satisfy the demands of our own constituencies that this or that should be provided.

To meet these responsibilities, to solve these problems and to satisfy our constituents we shall need an annual revenue of some $2,000 million, and we shall have to get this from taxes. Taxes are derived from national income and the rate of taxation is in direct proportion to the national income. With a national income of $10,000 million, we must impose taxation at the rate of 20 per cent in order to raise $2,000 million. With an income of only $6,000 million the rate goes up 33⅓ per cent. National income is the yardstick of the comparative severity of taxation. It is a principle of economics that income results only from production. In that I agree

with hon. members on the other side. Therefore, to have a high national income we must maintain a large production.

At the close of 1944, Canadian agriculture and industry, despite the shortage of labour, succeeded in meeting war-time requirements —and war was an insatiable consumer. But now reconstruction is taking place and we are faced with this situation, that Canada has become the third largest producing nation of the world. On a per capita basis the Canadian figures exceed those of all the leading world powers. This is a situation that we cannot evade. It is the whole crux of the question. It is an admitted fact that we cannot possibly consume all the goods we produce. We shall have surpluses of agricultural, forest and mineral products. What are we to do with them? Let them glut our domestic market? That was tried in the 1930's and found impractical, to say the least. Or shall we try to trade them? We have been doing that; we are doing that, and we shall keep on doing that.

The importance of our foreign trade has steadily increased since 1939. In 1944, Canada's total trade reached a record value of $5,242,000,000—a more than three-fold increase of the 1939 total of $1,687,000,000. Of course, this was mostly war-time trade. An approximate calculation indicates that seventy-five per cent of it belonged to that category; nevertheless, the remaining twenty-five per cent of peace-time trade was important and played a vital role in sustaining the activities of this country.

Because Canada is one of the least self-sufficient countries, her very existence depends upon making the most of her own specialized resources, and her prosperity also depends on trading them as advantageously as she can for her own requirements. Canada cannot dispense with international trade. Actually we have been trading all over the world; according to the Department of Trade and Commerce, the geographical distribution of Canadian exports has shown some marked changes under war conditions; but the United States and the United Kingdom have retained their position as Canada's best customers. To the United States we have sold much less than we have bought from her. For the last six years our trade with the United States shows an adverse balance of $1,187,852,000. On the other hand, trade within the British empire in the last six years shows a surplus of $4,203,773,000. As in the past we have compensated our deficit of United States dollars with English pounds. Our trade in those two markets, the United States and the United Kingdom, represent about seventy-five per cent of our exports. In consequence of these facts and statistics, I conclude that external trade is a matter of necessity for Canada, and that the United Kingdom is our best customer. The situation is not the effect of the war but a direct result of an old policy of the Liberal party.

This brings me to the second point of view of the lender: the present and future solvency of the borrower.

Up until the war the United Kingdom was the controlling factor in international commerce. The pound sterling was the monetary standard. It is an indisputable fact that the United Kingdom was the most solvent merchant in the world. Has this position deteriorated during the war? Of course it has. As a matter of fact, the United Kingdom from a creditor nation has become a debtor nation. It is estimated that it owes to the world twenty billion dollars. That is an enormous amount, but we have to take into consideration the national income accruing to private persons and to business for the basis of its reimbursement, and the revenue of the government that repays it. That was the rule applied in the case of Canada.

Statistics for the United Kingdom show the net national income of the people and the revenue of the government to be as follows:

	National Income	Government Revenue
1938	£4,604,000,000	£ 883,000,000
1939	4,968,000,000	975,000,000
1940	5,945,000,000	1,258,000,000
1941	6,885,000,000	1,836,000,000
1942	7,604,000,000	2,344,000,000
1943	8,172,000,000	2,876,000,000
1944		3,238,000,000
1945	estimated—	3,265,000,000

The English people are still doing business and paying taxes. Mr. Hugh Dalton, when he presented his budget in the British house yesterday, proved that even with the reduction he was proposing in the income tax the British rates are higher than ours on personal incomes.

We have to consider now what has been the effect of the war on British industry. There has been a six-year interruption of normal processes of trade. Overseas markets have been compelled to supply their own needs and foreign investments have been liquidated. Those are hard facts. But external trade is a matter of necessity for the United Kingdom. With a population of 47,000,000 people it cannot feed itself or supply its industries with essential materials without a large import and export trade. During the war great technological advances have been made, and Germany Italy and Japan have disappeared as competitors for many, many years. Therefore it

can safely be concluded that British industry will fast recover and that her exports will find a ready market within the next few years. That is my humble opinion in answer to the second question as to the future solvency of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is solvent but it has not the ready cash.

The end of the war and the termination of lend-lease have created great economic problems of reconversion. The main one is to find funds to finance an import balance during the immediate period when foreign receipts will be inadequate to sustain imports at a rate necessary for a fast reconversion. The only nation that has any money to lend is the United States and they have agreed to lend the United Kingdom $4,400 million, out of which $650 million will be in full settlement of lend-lease, surplus war property and other financial claims arising out of the conduct of the war.

Under the terms of the financial agreement, the United States negotiators agree to extend a $3,750 million line of credit to the United Kingdom, to be drawn upon until the 31st of December, 1951. The loan is to be repaid in fifty annual instalments beginning in December 1951 with interest at two per cent per annum; taking account of five interest-free years the rate is actually 1·62 per cent. This Anglo-American agreement was signed on the 6th of December, 1945, subject to ulterior ratification by both governments.

When it was presented to the parliament at Westminster, various voices pronounced it "cruelly hard", mentioned that "it left us with our agricultural programme" and concluded that "we have been forced into a disastrous bargain."

Sir John Anderson, Chancellor of the Exchequer, said: "The agreement was the result of very intricate discussions and of some very hard bargaining". He added, "I think we have had to accept a very hard bargain." Hon. Oliver Lyttelton said: "In many respects the bargain is a thoroughly bad one—the terms are onerous." Mr. Cyril Osborne said it was "an agreement under duress." The Right Hon. Ernest Bevin, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, said he knew that the task of facing this loan left a good many people with a sense of discomfort, but he did not know anybody who ever came away from a money-lender's office and felt comfortable.

The English parliamentarians seem pretty well unanimous that it was not an "outright gift", and they should know.

Canada's cooperation was essential to assure the ratification of the loan by the congress of the United States. Therefore, on the 6th of March last, an Anglo-Canadian agreement was signed at Ottawa. It is on the same terms and conditions as the United States agreement. It complements it and depends on it for its execution.

I think it ought to be ratified. If Canada refuses that credit to its best customer, it is sure to suffer an immediate decrease in its national income and to face terrible unemployment with all its consequences. This opinion has often been voiced in this house, but I am bound to repeat it because it is the absolute truth. It would be a great responsibility for me to refuse my adherence to this measure and risk, as a consequence, to see the farmers and lumbermen of my constituency without a market for their products. It is a good thing to try to obtain new markets, but it would take years to change the course of our external trade.

In conclusion, I wish to add that in my personal opinion this loan is a direct proof of our own sovereignty. It is not the payment of tribute by a vassal to his lord, but it is a business transaction of mutual interest between two friendly nations.

Mr. L. R. BEAUDOIN (Vaudreuil-Soulanges): Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to speak on this measure following the hon. member for Rimouski. In the first place, I wish to congratulate the hon. member upon his wonderful address. I think he has presented his conception of the measure in a comprehensive and realistic manner. I was not going to participate in this debate but, like the hon. member for Rimouski, I feel that some voices from Quebec should be heard in favour of this measure.

This question merits thorough consideration and careful study. It has been explained clearly this afternoon by the Minister of Finance. We have heard about this measure for quite a while: now it is presented to the house in the form of a resolution. Later on, a bill will be introduced and we shall have a further opportunity to discuss the present measure.

I was very much surprised at the speech which was made at the end of the afternoon by the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres. He stated at the beginning of his remarks that he was not very well prepared to speak on the matter but that he just wanted to state his opinion of the measure. When he said that, I recalled the advice which he had given to the people of Quebec about the seriousness of certain matters into which one should not go without careful study. I delved into some excerpts from the press, and I picked out this

item, which appeared in the Montreal *Star* on April 10, 1942, when the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres was addressing the people of Quebec on the matter of the plebiscite of 1942. He said:

I submit that several aspects of the question have not been presented to you, and, what is still more serious, you have not been shown the grave consequences which might result from your decision. It may very well be, in fact, that the vote to which you have pledged yourselves may bring results exactly contrary to those you desire.

I would be the last one to speak of this measure in emotional terms. It was a real comfort this afternoon to hear the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario state that he was considering this measure exclusively on the basis of the interests and the best interests of Canada itself. That is the tone that the Minister of Finance has set on this question, and that is the way that it is understood throughout Canada, that this loan is a good business proposition. But had there been anyone to suggest that the subject of this loan should be presented in emotional terms, I would again have recourse to thoughts expressed by the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres as I found them in *La Presse* of Saturday, April 25, 1942, when he said, and I translate:

Independence would not protect us; on the contrary it would aggravate our obligations and the results of a possible defeat. Look at Belgium! Look at Holland! We are far from there, one might say. Yes, because the English fleet guards the ocean. But without it, what would the defence of our coasts be worth?

These statements of the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres should be remembered today. Were we considering this measure otherwise than as a business proposition; were we considering it as a gift, I would be entitled to consent to this measure, under the terms expressed by the hon. member himself, as a gift, and I would consent to it not with interest at two per cent but without any interest at all.

I agree with the hon. member for Rimouski that this measure is only one loan of a group of loans which have already been made in order to restore and maintain our export trade. In the debate on the speech from the throne at the beginning of the session the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg made it clear, and it has been made clearer since, that other loans have been made, about which hon. members who are opposing this measure have never uttered a word. I would repeat, although the hon. member for Rimouski has made it quite clear, what was pointed out by the member for Queens-Lunenburg. namely, that:

Loan agreements have been entered into with England, Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, the Netherlands, the Netherlands East Indies, Norway and Russia. Furthermore, negotiations are well advanced toward making a very large amount of money available to France.

As part of that policy instituted by the government, in the best interests of Canada, we have this measure for a loan to the United Kingdom. We must understand that the economy of Canada and that of other countries interpenetrate. We cannot live alone. We must understand, in order to support this measure, that global strategy which the minister discussed so ably this afternoon.

The Liberal party is presenting this measure. It is supported by the Conservative party, by the C.C.F. and by the Social Credit party. A great deal of study was given to the question by the government before introducing the measure, and I do not see why certain individuals should rise and speak against the proposal after so many have given it careful consideration and so many people in all sections of the country, realizing what good business it is for Canada, have through their representatives, agreed to the resolution.

Again I will recall the words of the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres when he declared in *La Presse* on Wednesday, January 12, 1938:

(Translation):

A man who stands alone in politics or in any organization is worth nothing at all. What can be expected of an individual who is always changing about and who has such a nasty character he can get along with no one? Personally, I do not trust anyone who is neither with the government nor with the opposition, and is regarded as a one-man party.

(Text):

I know that hon. members are anxious to have this debate concluded and I have no desire to take up any more of the time of the house. Let me say, in conclusion, that I have confidence in the government of the country, and knowing that in every move it makes it does consider the best interests of Canada, I wish on behalf of my constituents to declare that I am very happy to support this measure since I believe that its object is to safeguard the interests of the country.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Ilsley thereupon moved for leave to introduce bill No. 28, respecting the financial agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom signed on the sixth day of March, 1946.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. CARDIN: On division.

Motion agreed to on division and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

The house resumed from Tuesday, April 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Martin for the second reading of bill No. 7, respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens.

Mr. C. C. I. MERRITT (Vancouver-Burrard): I should like first of all to say a few words on the Japanese question. I do not wish to dwell very long on that particular aspect of the subject, but I will place myself squarely behind the British Columbia members who have preceded me in this debate. The people of British Columbia are very much concerned over the delay in the application of the policy announced by the government. It seems to me that the government must recognize that delay will bring them further and further into difficulties, and they must very soon come to a decision and carry through their policy.

The government will be more and more under the influence of pressure groups in this connection. I would point out to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), when he receives these pressure groups, that the contest, if there is one, is between the people of British Columbia represented by their members in parliament, who have a responsibility not only to themselves but also to those whom they represent, and those deputations that have a responsibility only to themselves. The people of British Columbia have borne this Japanese problem for many years and for them it might be likened to a red-hot shot. During the war, after years of effort, they succeeded in dumping it on the lap of this government. There is only one thing that the people of British Columbia will not accept, and that is to have this red-hot shot dumped back into their hands to carry it again alone.

So that whatever policy the government eventually decides to adopt—and I hope that it will adopt a policy quickly—that policy cannot be one of forcing back upon us a load which we have carried too long and know too well. That is all I wish to say about the Japanese.

I now turn to the bill itself. First, I should like to refer to the point raised by the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Jaenicke) and the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Hazen). I was very much surprised that in introducing the bill the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) did not make any statement as to the discussions he had had with Great Britain and the other members of the commonwealth. I should have thought that in connection with a bill of such importance nothing could be more desirable than that there should be such a discussion; and if the Secretary of State were to take the view I do, surely he would have made that announcement when he introduced the bill. Then, arising out of his remarks in reply to the hon. member for York South (Mr. Cockeram), I wish to say that certainly for many years no one on this side of the house has doubted Canada's absolute sovereignty. Certainly there will be no one in the official opposition who will regret that we are taking the lead in the development of empire affairs. But if we are to take such a lead it is of vital importance to a very large number of people in this country that the lead we take and the example we set to the other nations of the commonwealth shall be not only for the good of Canada but also to the advantage of that association which so many of us believe is good for Canada. Therefore, if this bill is to be used as a model for legislation in other countries of the commonwealth it is vital that we do not put any impediment in the way of the free movement of peoples in the empire family.

Mr. MARTIN: Does this bill do that?

Mr. MERRITT: In the five years residence rule it certainly does.

Mr. MARTIN: That has been the law for twenty-seven years.

Mr. FLEMING: Oh, no.

Mr. MERRITT: I shall leave that point and come to another angle of this matter. I am a natural-born Canadian whose forbears were also born in this country. I am entirely Canadian, and I am one of a very large number who are entirely Canadian, yet who say with pride, "I am a British subject." Therefore, I think I may speak for a moment on behalf of that very large class. The Canadian-born British subject is the one class of Canadian that has taken an awful beating in this debate. We have heard much about the glories of all other classes of Canadians, while the Canadian-born who is proud to be a British subject has been accused of various weaknesses in his Canadianism. Well, I think it is very good that matters of this kind should be brought up, because the opinion of others is very good for one's soul. Until this debate I had never realized that my Canadianism was not complete. I do not doubt that it is, even after what has been said, but certainly it will do me good to know there are those who hold such a view.

I welcomed the bill heartily, and I welcome it particularly for the reasons so ably advanced by the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll).

I consider that this bill is of tremendous importance, as the hon. member said, to the class of Canadians on whose behalf he spoke; and I can well understand the view he takes when he says many people who have come into this country have not experienced the same sense of nationhood they knew in their native countries in crowded Europe. But I wish to say to the hon. member for Spadina, who, I am sorry, is not in his seat now, that he must not doubt the attachment of native-born Canadians to their birthright. We travel in no shadow of the mother country or of the United States. We are British subjects because and only because we are Canadians; we are not British subjects in spite of being Canadians. The hon. member spoke of "soft, apologetic Canadianism." I must say I have not experienced any such feeling, nor have I ever encountered it in this country. Very often I have met the reverse of soft, apologetic Canadianism, but never that type.

In addition to welcoming the bill, I welcome this debate, during which many frank things have been said. That is a good thing. I have sat silently in this house for some months now and have been amazed and distressed at references to colonialism and slurs on the status of British subjects. I have not been silent because I agreed with those remarks, but rather because I did not understand and therefore did not know how I could answer them. In this debate, however, I think I have heard the reasons which motivated references to colonialism and derogatory remarks about British subjects; and if I do understand them now I might say a word in reply. I gathered from the speeches of the hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret) and the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond) that both hon. gentlemen were of the opinion, although in very different degree, that the status of a British subject meant there was some allegiance to Great Britain or Great Britain's laws as well as allegiance to Canada. If that is so I think I can answer it. I would say that such a view is a complete misconception of law and of fact; and since it is only a misconception that stands between us, nothing really holds us apart. I say perfectly frankly that if dual nationality or allegiance to another country existed owing to my being a British subject; if it meant that Canada was not a sovereign state, I would join with my hon. friends not in destroying the status of a British subject but rather in rectifying it, so that if there were derogations from Canada's sovereignty those derogations would be removed. I wish to say this—and I do not say it for myself, but for all Canadians proud of the status of British subjects—that that status is not to us one of habit or law, or one to be supported simply because we were born to it; it is a status we honour because we believe in it.

We believe in the status of British subject, and as Canadians wish to remain British subjects, because to us the British Empire or the British Commonwealth of Nations, whichever you like to call it, has been for many years in the past, and will be for many years in the future, the greatest bulwark of freedom that exists in this world. We desire to remain British subjects. We are proud of being British subjects now, because to be and to continue to be such is to us the surest way to be and to continue to be free men.

If there was any such misconception that I thought I gathered in the speeches of the hon. members to whom I have referred, it seems to me that the misconception might be based simply upon our use of words. I would point out to the house that where we can refer to citizens of Canada as Canadians or citizens of Brazil as Brazilians, we cannot refer to citizens of the United States of America by any adjectival addition to that country's name. Therefore we call them Americans, although they have no greater right so to be called than have we or the Brazilians. After all, we live in America and we, too, are Americans. But we allow to the United States, for convenience, the national appelation of American.

The same might be said about Great Britain. That country is not Britain; it is the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and one cannot add to that description the suffix "an" and use it conveniently in conversation.

Therefore, particularly in the United States, there has grown up a habit, which I noticed in the debate this afternoon, of referring to the citizens of Great Britain or of the United Kingdom as "the British". Surely that gives rise to a misconception of the term "British". Surely we are imparting to the citizens of Great Britain a status they do not exclusively possess, and that they do not claim exclusively for themselves.

They are not the only British. A British subject is not a citizen of Great Britain, as one hon. member has suggested. I suggest to anyone who doubts that statement that he ask an Englishman what his nationality is. He will say that it is English. And if one were to confuse a Welshman with an Englishman I think there would be a great row from the Welshman.

To drive that point home I would call the attention of the house to the perfect conception of nationality which exists in Scotland where, not only would the Scot be annoyed if he were called an Englishman—I would not dare do it—but also Scotland, although part of the United Kingdom, still has its own law, and still jealously retains many of the attributes of a separate country. So that I do not for a moment think it can be said, with any justification, that a British subject is something which pertains exclusively to Great Britain.

I wish to enlarge upon my conception of the status of British subject. As I said, I am a Canadian and I come from a family which through all Canada's history, long before confederation, has lived in Canada. I have no connection whatsoever with Great Britain. Yet I am a British subject. As a British subject, however, I am not the subject of any nation but Canada. And let me say here, with all sincerity, that no nation holds a greater place in my heart than my own country of Canada.

A British subject, therefore, is not a citizen of the United Kingdom. He is a citizen, rathe, of the British commonwealth of nations. A British subject has one king and one country—not two countries. But he has fraternal affiliations with many countries; he is close to being a world citizen. He is a member of the greatest collection of freely associated nations the world has ever seen. He is an internationalist in a world which is still nationalist, but is groping toward internationalism. He is a member of the first successful united nations organization. I say to the house that the British subject is the prime hope for the future of a free world.

The term is the exclusive possession of no one country, but rather it is the joint possession of many. Although I do not wish to labour this, I might offer another illustration of status, which I think makes it very clear. The hon. member for Outremont and I are both British subjects from Canada. Likewise, an Australian is a British subject from Australia. Mr. Churchill is a British subject from England and Field Marshal Smuts is a British subject from South Africa. Neither Mr. Churchill nor Field Marshal Smuts has any greater claim to the title "British subject" than has any hon. member in the house. Country of origin gives no precedence whatever to that appellation.

Let us for a moment turn to the bill. If the status of British subject is as I have described it, then it is something very much to be prized. It represents freedom; it represents sovereignty, and at the same time it represents the ability to join with other countries in something more than a mere arrangement of convenience for the time being.

When a British subject comes from England to Canada he may, under this bill, if he wishes, remain a British subject from England or, by going through the procedure provided in the bill, he may become a British subject from Canada. If he follows the latter course he assumes allegiance to the law of Canada and at the same time renounces his allegiance to the domestic law of England. Therefore I say he does not become naturalized in the usual sense of the term, but rather he becomes re-nationalized. If that is his status, if the process that he has gone through is different, why should he be lumped together in this bill and be forced to go through exactly the same procedure as must be gone through by an alien? The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes) pointed out the other day, I think most cogently, that the period of apprenticeship should not necessarily be the same for the one who has already partaken of a part of our joint heritage and who needs only to familiarize himself with our domestic law in order to be able to fit very well into our national life. That he should be lumped together with the alien is, to my mind, an ungracious act by a government which has not paid sufficient attention to that non-vocal but very large number of people in this country for whom I think I can claim to speak. I say it is an ungracious act because it is an unnecessary act and also because, as far as I know, it is a unilateral act.

At the opening of my remarks I referred to the necessity of consultation with the other nations of the commonwealth before introducing this bill. If we are setting an example to those other nations we must be clear in our minds as to what we are doing if we lump these people together in the cause of sovereignty. I say to the Secretary of State that sovereignty is not something over which to chuck your weight about. I say rather that sovereignty is pure, steady power which needs vivid expression only when it is actually attacked.

I do not think there is anyone in this country or in this house who doubts Canada's absolute sovereignty to-day. We hear about appeals to the privy council and the right to amend our own constitution. But do not let us think that the existence of those limitations on our sovereignty, if they can be called such, are there because of any act committed outside the boundaries of this country. We all know, and if it were not so I would be

very angry, that the moment we in this parliament decide to change those things, and decide upon the way we are going to change them, it will be done on the instant with no one objecting and no one able to object to the exercise of our undoubted sovereign power. I hope that out of this debate will come an end to all this talk of colonialism and of the slurs on a status of which a large number of Canadians are very proud indeed.

Having said so much about my pride in being a British subject, I wish to go on and say a few words about why I am proud of that status. The Secretary of State referred to the advantages of having a Canadian passport. I would have the same delight as he would in having my own passport, but I should like to point out to the house that there still are, and will be for many years to come, many places in this world where that passport will have to be executed and where the holder will have to be protected by a British consul or by the might of the British fleet. I use the term "British" as I always try to use it, in its widest and only proper sense. It might be a New Zealand consul, or it might be the South African fleet, but I think we shall find they are all British and all one when trouble occurs.

I should like to refer to the statement which is often made, and which has been made by myself, as to the fact that Great Britain, or as we often say wrongly, England, stood in the breach alone before Hitler. A vast part of the forces which stood in the breach alone before Hitler was forces of the United Kingdom. That was so because they were by far the most powerful country in the family of British nations. But at the same time there were Canadian forces in England; there were New Zealand forces in England and there were Australian forces in the middle east. It is right to say, and I think we can take pride in saying it without taking away from Great Britain any credit which is due to her, that it was the British Commonwealth of Nations which stood in the breach alone against Hitler. That makes me proud of being a British subject.

Let me talk a little more personally about trouble and how the British family reacts in trouble. I got into trouble and I was a prisoner in Germany. While there, I was able to confirm the views I had always held about the value of my status as a British subject. I remember my arrival at the British officers' camp in Germany. I was in a semi-starved condition; I had no clothes other than those in which I stood; I had no toothbrush and I was very dirty. Although perhaps I should not have been, I must admit that I was very low in spirit. I was accompanied by fellow-Canadians who spoke the French tongue, among whom I had several very good friends. We did not have to wait for five years for admission into the British family. We did not have to wait five minutes. We were given food, clothes and all the facilities at the command of that camp before we got into it. These things were thrown over the barbed-wire fence to us when we were confined in a separate compound. We were showered with food and clothing and conveniences. But, most of all, we were showered with the kindness which can be shown only by members of one great family.

In one of the camps in which I was there were men who were nationals of other nations. There was not the same feeling between those allies as there was between members of the nations in the British commonwealth. We gave them as much as we kept to ourselves. We were their friends, and we liked to meet them and talk with them and learn their points of view. But always there was that barrier, that they were friends and not brothers, and when you are in difficulty, Mr. Speaker, it is nice to be among brothers.

In that camp, which as I say was a British camp, we were South Africans, Australians, New Zealanders, English, Scottish, Irish, Welsh, Rhodesians, Palestinians, Indians, and Canadians not only of British and French extraction but naturalized Canadians bearing European names. We lived together and were chained together, and we took precedence and command according to our ranks, not in our own armies, not in the Canadian army or the Australian army, but according to the date of appointment of our ranks in the army of the whole British commonwealth. We meshed in completely, but despite that meshing in, our nationalities remained distinct. We remained distinctly Canadian; the Australians remained distinctly Australians, and I, for all my pride at being a British subject, was not at all backward in keeping the Canadian viewpoint advanced against the viewpoint of other commonwealth nations. But although sometimes we did divide internally, when it came to a matter affecting the enemy we had a common front and we were one in trouble. That is the great advantage of this status.

I wish to end on this note, with one further illustration. Late in the war, when the nazi government, in its desperation for trained men in its air force, took from our camp into the hands of the gestapo in Prague certain Czechoslovakians who were serving in the R.A.F.—and incidentally spoke much better

German than they did English—and threatened them with death if they did not volunteer to serve in the German air force, those Czechoslovakian pilots said, "No, we are British subjects; we wear the British uniform and you cannot ask us to do that, and you cannot harm us if we refuse." And, Mr. Speaker, each one of those Czechoslovakian pilots was returned unharmed into our camp from the hands of the gestapo. That, to me, seemed cogent evidence of the value of the status of which I speak.

So I say, let us understand our situation. Let us not delude ourselves with doubts about a sovereignty that we have and that we cherish. There are those amongst us, and I say it with all respect to them, who fail to understand that the full expression of Canadian sovereignty does not require any diminution of the status of a British subject, nor does pride in being a British subject lessen our essential Canadianism. On the contrary, the status of both increases with an increase in Canadian sovereignty. The whole essence of the meaning of the term "British subject" is freedom itself, and you cannot have freedom without absolute sovereignty.

If we look at history, we find that the ground on which the tree of Canadian sovereignty was grown was tilled first by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Cartier. That ground was hard and stony ground because in those days there was a real sense in Great Britain that Canada was a colony. Sir John A. Macdonald had to fight and struggle; and fight and struggle he did, until he caused the then colonial office to realize that Canada did not intend to remain in any status other than that of a sovereign state.

After Sir John A. Macdonald's work, and he did the hardest part of the work, Sir Wilfrid Laurier came and tended the tree, and it grew. His also was a hard task, comparable with that of Sir John A. Macdonald. He carried on in the same tradition that had been Canada's tradition since the days of confederation, and under his care the tree grew strong and tall.

Then. in the last war, by the efforts of Canadian soldiers on the battlefields of Europe the fruit of that tree was ripened and was first plucked perhaps by Sir Robert Borden at the peace conference. That process has gone on until now there is very little, if any, fruit still left to be plucked; but if there is, then we must do it if we are to be true British subjects.

The sovereignty we all prize, Canadians all, was not won by any single man or by any single party. It was won by the feeling of all Canadians of every race that we must be a sovereign state. It was pioneered and led, not by one man alone, but by several men, and in particular by two great men of the French race and two great men of the English race.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has exhausted his time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MERRITT: I have practically finished, Mr. Speaker. I only wish to say, in conclusion, that I hope out of this bill we can establish a status that will settle all doubts and differences between us as to the way in which we all hold our sovereignty. Then we can go on, in national unity, to the great future which lies ahead for Canada. Canada, in the British Commonwealth of Nations may be not one of the minor partners, but one who in due time will assume the lead in the commonwealth of nations which will play the greatest part in making a reality out of the united nations organization.

Mr. T. A. KIDD (Kingston City): Mr. Speaker, I do not agree by any means with many statements which have been made so far in this debate, and for that reason I shall ask the indulgence of the house for a few moments.

We are now dealing with bill No. 7, an act respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens, which is now referred to as the Canadian Citizenship Act. This bill had its first reading some three weeks ago, on March 31. It is divided into seven parts and forty-seven sections, and the principles of the bill are directly related to about seven different items. It deals with natural-born Canadian citizens, Canadian citizens other than natural-born, loss of Canadian citizenship, status of citizens and recognition of British subjects, status of aliens, and the method of procedure and evidence, as well as a schedule defining the oath of allegiance.

This bill is undesirable for the reason that it takes away from British subjects a privilege which they have had and which they enjoy to-day.

Mr. MARTIN: What privilege does it take away?

Mr. KIDD: I will tell the minister, if he will follow me. If this bill passes as recommended by the Secretary of State, it will mean that British subjects throughout the empire will probably go to Australia or New Zealand in preference to Canada. This bill has been the sounding-board and is the instru-

ment to make known to this house and to Canada that there is in this house an anti-British following who are not desirous of giving preference to British subjects.

I welcome the opportunity to say something on this bill. The statement has been made, with reference to Japanese now domiciled in Canada, that the predicament and the embarrassing position in which the government now finds itself may be relieved by the passing of this bill. I wonder whether the bringing forward of this measure at the present time has any bearing on the Japanese question.

Mr. MARTIN: Not a bit.

Mr. KIDD: All right. Some supporters of the government could not avoid blushing to hear the various anti-British expressions which have already been used in this debate. After the next few months, when the troops have returned home from overseas and are settled in civilian life, Canadian immigration policy will likely be relaxed to admit many British people who are desirous of coming to this country. Under the provisions of the proposed bill these men cannot become citizens of the country until they have resided here for five years, and they will, therefore, be unable to vote in dominion or provincial elections held during that period.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. member knows that is not right.

Mr. KIDD: The minister knows the five-year clause.

Mr. MARTIN: It has nothing to do with the elections act at all.

Mr. KIDD: It has. Let the minister follow me. I should like to draw to his attention the immigration set-up as it existed in the ten years following 1930. There entered into Canada about 150,000 annually, or, in that decade, a total of one and a half million immigrants. One hundred thousand annually were aliens and the other fifty thousand annually were from Great Britain and the empire, or put it in this way, for every three immigrants entering Canada one was British and two were of foreign extraction. In the same period we lost 100,000 citizens annually to the United States. This means that the best citizens Canada produced, boys and girls of Canadian families, educated in our collegiate institutes, our technical schools and our universities, went across the border to find positions for themselves and their families. For every British immigrant entering Canada two Canadian citizens went to the United States. This is a state of affairs which we should not allow to occur again. Just as our immigration policy in that period was anti-British, so is this proposed bill, and I tell the Secretary of State that we have already had two indications of a government attempting to pilot through the house this most contentious bill. A citizenship bill was introduced by a previous secretary of state, Hon. C. H. Cahan, in 1931, but it was withdrawn, and—

Mr. MARTIN: It was not the same bill at all.

Mr. KIDD: I know it was not the same bill, but it had to do with citizenship. The urgency to-day is no greater than it was at that time. Two other contentious bills, one dealing with the flag and the other seeking to abolish Dominion day, have already been brought forward this session. I would refer particularly to the procedure in dealing with the Canada day bill, which was sponsored by a private member and was piloted successfully through the house in one afternoon and evening. The present bill is also contentious, and I tell the Secretary of State that he might have been well advised to have left this to the hon. member for Matapedia-Matane (Mr. Cote) who did such a good job in support of the government.

Though it has been recalled recently, I would briefly refer to the part played by Great Britain in world war I and world war II. In world war I Russia was an ally, but dropped out before the war was finished. In world war II she did not enter until after the war had continued for months. In world war I France was on the side of Britain; in world war II she capitulated to Germany nine months after the war commenced. The United States did not enter either world war I or world war II until some time after those wars commenced. In the last war Great Britain and the empire stood alone against Germany for over a year. This must not be forgotten. This is not a time for the House of Commons to enact legislation taking from British subjects entering Canada the rights they have enjoyed for generations. British subjects throughout the world should not be placed for immigration purposes in the same category as aliens who fought against the empire.

May I recall to the house something which Canada should not overlook, the part played by her troops on at least two occasions. Canada declared war in August, 1914, and September, 1939. Canada owes much to those men who in 1914 and 1939 formed the first and second divisions. The majority of these men were of British stock. If I may make a personal reference, I remember well, as do some other

members of this house, the first inspection by Their Majesties of the first Canadian division on a Saturday afternoon in November, 1914, on Salisbury plain. With Their Majesties the King and Queen were Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener. I wish to mention particularly the Princess Pats. The majority of these men were South African veterans who freely volunteered to serve Canada and the empire. They were marked by the ribbons they wore. The key men in nearly every section, company and brigade were veterans. A few weeks later, in April, 1915, the same troops, at Ypres, when the Germans launched their famous first gas attack, made a name for Canada, and from that very moment Canada's prestige in the empire has steadily grown.

What happened in 1914 repeated itself in 1939. The men of the first and second divisions were veteran volunteers, the majority being of British stock.

Let us also not forget that it was the British navy in the fall of 1914 and in 1939 that delivered Canada's first division safely to England. Reference was made to that a few minutes ago in the loan debate, and I shall not refer to it at length. But I would say this. Deputations from Canada have visited the empire year in and year out since confederation. Even since the last session representatives of Canada were in England. The part which our Canadian soldiers overseas played in world war I and world war II has done more to cement Canada to the empire than all the deputations and conferences held before or since.

Let me give one illustration. We had in Kingston a unit of the empire air training scheme, No. 14, which was the first and largest fleet air training school in Canada. There were 100 classes of about fifty each, which meant 5,000 men training there for the R.A.F. fleet air arms. These boys served in the most hazardous branch of the service. What happened during these four years? Many of them, not dozens but scores of them married Canadian girls. Many went overseas and many of them wish to return to Canada. Why should those boys be placed in the same category as aliens who have to wait for five years before being granted the franchise? No finer citizens will enter Canada than the 30,000 or 40,000 war brides who wish to find new homes here at the present time. We must not overlook the thousands of Canadian brides who married British soldiers and soldiers of our allies and who would like to return to Canada.

Mr. MARTIN: Every one of those, under the bill, will become a citizen.

Mr. KIDD: It will take five years.

Mr. MARTIN: No, not at all.

Mr. KIDD: I say that this bill should not take away, from our British subjects coming to Canada, the privilege they now enjoy. The Secretary of State, in his explanation of the bill, seemed to go out of his way when he said:

> One thing we hope to do, following the passage of this measure, is to provide a more effective and impressive ceremony for admission into the Canadian family.

I say to the Secretary of State that in view of the fact that nearly one million aliens entered Canada in the ten-year period of the thirties, the question flashes through one's mind: Why was not this ceremony carried out in the past when taking the oath of allegiance as British subjects as is now proposed?

An hon. MEMBER: The Bennett government was in power.

Mr. KIDD: For five years. Since the last session of parliament Canada was represented by members of the government in London. Heading the deputation were the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin). What happened there? Apparently the Secretary of State was not too favourably impressed by Canada's relationship and responsibility to the mother country. We have him returning from the old country, and the first major piece of legislation, contentious as it is, is tabled and sponsored in his name. He evidently set out to discard British preference in regard to British immigration.

Tuesday last developed into a Japanese and British Columbia day. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) did not hesitate to state where he differed with the government on this bill. The fact that bill No. 7 has been sponsored by the government makes it difficult, if not impossible, for government supporters to take any other position than a party view of it. This afternoon I went into the library and looked up the *Globe and Mail*, because I happened to be in London in 1937 during the conference there. We have heard a good many things said in connection with this bill and something flashed through my mind regarding what had taken place at that conference. I am sorry I have not the clipping because I did not know that I would be referring to the matter at this moment. However, take the *Globe and Mail* for the month of May, 1937, and you will find that at that conference the statesmen were dealing with the question of citizenship, which occupied a great deal of their time. On that occasion the premier of South Africa shot

a question at the meeting which took them all by surprise. He wanted to know what the definition of "British subject" was and no one could answer him. A committee was appointed and a former Minister of Justice was made chairman, while the British attorney general, whose name has slipped my memory, spoke for twenty-five minutes on the subject of British citizenship. After the discussion was over, they did not seem to be much farther ahead. What took place in 1937 at that conference only convinces us that this citizenship bill is a contentious one and something that should not be rushed through the house hurriedly but should be studied from all angles.

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): I should like to contribute a few words to the discussion of this bill. I am absolutely in support of the principle of it. As a child I had my education partly in the old country, in Scotland, and here also in this country. I think a lot of the race I come from in Scotland, but I also think a great deal of the country in which I was born, Canada. I also realize that this country comprises many men and nationalities and that here we still have to write down, when we are asked to furnish information on going to the United States on a visit, that we are British subjects. We are still known by our racial origin, and it is about time that this country grew up and that we became just Canadians.

In the United States, no matter whether a man be an Italian or a Czechoslovakian, he is always an American and there is no deviation from that. We here in Canada should have the same spirit and be known as Canadians.

The tradition of the old country has in some respects held back the development of this country in so far as working-class conditions are concerned. I am now referring to the merchant marine. In the building of freighters, which we constructed during the war, 10,000-tonners, we followed the good old British traditions of putting the galley amidships and the mess hall at the front of the boat, and you had to lug the food across the open deck. Imagine what it would be like in the middle of winter on the north Atlantic! An American would have enough sense to put the galley and the mess hall in one part, but we have to follow the tradition of the British navy and the time of Lord Nelson.

That may be a small thing, but it means a great deal to the men working on the ship. I suggest that we here should establish our own traditions on the North American continent. I am not so much concerned about a national viewpoint. I am thinking of the spirit of the people of the whole North American continent. It is something distinctive and we should follow along our own lines.

There has also been too great a tendency on the part of those who have been British-born or who have come of British stock to rub it into the other fellow. I shall never forget the time I was working on a threshing outfit in southern Alberta. There I saw Dutchmen, Belgians, Czechoslovakians and Poles. One Englishmen had preceded me on the job and he claimed that he was the only white man there. That is the sort of thing that must stop if we expect to have a united nation.

In the speeches that have been made on this bill, especially by members from British Columbia, hon. gentlemen seem to have suffered from violent attacks of yellow fever. I come from Skeena, a federal riding, a fishing district which produces as much fish as any riding in that province, and in spite of the Jap issue they elected me. Let me explain the reason they did so. They found out a long time ago what was the secret of it. Like the other members from British Columbia I am absolutely opposed to the Japs going back to the coast, but for a reason. In the last election, if it had not been for the Jap issue the poor Conservatives and Liberals would not have known what to talk about; they would have been absolutely bankrupt. The fishermen on that coast suffered during the depression; fish went down to around two cents a pound, and the full hatred of the fishermen was turned to the Japs, their fellow workers. But when the crisis begins to become apparent in this system, as it will with mathematical certainty, I hope there will be no Japs on the coast on whom to blame it. This time the people will know the cause of the trouble.

I went back to British Columbia during the last provincial campaign. The last lone Liberal there, Mr. Pattullo, was in desperate circumstances. He came out with this line of propaganda, that if the C.C.F. got in they would allow the big companies to bring the Japanese back into the canneries. It was my duty to tell the people that if the C.C.F. got in there would be no big fish packing companies. But he lost, and again the Japanese were the main issue in that area.

What I want to see brought out clearly is that there is no difference among the workers in this country, whether we be black or yellow or red. We all suffer under the same system, and soon we are going to realize that. Sir James Orr says that in a couple of years we shall have complete collapse of commodity prices unless such prices are fixed internationally. If that collapse becomes apparent

on the coast within the next two years the fishermen will realize once and for all who are the real Japs. A year before the election I attempted to go on the radio with a speech in which I wanted to say that after the war with Japan was over and won our first act would be to put Hirohito back on the throne. The C.B.C. censor, who said that he was not a censor but that he just checked things, censored that speech and said that such a statement was seditious. I was in the army, and he was not; but they did put Hirohito back on the throne, and these governments here did trade with Hirohito even after we had declared war on Germany. Therefore in the final analysis, putting Hirohito back on the throne showed more of a community of interest with the ruling class of Japan than with their own workers here.

This citizenship bill is a step in the right direction. I hope it will mark the beginning of a united Canada.

Mr. T. J. BENTLEY (Swift Current): I did not really expect to be called on to speak to-night, Mr. Speaker; I thought there was a long list ahead of me, but I do not want to miss the opportunity of saying a word or two on this particular measure. It is not very often that one in this corner of the house is able to agree so wholeheartedly with the present government, but I wish to congratulate the government and the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) on this bill. It is peculiar to note that at infrequent intervals during the life of this government they have shown flashes of brilliance, but their inspiration has come from only one source. Many years ago there sat in this house, with a smaller group and under a somewhat different name but with just about the same philosophy, a gentleman from Winnipeg named Mr. Woodsworth. He was keen to have the old age pension brought into effect, and as a result of his constant pressure the Liberal government of that time finally gave us old age pensions. They were not very good ones, but still it indicated that the government were susceptible to such propositions after a great deal of pressure, and, of course, if they thought it would do them good politically. Then, after another long period, following constant pressure by progressive people on this side of this house and throughout the country—I did not say Progressive Conservatives but progressive people—the same government finally brought in the family allowances measure. That was another good step; the allowances were not good enough, but they were far better than nothing at all.

I believe the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is to be commended for the selection of his Secretary of State (Mr. Martin). I do not make that statement in order to obtain any applause either for myself or for the minister, but simply to point out that apparently the hon. gentleman is open to inspiration, and is able to convince the government that something good should be adopted. He has now brought in this citizenship bill. I wish to read from a little pamphlet; and then I will give the name of it.

> The C.C.F. again pledges itself to . . . the adoption of a distinctive national flag and national anthem and the necessary legal provision for Canadian citizenship.

This little book is called the "C.C.F. Manifesto", and was drawn up at the C.C.F. national convention held in Montreal a year ago last November and early December. So that the government can be congratulated on being able to accept suggestions of this kind, and on being able to select from the platform of another party the things they consider good. We hope that some day they may take more from our platform; in fact we believe it would be an extremely good thing if they would read this little book all the way through and adopt everything it suggests.

To Canadian-born citizens like myself I believe this measure is very welcome. I welcome it not only for reasons of national pride, because a person should not have too much national pride just because he was born here. I cannot be proud of being born here because I had nothing to do with it, but can feel very lucky to have been born in a country like Canada and to have grown up among the kind of people we have here, those who were born here and those who have come here from other lands. I believe those who like myself were born here will welcome this for another reason. As I grew up I made up my mind that never, under any circumstances, no matter what the law says—and I am a law-abiding citizen—would I ever give any nationality to any government official on any question but that of Canadian; and I never have. I do not know whether I can be arrested for breaking that law, but I make the statement that I have never given any other nationality than Canadian, and if this bill should not pass I will still stick to that. No one will ever get me to say anything else without putting me in a torture chamber. I could not do anything else; I have to be a Canadian or I am nothing at all, and I refuse to accept that alternative.

Possibly the people who can be proudest of this bill are those who have come here from other shores. They at least can say they exercised their intelligence and chose the country in which they wanted to live. Their coming here has been a compliment to Canada, a compliment to those who were born here and a compliment to their own intelligence in wanting to live here. They have made a great contribution to this country, and I am sure they must feel gratified, after having chosen to come to these shores, that now they will be able to call themselves what they wanted to be.

So far as the Japanese question is concerned, let me say that I am not closely associated with it at the present time. However, I should like to tell hon. members from British Columbia, from whichever side of the house they come, that I remember the question quite well around thirty-five years ago when I was a very young man. I was working in British Columbia then for wages, and I remember that when the Japanese came in there at that time they were welcomed by the employers.

An hon. MEMBER: Cheap labour.

Mr. BENTLEY: Yes, they were cheap labour. They were hired for cheap wages when they were swinging the rigging on the old donkey-engines for the big timber companies. The rest of us, if we were not able to work on the springboard, or at the higher type of work, had to compete with them in the lower work. But the employers welcomed them then.

Since then, they have shown themselves in many respects capable of competing with our own people in different lines of business. Probably because of this they are not so well liked. However, I am not going to discuss the question from the British Columbia point of view; rather I shall leave that to the intelligence of the house, when a vote in the matter is called.

But I do wish to say this, that, with my limited knowledge of Canadians of Japanese origin, I could not now possibly support some of the statements we have heard from British Columbia about the poor citizens their Canadians of Japanese origin are likely to make. We have a few families of these people in the constituency in which I live. Some of them are in business; some are market gardeners; some are on farms, and some are at labouring work. Every one of those citizens is well liked in his community. They are good men.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): We can give you lots of 'hem.

[Mr. Bentley.]

Mr. BENTLEY: Our premier in Saskatchewan has, I believe indicated that we are willing to take some.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): We have an unlimited supply.

Mr. BENTLEY: No, you have not an unlimited supply, but you have quite a number of them. Possibly they will like to come to Saskatchewan; possibly they will not. But let me say this to the house, that there is one elderly Canadian gentleman of Japanese origin who sits with me in the Canadian legion, a veteran of the last war, of the Princess Patricia Canadian Light Infantry. That same Canadian Japanese citizen is liked by all the Canadian legionnaires around there. He is received and accepted in all circles, the same as any other individual out there. But he is a practical farmer, a good farmer. He has a wife and family, and one of his boys was killed in the Canadian forces in this war. Does anyone here think for one moment that I am ever going to cast a vote which will throw a reflection upon that kind of individual? It certainly would not be fair to do so. That is the way I feel about these people.

This bill carries with it a great many privileges and responsibilities. One of those privileges is the right to vote, and the responsibility is the obligation to vote and to try to understand what one is voting on. Those are two things which go with citizenship, and should not be forgotten.

The fact that the bill, as described by the Secretary of State, is to provide for some kind of ceremony and initial training for these people to teach them the responsibilities connected with their privileges is all to the good. I believe the newcomers will welcome it, and be the better for it.

They have another privilege, the right to do useful work. That is an important privilege in the citizenship of any country—the right to work at useful work. They have no right to be thrown on the bread-line every so often when the system under which we operate refuses to work. If they are to be citizens they have the right to work. Then they have the obligation to accept useful work. Their jobs should be there, and they have the right to take them, and also the obligation.

They have the right to education and training to make them more useful in some useful job and to make them useful and valuable citizens in the community. They have the right to training to the extent of their ability to learn that to which their training is directed. They have the obligation which goes with that, that of educating themselves

to the best of their ability, according to the facilities made available to them for that purpose. That is a privilege and a responsibility, right there.

They have the right to security and comfort to the fullest extent of Canada's ability to produce the goods and services needed for security and comfort, regardless of their ability to work. That is right in line with the resolution placed before the house by an hon. member opposite.

With that obligation goes the obligation of all citizens, whether they were born here, or whether they came here later, or are newcomers recently arrived, of contributing to the comfort and security of the less fortunate among our citizens.

If this citizenship bill will impress upon the people the fact that these privileges are accompanied by obligations, then I think we have one of the measures to which the people of Canada have been looking forward for a long time. Let me again remind the house that this was part of the programme of the party to which I belong, of hon. members sitting in this corner of the house. Because of that, and for other reasons I have mentioned, I believe there will be no difficulty in our supporting the measure.

On motion of Mr. MacNicol the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, April 12, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

ADDRESSES IN SENATE CHAMBER THIS DAY TO BE PRINTED IN HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I have a brief motion to make which speaks for itself. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has kindly consented to second it. It reads:

That the speech of His Excellency the Right Honourable Viscount Alexander of Tunis, G.C.B., Governor General of Canada, together with the address of welcome read by the Prime Minister in the Senate chamber this morning, be printed as an appendix to the official report of debates of the House of Commons, and form part of the permanent record of this parliament.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to second the motion of the Prime Minister. In doing so I might say that I observed in the proceedings this morning that there was no word of greeting to His Excellency in the French language. In view of the fact that under the British North America Act we have two official languages in this house, I should like to suggest that these proceedings be printed in both languages.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend and to the house that on these matters precedent is followed. All arrangements are made by a committee, of which the chairman usually is the Under-Secretary of State. I have asked Mr. Coleman with respect to the proceedings and he has given me a memorandum in which he says that he had carefully looked into the matter before the arrangements were made and that the records in the department indicate that previous governors general have said a few words in French only on occasions when the installation took place at Quebec. On those occasions addresses of welcome were presented on behalf of the city and the province, which were in French, and normally the Governor General replied to these by speaking briefly in that language. In the case of Lord Tweedsmuir this occurred. In the case of the Earl of Athlone, who was sworn in in the senate chamber, and the Earl of Bessborough, who was sworn in at Halifax, their addresses in reply were entirely in English. From the above it would appear that the proceedings of this morning were in accordance with precedent.

Of course I am only too prepared to take the responsibility for all the proceedings, and, in particular for the address of welcome having been presented only in English this morning, but I can assure my hon. friend that there was no discourtesy intended either to His Excellency the Governor General or to our friends from the province of Quebec or any other part of Canada.

Mr. BRACKEN: There was no suggestion of any discourtesy on the part of anyone to anyone; there was only a suggestion that these proceedings be printed in both languages.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They will as a matter of course. *Hansard* is printed in both languages.

Mr. POULIOT: Don't take it too high. Give a calling down to Coleman.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ADVANCE FOR PURCHASE OF 200,000 SHARES OF T.C.A. CAPITAL STOCK

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Mr. Speaker, I desire to table, in accordance with chapter 31 of the statutes of 1945 copy of order in council P.C. 1280, of

April 5, 1946, authorizing a further advance to Canadian National Railways to enable the company to subscribe for an additional 200,000 shares ($20,000,000) of the capital stock of Trans-Canada Air Lines.

UNITED NATIONS

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION—CANADIAN CONTRIBUTION

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread public discussion at the present time with regard to UNRRA, I thought that the house might be interested in having a brief report regarding the Canadian contribution to UNRRA.

Canada's total contribution to UNRRA up to March 31, 1946, was $154,000,000. Of this amount, ten per cent has been reserved as UNRRA free funds expendable in any part of the world. The balance reserved for expenditure in Canada is, therefore, $138,600,000. As of March 31 of this year, $119,000,000 has been committed by various government departments and agencies leaving approximately $19,000,000 uncommitted, of which it is estimated that ten per cent should be removed for freight storage and handling charges. The exact figure of the balance available for future purchases on March 31 was $17,350,532.87.

Hon. members will be interested to know in greater detail how this $119,000,000 has been committed. A sum of $27,500,000 has been set aside for the purchase of wheat and grain; $16,000,000 for meat and more than $2,500,000 for seeds and milk. The grain has been purchased by the wheat and grain division of this department, and the seeds, meat and milk by the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Munitions and Supply has contracted for $2,300,000 worth of electrical equipment. The Canadian Export Board have made commitments on behalf of UNRRA for $56,500,000 worth of goods under the following headings:

	million
Farm machinery	$ 3·4
Clothing, textiles, footwear	6·8
Miscellaneous supplies	7·1
Medical supplies	3·1
Trucks	20·5
Miscellaneous food	1·9
Soap	4·1
Fish	9·6
Total	$56·5

In addition, freight charges will amount to about $13,500,000, of which slightly more than half will be for inland freight. The total Canadian contribution to UNRRA has been paid as of March 31, and has been largely expended or committed as outlined above so that only slightly more than $17,000,000 remains available for future purposes.

In addition to Canada's own contribution to UNRRA, we have found it possible to make available for UNRRA purchases, above and beyond the amounts already mentioned, goods to the value of nearly $67,500,000. This amount includes $27,000,000 worth of wheat; approximately $16,000,000 worth of trucks; more than $2,000,000 worth of canned fish; nearly $2,000,000 worth of shoes; more than $1,500,000 worth of metals; about $14,000,000 worth of meat and smaller amounts of other items including some clothing, some surplus textiles, asbestos, ambulances and an allowance of $1,500,000 for ocean freight. Thus it will be seen that nearly $200,000,000 worth of goods have been made available in Canada for UNRRA up to the end of the last fiscal year.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Speaker, arising out of the statement just made by the minister, may I ask two questions? Can the minister advise us whether the other countries contributing to UNRRA have paid their allotments in full, and will he say under what authority this last $67,000,000 was advanced?

Mr. MacKINNON: Answering the latter question first, there was no special authority necessary. The supplies were available in Canada and were purchased by the Canadian Export board for UNRRA.

Mr. BRACKEN: These are purchases, not gifts?

Mr. MacKINNON: They were purchases in Canada.

Mr. COLDWELL: Purchased by UNRRA, or by the countries to which they were being sent?

Mr. MacKINNON: Purchased for UNRRA in Canada.

Mr. MacNICOL: But paid for out of the money we contributed?

Mr. MacKINNON: Paid for out of UNRRA funds. These purchases in Canada were not necessarily limited to the amount of money contributed by Canada. Answering my hon. friend's other question, I have no idea whether or not all the countries have paid their total commitments to UNRRA. I saw in the press recently that two or three countries had met their commitments, but I have no detailed information on the matter.

Mr. BRACKEN: Our representative to UNRRA ought to have the information. I suggest that the minister should get it and let us have it.

With respect to the provision of $154,000,000 by Canada for UNRRA, and this other $67,000,000, I gather that the minister did not mean to leave the impression that we had ourselves contributed over $200,000,000, but that we had provided $154,000,000, and that out of other UNRRA funds $67,000,000 of extra goods had been purchased in Canada.

Mr. MacKINNON: I am sure the leader of the opposition when he looks over my statement in *Hansard* will see that that is what I said.

Mr. POULIOT: I should not like to be an intruder, but may I ask the minister if he would be kind enough to give the house a statement later showing the number of automobiles and trucks which have been given to each country as Canada's share?

Mr. MacKINNON: I will take that into consideration.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister will perhaps recall that at the meeting of the general assembly in London the whole question of contributions by various countries to UNRRA came up, and a special resolution was passed in one of the committees on which my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) sat. I listened to the debate on that occasion. A number of countries had not made their full contribution, and the purpose of the resolution which was brought forward by Mr. Bloom, representing the United States of America, was to stimulate and encourage various countries to bring their payments up to date. The Secretary of State has a wide knowledge of this matter, and I think he will agree that the parliament of Canada ought to be given a full explanation of the position of other nations so that we can see whether their obligations under the original agreement have been carried out.

STATUTORY HOLIDAYS

REVOCATION OF ORDER IN COUNCIL P.C. 4671

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): I wish to announce that order in council P.C. 4671 of the 7th June, 1943, was revoked to-day. This order provided that the only statutory holidays which "should be observed by employers and employees" during the war were to be New Year's day, Good Friday, Dominion day, Labour day, Thanksgiving day and Christmas day. The same order similarly restricted the number of statutory holidays to be observed by the public service of Canada and those which were during the period indicated to be legal holidays or non-juridical days within the meaning of the Bills of Exchange Act.

As a result of the action now taken, the definition of "holiday" in the Interpretation Act is again in full effect. The holidays to be observed by the public service are again those enumerated in section 45 of the Civil Service Act, and again are those to be observed as legal holidays or non-juridical days. The result will be that, among others, Easter Monday and Victoria day will be observed as statutory holidays this year.

With regard to Remembrance day, the Minister of Veterans Affairs in particular has been in consultation with the national veterans organizations of the country. It seems desirable that before a definite decision with regard to that day be made, full consultation with veterans organizations should be proceeded with. Some of these organizations are holding annual meetings—one, early in May—and as soon as the veterans have had an opportunity of conferring further with the Minister of Veterans Affairs, in particular, a definite policy with regard to that day and, I may say, a definite decision with regard to holidays generally other than those covered by the present announcement, will be made.

Mr. POULIOT: What about Boxing day?

Mr. HAZEN: Is an employee entitled to a holiday with pay on these statutory holidays?

Mr. MITCHELL: If I may answer that, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of arrangement between the employer and the employee, and that has always been so, notwithstanding the order in council which my hon. friend the Secretary of State has just mentioned. Where the holidays are enumerated in an agreement between the employer and the employee, that practice has been followed.

WAR EXPENDITURES

CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT

Mr. GORDON B. ISNOR (Halifax) moved that the third report of the special committee on war expenditures and economies, presented on the 10th instant, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

On the order:

Bill No. 18 (Letter I of the Senate) intituled: "An Act for the relief of Juliana Edmonda Isabella Ferdinanda Becquaert de Beaujeu."

Mr. SPEAKER: No petition has been presented in respect of this bill; therefore it is out of order.

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 19, for the relief of Margaret Penelope Brown.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 20, for the relief of Marion Cruickshank Isaac.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 21, for the relief of Malvina Angelina Seguin Gascon.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 22, for the relief of Nora Kathleen Loury Cheverton.—Mr. MacLean.

Bill No. 23, for the relief of Elsie Fisher Armitage.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 24, for the relief of Florence Mabel McIntosh Simpson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 25, for the relief of Francis Gordon Sullivan.—Mr. MacLean.

Bill No. 26, for the relief of Minerva Jane Cory.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 15, to amend the criminal code (race meetings).—Mr. Gardiner.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING RATES OF INTEREST

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a bill to amend the Soldier Settlement Act to provide that a soldier settler within the provisions of the Act who served in world war II who has not abandoned his land and whose agreement has not been terminated, rescinded or assigned, and a soldier settler who did not serve in world war II who has not abandoned his land and whose agreement has not been terminated, rescinded or assigned, shall be charged in the case of the soldier settler of world war II a rate of interest of three and one-half per centum per annum in respect of his agreement made under the act after the standard date in the year 1942 or the date of his enlistment whichever is the earlier and in the case of a soldier who did not serve in world war II a rate of interest of three and one-half per centum per annum after the standard date in the year 1944.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Mr. BROOKS: In connection with this resolution, when the matter was brought to the attention of the house yesterday the minister asked that it be allowed to stand. My impression at that time was that he was asking that it stand in order that there might be further consideration in the veterans committee. The matter was to be further considered by the veterans committee, and there were other representations to be made, as I understood, by a delegation from the soldier settlers. I would ask the minister if this should not stand until these representations have been made.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I was quite aware of the point raised by my hon. friend. The intention would be that whatever recommendation came from the veterans committee would be considered and then, if approved, introduced by way of amendment at the proper time.

Motion agreed to.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

ENTITLEMENT OF CERTAIN WOMEN'S SERVICES TO REHABILITATION BENEFITS, ETC.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a bill to provide that the members of the women's royal naval services and the South African military nursing service, shall be entitled to the rights, privileges and benefits enjoyed by Canadians serving in His Majesty's forces other than Canadian forces during world war II under the Veterans Land Act, 1942, the Veterans Insurance Act, the Veterans Rehabilitation Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, 1946, the reinstatement in Civil Employment Act, 1942, the Civil Service Act, the Pension Act and the Income War Tax Act.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED TRANSPORTATION LINES

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport) moved:

That a sessional committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government be appointed to consider the accounts and estimates and bills relating thereto of the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships, and Trans-Canada Air Lines, saving always the powers of the committee of supply in relation to the voting of public moneys; and that the said committee be empowered to send for persons, papers and records and to report from time to time, and that, notwithstanding Standing Order 63, the said committee consist of Messrs: Chevrier, Clark, Coyle, Belzile, Bourget, Emmerson, Gibson (Comox-Alberni), Harkness, Harris (Grey-Bruce), McLure, Hazen, Jackman, LaCroix, Lockhart, Maybank, McCulloch (Pictou), Moore, Mutch, Nicholson, Picard, Pouliot, Reid, Shaw.

He said: This notice of motion seeks the establishment of the committee on railways and shipping. To this committee are referred the annual reports of the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships, and Trans-Canada Air Lines. Certain items of the estimates are

taken from the committee of supply and referred to this committee. It is in the same form on the order paper now as it was last year.

Motion agreed to.

WAR CRIMES

CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVES IN TRIALS AT HONG KONG

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) asked me a question yesterday and I said I would give a reply to-day. The question was whether a Canadian representative has been appointed for the trials of Japanese war criminals at Hong Kong which are now proceeding, and when the representative will be dispatched.

In order that hon. members may get a true perspective of the whole matter as it arises out of the question which has been asked by the hon. member, I will give the house a brief review of the arrangements which have been concluded with regard to Canadian participation in the trials of far eastern war criminals generally.

The major war criminals are to be tried by an international tribunal, convened by General MacArthur, to which each state signatory to the Japanese surrender instrument has been invited to name a judge and an associate prosecutor. The Canadian nominee as judge is Mr. Justice E. Stuart McDougall, of the Court of King's Bench, Quebec, and the Canadian nominee as associate prosecutor is Brigadier H. G. Nolan, C.B.E., M.C., Vice-Judge Advocate General at national defence headquarters. Both Brigadier Nolan and Judge McDougall have been in Tokyo since February.

Canadian participation in the trials of the lesser far eastern war criminals has been complicated by the fact that under existing international arrangements military courts for the trial of such war criminals may only be convened by states now in occupation of areas formerly dominated by Japan. Moreover, under the war crimes regulations (Canada), Canadian military courts can only be convened by senior officers in command of "Canadian forces"; since Canada has had no occupation force in the far east, no such courts could be convened in that area.

However, arrangements have been concluded with the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States pursuant to which a group of Canadian officers are proceeding to Hong Kong and Tokyo to exercise the following powers and duties:

(a) to assist in the collection and collation of further evidence of atrocities against Canadians;

(b) to assist in providing the United Kingdom (or United States) authorities with such available evidence from Canadian sources as may be considered of value to them;

(c) to request the United Kingdom (or United States) military authorities to convene military courts under their respective war crimes regulations for the trial of particular persons within their jurisdiction against whom, in the opinion of the appropriate Canadian military representative, a prima facie case of a war crime against a Canadian has been established;

(d) to assist in the prosecution of Canadian cases if so authorized by the appropriate United Kingdom (or United States) military authority;

(e) to act in general liaison with the United Kingdom (or United States) war crimes officers in the far east.

In implementation of these arrangements, four Canadian army officers and four other ranks, with Lieutenant Colonel J. O. H. Orr in charge, are now en route to the far east. These officers will act in both the Hong Kong and Tokyo areas. The officers, all of whom possess legal experience, were drawn largely from the war crimes section at national defence headquarters; two of the other ranks are ex-Hong Kong prisoners of war.

Evidence of far eastern crimes against Canadian citizens and members of the Canadian armed forces has been collected and collated by a war crimes section at national defence headquarters. The section has reported that there is an accumulation of evidence of atrocities against Canadians both in the areas now occupied by the United Kingdom forces (that is, Hong Kong) and in Japan proper.

Lists and descriptions of "wanted" persons have been transmitted to the appropriate United Kingdom and United States authorities with the request that they be apprehended, or held in cusody if already apprehended.

The war crimes officers en route to the far east have with them the evidence above referred to and will keep in close touch with the war crimes section at national defence headquarters.

The United States authorities have requested that an additional officer accompany the officers proceeding to Tokyo and be available to sit as judge on any joint military court convened by General MacArthur for the trial of lesser war criminals whether the victims were

Canadians or nationals of other countries. Colonel Thomas Moss, M.C., K.C., of the Judge Advocate General's branch, has been assigned for this purpose and has now left Ottawa en route to Tokyo. It may also be that conversations held by the war crimes officers in Hong Kong will indicate that it would be in order for a judicial officer to be sent to Hong Kong to carry out similar functions.

Mr. FULTON: I should like to put this in the form of a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Before doing so, if I may be permitted, I should thank the hon. gentleman for the long and informative statement he has made in reply to my question. The Prime Minister said that a group of officers had been appointed to proceed to Hong Kong. I believe he mentioned Colonel Orr. This is a restatement of my original question. Will the Prime Minister tell us when those officers will be leaving? I do not think that point was covered.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): Perhaps I may be permitted to reply to that question. Colonel Moss, who was referred to in the Prime Minister's statement, left for Washington on April 11, and will travel by air to Tokyo where I am informed the new tribunal is soon to be convened. Colonel Moss will represent Canada on the lesser tribunal, if I may so describe it, referred to by the Prime Minister in his statement. I understand the others left some time ago.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

MONTREAL BREWERIES—FINDINGS OF QUEBEC REGIONAL WAR LABOUR BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, notice of which I sent him this morning. I ask it in view of a serious situation at Montreal which requires urgent attention. Were the findings and directives of the regional war labour board for the province of Quebec, made on or about January 3, 1946, in the matter of the employees of certain Montreal breweries, reported to the national war labour board? If so, what action was taken in regard thereto?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Of course decisions of the regional board are reported to the national war labour board, and it is only in cases where the decisions themselves show an error that any action is taken by the national board by way of review. I am informed that in the case in question nothing in the decision received appeared to warrant special review proceedings by the national board. Reviewal procedure should not be confused with the matter of appeal, which is open to either employer or employee; that is to say, any person aggrieved by the decision of a regional board may appeal from that decision to the national board. Appeal proceedings have not yet been taken in any of the cases about which my hon. friend has inquired.

May I say this. There is a good deal of loose talk going on throughout the country—

An hon. MEMBER: There always is.

Mr. MITCHELL: There is a good deal of loose talk among my hon. friends.

Mr. COLDWELL: And by the minister himself, sometimes.

Mr. MITCHELL: Even the minister himself and the leader of the C.C.F. I suggest however that when machinery of this kind is set up, such as the constitution of an employers or employees organization, those in charge being representatives of organized labour and of employers, the best advice that either side can give to their rank and file is to obey the law and not declare that they are going to break the law before they have appeared before the tribunal with respect to the creation of which they were consulted. I think that needs to be said at the moment.

Mr. MacINNIS: May I ask a supplementary question? The minister stated quite correctly that there was provision in the national labour code for appeal. I understand that there was an appeal in this instance, but to the regional board which made the first finding and directive. Is there any provision for that in the labour code?

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not know. My hon. friend probably knows as much about the circumstances as I do, and perhaps more. There has been some difficulty in connection with the position of the board arising out of differences of opinion between one of the members of the board and the Canadian Congress of Labour of which he was the nominee. I still maintain, however, that the appeal should have been made to the national board, and I say so in a kindly way without being critical. The proper method of procedure should have been an appeal from the regional board to the national board by the organization concerned.

Mr. COLDWELL: The minister has misunderstood the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. COLDWELL: The original decision was in favour of the employees,—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. COLDWELL:—And the employers appealed to the regional war labour board.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. COLDWELL: Does the first decision stand?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would impress upon the hon. member the importance of the rule which requires a member to resume his seat when the Speaker rises and asks for order.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am sorry I transgressed, Mr. Speaker, but I just did not see you.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no motion before the house, consequently there can be no debate. A question was asked by the member for Rosetown-Biggar, and the Minister of Labour replied. An answer given by a minister is, under the circumstances, not debatable. I permitted another question, but I cannot permit a debate, because that would be against the rules.

INQUIRY AS TO DIRECTING OF VETERANS TO BREWERY INDUSTRY FOR EMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I did not send him notice of this question, because it arises out of an exchange between the minister and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), and a telegram. Has the minister been advised that the Department of Veterans Affairs employment agency in Montreal has been directing veterans to the brewery industry where a dispute is in progress?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): No, I have not yet been so advised.

Mr. GILLIS: Will the minister check on it?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. GILLIS: I shall send him the telegram.

REGIONAL WAR LABOUR BOARD FOR QUEBEC—J. M. BEDARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): On Monday last the Minister of Labour, in reply to a question, said that Mr. Bedard was to be appointed to the regional war labour board for Quebec. Has an order in council been passed to make the appointment effective?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The answer is no, not yet.

AVAILABILITY OF PRISONERS OF WAR TO SUGAR BEET GROWERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT McCUBBIN (Middlesex West): Having been interested in the securing of farm labour for western Ontario, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Is the statement true that we see in our Ontario daily newspapers, that 850 German prisoners of war will be available for sugar beet growers in western Ontario?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): In reply to the hon. member for Middlesex West and to inform the hon. member for Provencher, and the hon. member for Lake Centre, who are also interested, may I say at the moment consultations are proceeding with the British government with respect to the retention of a certain number of prisoners of war to take part particularly in the sugar beet harvesting in Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario during the coming season. I hope that when the reply is received I shall be able to tell the house about it, probably in the course of the next few days.

INDIANS

REVISION OF INDIAN ACT—CONSIDERATION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. DECHENE (Athabaska): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. On October 24 last the minister stated in the house that he hoped it would be possible to introduce at this session a bill to revise the Indian Act, and that it would be sent to a committee of the house for consideration. What are the government's plans in the matter?

Hon. J. A. GLEN (Minister of Mines and Resources): I am glad to be able to inform the hon. member for Athabaska that since I made the statement to which he refers the matter has been considered further by the government and it is proposed to set up a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to examine and consider the Indian Act and the suggested revision and to investigate and report upon Indian administration in general. It is my intention immediately after the Easter recess to introduce the resolution for the appointment of a committee.

FARM IMPLEMENTS

REMOVAL OR REDUCTION OF TARIFFS TO ACCELERATE PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): May I ask a question of the Minister of Finance? For the purpose of accelerating the production of much needed foodstuffs, what steps are being taken by the government to reduce or remove the tariffs on farm machinery, trucks and harvesting machinery, and thus reduce the cost of production?

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Tariff changes are not announced until the budget is introduced. It would be impossible for me to make a premature statement.

LOAN TO UNITED KINGDOM

APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL AGREEMENT SIGNED MARCH 6, 1946

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of bill No. 28, respecting the financial agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom signed on the sixth day of March, 1946.

Mr. MAURICE LALONDE (Labelle): Speaking in this house on March 22 last on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, I reserved my judgment on the subject matter now before the house, namely, the loan to Britain. I think it is my duty to-day to ask the indulgence of the house in giving my personal views on this matter, and the reasons why I approve this piece of legislation and shall vote in favour of it.

(Translation):

Mr. Speaker, I have made a careful compilation of the views expressed both by those who are in favour of the loan and by those who oppose it. I have come to the conclusion that, by reason of the uncontrollable circumstances connected with this loan, we have no alternative but to vote for this financial arrangement.

I noticed that most of those who are against the proposal—I say most of them, because there are noteworthy exceptions—base their argument on a matter of sentiment and revive, in support of their claims, old race squabbles. The government have announced their intention of lending nearly 250 million dollars to France. Have any protests been voiced by nationalists? Not to my knowledge. They have kept silent because they have no other protests to advance about the loan to England than arguments based on race squabbles. This is clearly evidenced by a letter I have received from a Social Credit supporter, and from which I wish to quote some significant excerpts:

March 28, 1946.

Mr. Maurice Lalonde, M.P., for Labelle.

Sir,

I have read the statement you have made about the Social Credit in the province of Quebec. I believe that you are not well informed on this country's economic problems.

Alberta is in favour of the loan to England because the majority in that province is of English descent. Here in the province of Quebec, the people oppose the loan because the majority is French.

J. B. Bureau,
37 St. Bernard Street,
St. Malo, Que.

(Text):

I am giving that for the prime consideration of hon. members across the way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask hon. members not to make so much noise. It is nearly impossible to hear the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. LALONDE (Translation): This individual unknowingly puts in concrete form the opinions of nationalists and dissenting Liberals, whose good faith and intent I respect. However, protests always have and always will come from a noisy minority which does not speak for the majority, in my province. The last federal elections have amply proven that the majority of my fellow-citizens can distinguish between constructive Liberal policies and a demagogic and impassioned appeal by a group of Quebec nationalists.

The hon. members for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond) and Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) remember their experience of June last, when, after having been elected as Liberals for many years by large majorities, they only succeeded in retaining their seats by very small margins. In his speech to the house, yesterday, the leader of the Bloc Populaire did not give adequate proof in support of his statement to the effect that we were granting interest-free loans to Great Britain, while that country collected interest on her advances to others. But the hon. member thought fit not to say what countries he had in mind, nor did he mention the amounts involved, as we might then have been in a position to say whether he were right or wrong. Indeed it is customary for our nationalists to make such statements without offering any evidence.

I have therefore examined the bill strictly from a business standpoint, leaving to idealists the difficult task of convincing the people that we must build up the future by drinking at the bitter spring of ancient persecutions. It is certainly not without some reluctance that I find myself compelled to approve this policy of assistance, but in view of the irre-

sistible influence of world events and happenings, the inevitable effect of the political evolution of the world, the indisputable interdependence of democratic and free peoples, the universality of economic interests linking all the so-called free nations of the globe, I am compelled to admit that international isolationism will in future be a monstrous utopia, and that the Canadian people who have emerged from the crucible of war bruised but grown in stature, must comply, like any other entity living under the sun, with the unyielding laws that govern the progress towards maturity. The proposal must therefore be examined from the standpoint of national interest. And that is what I have tried to do.

Canadians will enjoy prosperity only if they have an adequate income. Therefore, if the national income is maintained on a high level, our entire nation will be prosperous. The shrinking and freezing of capital are the source of economic depressions. Our experiences from 1930 to 1935 should not be soon forgotten. In order to maintain the national income at a high level, it is necessary that the purchasing power in the hands of the taxpayer be also on a high level to enable him to meet taxation and high prices. In other words, it is essential to have a sound monetary unit in free circulation, creating profits and prosperity. Eisler in his book entitled "Stable Money", pages 16 and 17, reviews the situation as follows:

(Text):

The purchasing power of the consumer is obviously measured by the total amount of cash and credit available to him for spending at any moment on goods and services for immediate consumption. As the monetary unit will buy a varying quantity of goods according to whether the average price of goods—the so-called "general price level"—is high or low, the consumers' real capacity for acquiring goods will be measured by the sum total of their nominal monetary incomings for a given period, minus their savings, multiplied by the reciprocal value of the index of retail prices, i.e., by the purchase power of the monetary unit.

If goods are to flow steadily from the producer to the ultimate consumer, the real purchasing power of the consumer must be equivalent to the total money value of the goods destined for immediate consumption offered by the producers during the same period. And this state of affairs may be described as the ideal or normal equilibrium of the national or world market.

Should the consumers' purchasing power . . . be greater at a given period than the capacity of industry and agriculture to produce directly consumable goods, prices will rise and the owners of capital will be spurred by the prospect of profit to increasing their producing capacity by installing new machinery and by engaging more labour, thereby further increasing the purchasing power of the consumers. If, however, the sum total of money available for spending on commodities is less than the total money value of such goods offered by their producers, prices will fall, production will be reduced and producers will refrain from increasing their plant or staff, thus further restricting the consumers' purchasing power. Consequently the situation on the market for producers' goods is always entirely dependent on the situation on the market for consumers' goods. Both markets must stagnate and employment of every kind must shrink if too little money flows to the second of the two.

(Translation):

Which means that scarcity of capital brings on unemployment, by the fact that it decreases the purchasing power of the consumer.

Now, how is the active circulation of money to be promoted in Canada? How is the worker to be guaranteed a reasonable income? How are we to prevent the stoppage of the trade cycle? By what measures are we to maintain the rotation of the wheel which the artificial prosperity of the war period has caused to turn at a great speed? The answer will be found in the internal economic conditions of our country.

Canada, being a highly productive nation, forced to export 40 per cent of its goods, must enact and apply measures compatible with the inflexible standards dictated by her position as an exporting country. Not a single Nationalist, not even a single pure-bred imperialist, were he prostrate before the Empire's altar, like my friend from Broadview (Mr. Church), could afford to challenge this truism. A brief, prepared by Mr. Gilbert Jackson, states that for each unit of $380 of national revenue, we must export goods to an amount of $100. In other words, if we are to maintain a national revenue of approximately $7,000,000,000 we must export goods worth $1,800,000,000. This expert has gone even further. He has prepared a table of the relative importance of our possible national revenue for the period 1950 to 1961, together with the corresponding imports that would be necessary. I should like to have it placed on the record, with the permission of the house:

Year	Anticipated national income returns on the assumption of an 11 per cent deficiency	Corresponding exports anticipated for our goods and our bullion gold
1950	$5,489	$1,311
1951	5,598	1,338
1952	5,712	1,364
1953	5,825	1,390
1954	5,936	1,417
1955	6,049	1,443
1956	6,161	1,469
1957	6,274	1,496
1958	6,388	1,521
1959	6,497	1,547
1960	6,605	1,572
1961	6,711	1,596

We can therefore repeat what we have said time and again: namely, that prosperity in Canada is dependent on our exports. We have

to face that fact. Be it to England, China, Russia, Nicaragua or Egypt, it is imperative that we should export our goods. Otherwise, economic strangulation shall be our lot.

Now, such exports will be useful only inasmuch as the purchasing countries are able to pay for them. That is another truth which we should not let the clouds of a narrow nationalism or of an extreme imperialism hide from us.

England has suffered terrible losses during the war, as evidenced by the following excerpts from the monthly letter of the Bank of Commerce (February, 1946):

(Text):

Britain lost about $30,000 million, approximately 25 per cent of her national wealth, during the war. Property damage alone is estimated as nearly $6,000 million, shipping and cargo losses as $3,000 million and internal disinvestment over $3,500 million. The last mentioned amount represents merely accumulated depreciation and obsolescence of business establishments which could not be taken care of under the stress and strain of an all-out war effort. No allowance was made in this particular estimate for enemy destruction, nor for inventory losses. External disinvestment of nearly $17,000 million included in the over-all calculation of the loss in national wealth is made up of increased liabilities abroad incurred for war purposes, as well as the liquidated capital assets previously mentioned, and sundry items.

(Translation):

We must therefore look to a customer to whom we shall have to lend our money so that he may purchase what we must necessarily export. That is a distressing dilemma which we must solve.

We shall soon have, on the one hand, great quantities of goods piled up on our docks, a monetary circulation of over a billion and a half dollars, as compared with $250,000,000 before the war, a production capacity enormously greater than our national consumption, and on the other hand, a customer who has tremendous responsibilities for recovery and rehabilitation but who is only able to pay in pounds sterling, which we cannot use in Canada because they cannot be converted into gold, a customer who has ever been our best one, as evidenced by the official statistics table which, with the permission of the house, I shall place on *Hansard*.

CANADA YEAR BOOK

Exports to the United Kingdom

1868	$ 17,905,808	36·9%
1880	35,208,031	48·3%
1890	41,499,149	48·7%
1900	96,562,875	57·1%
1910	139,482,945	50·0%
1916	451,852,399	60·9%
1917	742,147,537	64·5%
1920	489,152,637	39·5%
1934	339,006,389	51·0%
1939	430,806,546	50·0%
1943	1,401,661,623	47·0%

Imports from the United Kingdom

1868	$ 37,612,325	56·1%
1880	33,764,439	48·3%
1890	43,777,009	38·8%
1900	44,280,041	25·7%
1910	95,337,058	25·8%
1916	77,404,361	15·2%
1917	103,096,735	12·7%
1920	126,362,631	11·9%
1934	140,403,886	34·1%
1939	188,900,000	24·0%
1943	23,863,372	13·2%

Shrewd business men have but one answer: we should extend a loan (not an outright gift, as is claimed by some of our opponents) to that customer who is temporarily short of Canadian dollars and we insist that the amount of that loan be entirely spent in Canada for goods or services. That is the essence of the measure which we are called upon to consider and pass. May I refer to section 2 of the bill which reads as follows:

(Text):

The purpose of the credit is to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services in Canada and to assist in making it possible for the United Kingdom to meet transitional post-war deficits in its current balance of payments, to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars and to assume the obligations of multilateral trade.

(Translation):

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Canada has lent money to other countries besides England. The right hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), on March 28 last, has tabled the following figures showing that Canada has made interest-bearing loans to other countries besides England. I shall ask that this table be published in *Hansard*, with the consent of the house.

Loans under the Export Credits Insurance Act

	Authorized	Advanced	Balance outstanding March 15, 1946
Belgium	$25,000,000	$25,000,000	$25,000,000
China	60,000,000	....	....
Czechoslovakia	19,000,000	3,191,551	3,191,551
Netherlands	125,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Netherlands Indies	15,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Norway	13,000,000	8,995,000	8,995,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	3,000,000	2,775,500	2,775,500
Special loan for purchase of wheat, 1943 and 1944 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	10,000,000	10,000,000	7,500,000

Temporary advances under Section 3 of War Appropriation Acts	Balance outstanding February 28, 1946
Australia	$8,091,076 00
Belgium	5,745,472 00
Czechoslovakia	912 04
France	67,425,559 00
Greece	189 00
India	48,522,130 03
Netherlands	12,517,232 39
Newfoundland	6,908 30
New Zealand	201,640 00
Norway	14,046 00
Poland	8,227 36
Portugal	255 00
Union of South Africa	4 00
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	9,161,871 16
United States	3,231,397 40

And have we heard protests from the hon. members who are opposed to the resolution? No, Mr. Speaker. Such silence is sufficient proof of their intentions. You may draw your own conclusions.

I hope that by causing money to circulate a lot more in our country, the loan will create employment to the benefit of all classes. Manufacturing for export will create employment and I wonder if the government's critics on this score can afford to shoulder the tremendous responsibility of refusing their support to a bill which may create more jobs, simply, in some cases, because of political anglophobia? Can they suggest a better way of solving unemployment, which is getting more acute every day? I would gladly hear them put forward some constructive suggestion instead of their destructive criticisms. Public administration in Canada would benefit by such a display of true Canadianism.

Some critics contend that the loan is further proof of our British colonialism. I would not go that far. Our neighbours to the south have lent nearly 5 billions on similar terms, and yet we could hardly accuse them of British colonialism. Our loans to France and Belgium did not mean that we are their colony. I say rather that Canada must pay to reconquer her foreign markets and that Great Britain is one market we cannot afford to lose. Everyone knows that colonial ties still bind Canada to Great Britain; Westminster has not yet accomplished the miracle of granting us complete independence. At least, that is my personal opinion. But to come to the conclusion that any financial transaction between Canada and England constitutes a gesture of colonial dependency seems somewhat radical. We might discuss at great length the methods resorted to by the British to restore their economy. We are all entitled to our own opinions on the matter; however, the fact remains that Canada must have access to the world markets and accept such satisfactory compromises as are required in the gigantic struggle which is actually being waged in our confused world.

Those remarks will explain clearly my stand in regard to the loan to England. I have examined the facts purely from the standpoint of a business transaction leaving sentimentality out of the picture.

I trust that those remarks will not offend anyone; I have made them in good faith and in a spirit of fairness. I am sure that this loan to England will be approved by a great majority of the Canadian people, for the war has taught us a grim lesson and has convinced us that isolationism is out of the question, that the trend of world's public opinion cannot be disregarded and that we, in Canada, must go hand in hand with the great trading nations of the world. This entails obligations, Mr. Speaker, and I am convinced that the house is fully aware of that, but we must not shirk our national obligations and it is the bounden duty of each and everyone of us to endorse proposals which now or later will provide our workers with jobs and with an adequate income.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I will approve the loan unreservedly, leaving it to the government to carry out those proposals and to my constituents to pass judgment upon me at the opportune moment. Indeed, during the last federal election, my constituents were of the opinion that the policy of the present government in such matters is a sound one, for as stated by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Belzile) yesterday, the campaign in the constituency of Labelle as well as in his own riding hinged upon the gifts or loans to England. I had supported such gifts or loans at the time and I support the present loan, for I am convinced that the constituency of Labelle, as all the other constituencies of the country, will derive benefits from this sound legislation.

Mr. PAUL EDMOND GAGNON (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I shall preface my remarks on the bill now under discussion with an excerpt from a speech which the Right Hon. Prime Minister made in the house on March 30, 1939, during the debate on foreign policy. The leader of the Liberal party said:

> We have tremendous tasks to do at home, in housing the people, in caring for the aged and helpless, in relieving drought and unemployment, in building roads, in meeting our heavy burden of debt, in making provision for Canada's defence, and in bringing our standards of living and civilization to the levels our knowledge now makes possible. There is no great margin of realizable wealth for this purpose; we must,

to a greater or less extent, choose between keeping our own house in order, and trying to save Europe and Asia.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the government seems determined, as it was in September, 1939, to take very good care of the peace-time interests of our sympathetic friends from overseas and seems mainly if not solely concerned with the speedy rehabilitation of the British empire. Taxes snatched from the pockets of the Canadian people will meet the fantastic cost of this usual policy of serfdom which takes the form of presents, loans and advances never or only partially repaid. Now that the war is over, this policy sounds less attractive than ever before.

Let Great Britain try by every means at her disposal to regain world supremacy in the economic field; to that, we have no objection, but it seems immoral and ridiculous that we should partially finance the attempt.

In this instance, as in every phase of our participation in the world conflict, we overstep the bounds of sound common sense. Our leaders are once again afflicted with a fit of supra-national patriotism which distresses those who think of Canada's greater interests before trying to satisfy the unexpressed ambitions of imperialistic nations. We forget that it is not pretty and rather ominous to become inordinately inflated. Under present circumstances, it is no waste of time to look at things in their right perspective and to beware of misleading prospects and self-seeking propaganda.

The loan submitted to our approval is equal to one-third that asked of the United States, but compared to their national revenue, it is five or six times greater than the amount requested of them. We will pay an annual interest of about $30,000,000 until 1951 and of $12,500,000 afterwards. Canada, the Croesus of the atomic age, will borrow from the banks or elsewhere at 3 per cent and lend at 2 per cent. The least we can say is that we need not have racked our brains to find more radical methods of increasing our wealth.

According to the hon. Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe), "Canada is able to manufacture all that is manufactured elsewhere". Therefore, as has been said over and over again, we need foreign markets to dispose of our surplus production and keep employment at a maximum level. Why then not do what is necessary to take over without delay the places left vacant by Italy, Japan and especially Germany as exporting nations in South America? Considering the financial status of the South American countries, we could trade with them without first giving them money with which to buy our goods;

that is the initial but not the least important advantage Canada would derive from such an arrangement.

According to an article which appeared in the *Gazette* of February 26 last, those South American countries wish to do business with us. I quote:

(Text):

Central and South Americans are eager to do more business with Canada and every effort should be made here to stimulate the exchange of goods with Latin American countries, according to Trade and Commerce Minister James A. MacKinnon, who in a press conference to-day told of the encouraging results of his three weeks air trip to Central America and Jamaica.

(Translation):

Brazil, with a population of 45 million inhabitants in 1939, purchased from Germany, its most important supplier after the United States, coal, iron, steel, pharmaceutical products, vehicles, electrical appliances, raw wool, aluminum, etc. Canada was eleventh on the list of exporters to Brazil.

The Argentine, a country of 14 million people, imported from Germany, before the war, such goods as tin, copper, locomotives, petroleum, textiles, etc. Our exports to that country did not even represent one per cent of its total imports.

Colombia has a population of 10 million and its purchases of manufactured goods represent 90 per cent of its total imports; well in 1939, that country imported from Germany 80·9 per cent of such goods. The list includes chemical products, automobiles, alcoholic beverages, clothing, leather, artificial silk, cement, radios, tobacco, etc. Our exports to Columbia in 1939 made up but 2·3 per cent of the total.

In 1939, Chile, a country with five million inhabitants, imported from Germany, its second most important supplier, metal products, rolling stock, paints and varnishes, etc., while our exports to that country were practically nil.

Germany was also second on the list of exporters to Uruguay and Bolivia, and third among the exporters to Peru.

In the *Review of Commercial Conditions*, published by His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, Great Britain serves notice of her intention to resume her trade with South America. Why should we not vie for those markets? Of course, if we neglect our own affairs, others won't look after them for us.

Mr. Speaker, the financial transaction proposed in this resolution is mostly favourable to England. None but imperialistic extremists and utopians who dream of an eternal empire in which Canada would remain the eternal doormat, could be led to believe that

such agreements are wise and profitable. One has but to stop and think to realize that our resources, however tremendous, do not justify such generosity. They were entrusted to us by Providence for our greater welfare and we have not the right to deprive our fellow-citizens of wealth which is indispensible to their happiness, to the advantage of a still wealthier people. The Right Honourable the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has no illusions as to the economic value to Canada of this new $1,250,000,000 loan. Here is what he had to say, on the 18th of March, 1942, with regard to the billion dollar loan. I quote from page 1421 of *Hansard*:

I am sure that hon. members can recall the grave international problems and difficulties which arose in the nineteen-twenties and nineteen-thirties from the huge international war debts which had grown up during and immediately following the last great war.

International debts can be settled only by the transfer of goods and services from the debtor country to the creditor country. Such transfers can be made only if and to the extent that the creditor country is prepared to accept goods and services from the debtor country for not only principal repayments but also annual interest charges. In other words, the creditor country must be prepared to see an increase in its imports or a decrease in its exports, or both. Experience has shown that countries will accept these payments in the form of imports only to a limited extent on balance if at all. To do so, of course, exposes their producers to more intense competition from abroad, and the excess of imports serves as a deflationary influence which appears to be unwelcome in normal peace times. On the other hand, the inability of debtor nations to make payment when the creditor nation will not readily accept imported goods and services in payment is bound to lead to international misunderstandings and frictions. Consequently there is a practical limit to the amount of international debt which can be satisfactorily carried and repaid, particularly when such debt arises from the economically wasteful processes of war.

In an editorial published in *Le Devoir* of March 31st last, Mr. François-Albert Angers made forceful and accurate comments on those words of the Minister of Finance, the right. hon. Mr. Ilsley; I shall quote the following excerpt:

The value of a loan depends upon its repayment and on what the latter ensures . . . But it will be repaid, said Mr. Ilsley, only to the extent that Canada (the creditor country) is prepared to accept from England (her debtor) goods and services for not only principal repayments but also annual interest charges.

Therefore, by making a loan to England, it is not, as has been contended, Canada which will benefit from England's purchases in the future; it is exactly the opposite: either we remain England's customers in future or we lose our money. Actually England will be our customer for a year or two (until the billion and a quarter has been used up) and without any cost to her at that during that period, and we can only be repaid provided we remain England's customers for fifty years from 1951 on; of course, we must agree also that England's purchases from us will decrease gradually as the amount of interest and annual instalments on principal decrease also.

In future, therefore, the loan will result in a decrease of Canada's exports to England, as stated by Mr. Ilsley when he said: "In other words, Canada (the creditor country) if she wishes to be reimbursed must be prepared to see an increase in her imports or a decrease in her exports, or both.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, economically speaking, it is permissible to contend that this proposal will not bring to Canada the benefits anticipated by the Reform Club speakers. From a humanitarian standpoint, it cannot meet with our approval because it would entail financial sacrifices beyond our means, which we have not the right to make without first consulting all the taxpayers of the country. The borrower will derive the greatest benefits, the most tangible advantages, and this is unfair to us. It is an overwhelming burden which our people will bear for generations, whereas their load is already so heavy and vexatious that it should not inconsiderately be increased.

Again I repeat it is time that the people of Canada derive some benefits from such huge outlays. I am much more concerned with the well-being of my compatriots than with the attempts of a foreign nation to gain supremacy on the markets of the world. We hear a great deal about Canada being endowed with a super-abundance of forests, mines, water powers, etc.; this is quite true. However, we must not forget that the larger number of workers, and settlers, the ordinary and humble citizen, live from hand to mouth, without hope of any improvement in their situation and that they do not look favourably on such splendid gifts. Lack of comfort, privation, unemployment, destitution are as many culture mediums for the virus of subversive doctrines that we must by all means eradicate

I know some good, honest and laborious farmers who are generous beyond their means and who would welcome government assistance or the help of experts free of charge for the draining of their lands, the purchase of farm implements, the improvement of their farming methods. A small part of a billion dollars earmarked for the benefit of our farming class

would be more beneficial to the country than the surrender of claims amountaing to a few million dollars.

I know some seasonal workers, such as stevedores, lumbermen, railway employees, who would be pleased to enjoy unemployment benefits, either non-existent or inadequate at the present time; an improvement in the condition of these people who comprise the greatest part of our population would increase the general well-being of Canada in permitting a greater expansion of our wealth and a fairer distribution of our public funds.

Since I have had the privilege of holding a seat in this house, I have heard almost daily, hon. members making various requests: for the building of a railway line or a seaport, for an increase in the old age pension or the pension to the blind. One would request that researches for a cancer cure be not hindered by the lack of necessary funds; another, that a benefit system be inaugurated for the crippled without income or revenue; and there are also the requests for bridges, post offices and other public buildings. Another member would ask air mail for his district. Hardly a speech that does not refer to an old or a new request

Should we not, Mr. Speaker, first grant all reasonable requests, either by lending the amount required or granting the sums asked for, before giving additional millions of dollars to an Empire whose wealth is incredible? What we want for Canada, is a sane legislation and a conservative financial management; this is more important than entering the international race with millions and billions of dollars. All the arguments advanced or to be advanced in favour of the agreement between Canada and Great Britain which is submitted to us at the present time, do not and will not alter the fact that when one has not enough money to meet his obligations, one is ill-advised to make additional debts in order to make a loan to one's neighbour.

"A deep and prevailing national feeling is not a luxury for Canada, it is a necessity", such were the words used in 1939, by the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and this is why I am willing to vote billions of dollars for the care, protection and future welfare of my Canadian fellow-citizens, while refusing to support this agreement. As the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion) stated, on March 26 last:

> Before paying millions every year on account of the loan made to another country, our leaders should show the people that they are ready to undertake the public works which are sorely needed.

[Mr. Gagnon.]

Mr. RENE HAMEL (St. Maurice-Laflèche): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks on the measure now under consideration. The tax-paying public does not seem to welcome as readily as do some hon. members of this house the idea of lending $1,250 million to England. I should like to indicate some of the reasons why I feel bound to oppose this measure which, to my mind, borders on extravagance.

My opposition comes, in the first place, from the instructions of my constituents. I have received numerous protests from my electors. I have made a personal investigation and I must say that I have not met one person, of whatever political party, to whom such an utter prodigality has not been a cause of deep resentment.

If the hon. members of this house are still the representatives of the people, rather than the tools of a dictatorship, I believe that the opinion of my constituents must influence the stand we have to take on this matter.

I am not against this proposal merely because of the views of my electors, I oppose it on behalf of the 150,000 voters who, in the last election, accepted as their own the Bloc Populaire's motto "Canada for Canadians". Now, so that no one may charge me with being an isolationist, I should like to refer to the views that have been voiced throughout the province by prominent journalists and people who are outstanding in the field of economic and political science in our province. Here is what the brilliant parliamentary correspondent of *L'Action Catholique* had to say in an outspoken article published on March 9, 1946:

> It is true that our gifts for this week give us a respite of a couple of years and that they will maintain our economic activity during that limited period. This dubious result is obtained by unnatural means, just as the spark of life is sustained in a dying man through the administration of a drug.

The same writer, had this to say in the same paper on March 12, 1946:

> The naked truth is that Greit Britain will in future receive our products and distribute them in order to maintain her trade and her imperial policy, and that the Canadians will have to foot the bill.

I must recall to the house that *L'Action Catholique* has a circulation of 80,000 to 90,000 in the province of Quebec. The outspoken opinion of that parliamentary correspondent is fully confirmed by experts. I am referring to Mr. Roger Vézina, editor of the financial page in *L'Action Catholique,* who in the April 2, 1946 issue of that paper expressed the following opinion:

In any case, we believe we are justified to claim that, in its present form and extent, the loan which the Canadian government is about to make to England is not a very sound transaction, but rather a take-in which will keep us dependent on the whims of Britain and will therefore prevent us from securing other external markets and from directing our economy in such a way as to give priority to Canadian needs.

I shall now quote Mr. François Albert Angers, professor at the University of Montreal, whom I consider as an expert in that field. I shall read a few excerpts of an article he published in *Le Devoir* of March 30:

For the future, the loan may therefore result in a decrease of Canada's exports to England.

Let me refer to the following statement made by the Minister of Finance:

In other words Canada (the creditor nation) must increase her imports in order to be paid.

To cut short, I quote further:

But if things keep in the trend of the past six years, Mr. Ilsley will be proven wrong and history will show that no country, in the experience of the world, has evinced Canada's gullibility in agreeing blindly to sacrifice the interests of her producers to those of another nation, England in this case, for the sole purpose of helping that country to squeeze her out of the international market.

One might think this statement came from government opponents. I would like to add to this compelling evidence the opinion of *Le Soleil,* Quebec's Liberal organ, which cannot be accused of being in any way opposed to the present government. Here is an editorial from *Le Soleil* of March 11, 1946:

Any reasons or pretexts brought up in favour of new financial sacrifices to the cause of imperialism will not alter the fact that these sacrifices go beyond what can be expected of Canadian democracy.

This from *Le Soleil* and not from any member of the Bloc Populaire. The editorial goes on:

We need not hesitate to censure the abuse of power instanced by this advance of $1,250,000,000 to Great Britain without the previous approval of parliament whose great mistake was to give a free hand to the executive.

Such has been the effect of the views I have just quoted on public opinion that the Liberal member for Lotbinière at the Quebec legislative assembly introduced the following motion:

That in the opinion of this house the federal parliament should decline to implement the projected financial agreement between Great Britain and Canada, unless the dominion government establish that this agreement is beneficial from a Canadian point of view.

Mr. LALONDE: Was the motion passed?

Mr. HAMEL: I cannot say. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it has not been shown to the people of this country that the financial agreement before the house is in the best interest of Canada.

The argumentation used by the advocates of the present loan boils down, more or less, to the following pleas:

In the first place, the United Kingdom has been sorely tried by the war and needs our help.

In the second place, the United States have agreed to a loan of some $4 billions without making any sentimental fuss but simply working from a business standpoint.

In the third place, Canada needs foreign markets to dispose of her products and to avoid unemployment.

Conscious of my responsibility as regards our obligations towards humanity on the one hand and our own country on the other, I honestly weighed these arguments.

We are told that the United Kingdom has endured a great deal during the six years of war. I have every sympathy for the suffering of others, whatever country, creed or language happen to be involved. My heart, however, goes out first to my own people, to my fellow-countrymen before I am drawn to the inhabitants of distant lands. The position of the United Kingdom, moreover, is described in Canada in terms far more pessimistic than in Great Britain. We know, for instance, that England has to a great extent relieved the taxpayer's burden. According to English papers, British exports are increasing materially, the British people enjoy better health than before the war and houses are rapidly being built. I even read recently that the Ministry of Social Welfare in Great Britain will supply milk daily to all school children or university students. A Reuters despatch, carried by the Nelson *Daily News,* gives some rather illuminating information on the matter: the heading is:

Luxury Returns to Bond Street. London, March 20—Almost pre-war luxury has come back to Bond street, London's fashionable and most expensive quarter of a mile, where you now can spend £1,000 ($4,450) within an hour without any difficulty.

And so, Mr. Speaker, our first duty, as I see it, is to relieve distress here in Canada, to raise the standard of living of our own workers, our own citizens, to lower the pensionable age of old people and increase the amount of pension. I am, in addition, particularly impressed by the fact that the interest rate charged by the Government to its borrower is less than that required by British investors, who loan money to their own government at 3 per cent.

The second argument is that of the American loan. But that loan is altogether different

from our own. I need not go into the details, for they are quite unlike those of our own. The United States' total income amounts to 198 billions, whereas ours barely amounts to 10 billions. The United States have a population of 137 millions, while ours is less than 12 millions. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of going into particulars. I shall merely recall the different way in which news of both loans was received in London, and that while the British house greeted the Canadian loan with frantic applause, it received the American loan coldly, submissively, and with obvious discontent. Besides, as a compensation for their load, the United States have compelled the United Kingdom to give up imperial preferential tariff, a condition which might have the most serious consequences on our industries by forcing them to compete with American products on the markets of the Commonwealth.

As for the third argument, Mr. Speaker, I shall call it childish at the risk of scandalizing the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Lalonde). At a time when we are compelled to ration ourselves; when the world is threatened with starvation; when the demand for agricultural products and raw materials is so superior to the supply as to endanger the very existence of mankind, is it reasonable to claim that such a loan is essential to our exports? If it ensured for the future a protection against unemployment, I would agree. Far from it, the opinion expressed by the two experts I have quoted is the very opposite of that theory and they say that this loan will lead us, within two years, into a period of unemployment. Mr. Speaker, the true reason why England is in such a great need of that advance is to be found in the *Gazette* of March 20, 1946, and that paper is not an organ of the Bloc Populaire.

Mr. LALONDE: It is not a Liberal paper either.

Mr. HAMEL: Here is what the *Gazette* has to say:

> Full importance of the United States loan for British foreign policy is not generally realized . . .
>
> Maintenance of troops in Greece, Indonesia, Egypt and India represents a heavy drain on this country which has emerged seriously impoverished from the war.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to make myself an accomplice of any nation which prevents people from enjoying their independence. For that reason, I shall vote against the motion.

(Text):

Mr. LUDGER DIONNE (Beauce): If I recall the speed with which the resolution concerning the loan to England was carried at its first reading it is easy for me to foresee that this measure will be adopted promptly on second reading.

Not having much experience in international business matters and having no knowledge of international politics and economy, I must necessarily listen to people who know more than I do on these subjects. Competent authorities in whom I have reason to have full confidence tell me that this loan of one billion and a quarter must be made to Great Britain for many reasons—because we must dispose of the surplus of our farm products such as wheat, bacon, cheese, et cetera. Evidently if we cannot sell these commodities the purchasing power of our farmers will decrease and will prevent them from remodeling their farm equipment and buying the necessities of life of which they have been deprived during the last few years. Naturally, if this happens our manufacturing process will take a long time to revive on civilian goods exclusively, thus making it practically impossible to give employment to the numerous people idle at the present time on account of our war activities having been brought to an end. It stands to reason that I must admit this argument. On the other hand, I am at a loss to understand why we cannot dispose of at least a portion of our farm products outside England. The whole world is hungry at the present time. Would it not be a good opportunity to try to find some new channels to dispose of these goods, at least part of them? We might find some people who would not impose such drastic conditions as England does in purchasing our manufactured products.

I was told the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) declared recently that England had permitted some Canadian manufacturers to resume their export to England on a proportion of twenty per cent of their pre-war trade. I am informed that this permit is extended not only to Canada but to all other countries of the world.

It is hard for me to believe that England is in such a really critical financial situation as we are given to understand. Here is a small article from London reproduced in the Montreal *Daily Star* of April 4:

> It is estimated that by Christmas Britain will have more people engaged in the home and export trade, and a higher total output of goods than ever before.
>
> Latest figures show there is an all-round labour force of about twenty million men and women. This includes nearly five million who have been switched from the fighting services and war production since June, 1945.
>
> Despite the rather dislocating changeover from war to peace unemployment has risen from 100,000 to only 300,000, less than two per cent of the total workers covered by the government compulsory insurance scheme.

It is claimed to be the lowest level of unemployment in any peace-time period since 1913.

Exports are being stimulated. Last June the number of people in export manufacturing industries was 408,000. This rose to 944,000 by January and now is estimated at more than 1,000,000—well ahead of the 830,000 workers in these industries in 1939.

Moreover exports have increased faster than had been anticipated and imports are falling.

From a value level of about £30,000,000 ($135,000,000) in November exports rose to £60,000,000 in February and preliminary calculations indicate they will be well above that figure for March.

Imports are going the other way. About £90,000,000 worth of goods were imported in November, but only £75,000,000 were imported in February. These include raw materials and food.

If we compare the unemployed people we have in this country with those in England, Great Britain is in a much better situation than we are.

Frankly I am inclined to think that England is taking advantage of our natural sympathy. During the war every country in the world admired the heroic resistance of the British. Canada was at the head of the parade. The billions that we have given to England are a living token of our national admiration and gratitude. I have a notion that England takes it for granted that Canada has unlimited resources which she is entitled to share with us.

At least if Great Britain was showing her appreciation in some way toward Canada, the gift of $425 millions might be easier to swallow. But when it comes to business transactions England is just as sharp with us as she would be with any other country, and when time to meet her obligation with Canada is matured she declares she cannot pay and the government seem to believe it.

I am led to believe that England will revive its former favourable trade with the outside world much quicker than we are given to understand, especially if I judge by the way she is managing her manufacturing facilities and handling her unemployment problem.

England was responsible to a certain extent for the enormous expansion of our manufacturing activities during the war. We cannot close these shops of ours and send the labour back on the farm. Great Britain seems to favour this idea in prohibiting or restricing our export of finished products and buying from us preferably what she cannot get elsewhere at the same price or cheaper.

I will use wheat as an example, which I understand we sell cheaper to England than she can buy United States wheat; bacon and cheese on which the government has to pay a subsidy to the producers in order that England may buy them. Have any hon. members known of any commodity on which England is paying, or has paid a bonus to her own producers in order to sell it to us at a more favourable price? On the contrary, how many articles imported by our large department stores command a higher ceiling than our own Canadian goods. Some goods produced in England have been subsidized by the Canadian government in order that we may buy them.

I think the time has come for us to face the situation and realize what we are up against. If we do not take any action, England will. Look at what she has done recently; she has reduced the income tax substantially; she has eliminated the excess profits tax. Why? To help her industry to compete more advantageously with the rest of the world, Canada included. If England were in such an acute financial situation do hon. members think she could afford to do this?

Here in Canada we are told that such a breathing spell cannot be enjoyed by our population. Well, if we cannot give our people the same privilege as England, we should not be asked to make gifts of this importance. Why not let England get back on its feet and then consider if such gifts cannot be refunded to us? Then it would be the proper time to consider this matter.

We must take it for granted once and for all that we are no longer dependent on England for our manufactured products. We are a competitor of England and we must therefore treat England exactly as she treats us or any other competing countries. It is late but not too late for the Canadian government to look for trade with other countries, to avoid being at the mercy of England forever, as we have been in the past.

The second reason given to me was to the effect that the loan must be made because we must help England to maintain its prestige and influence in the world. Again I must admit that this reason is worthy of serious consideration. I do not think any hon. member would like to see another country influence Europe to the detriment of England. On the other hand, if we must keep on making such large contributions to England as we have made in the last few years, just for the sake of maintaining her prestige, I imagine it will not be many years before Canada is bankrupt.

I understand I must vote in favour of the loan because I cannot take the responsibility of depriving our farmers of the opportunity to sell their product at decent prices, or of making the unemployment situation more acute than it is at the present time; but I hope I shall not be called upon to take this

action again. I note that the government has lent money to different devastated foreign countries in order that they may buy the necessities of life in the Canadian market, and I congratulate them upon this effort. It is a constructive move to provide additional markets, and I hope no effort will be spared on the part of the government to continue this policy of attracting additional customers to Canada.

As for the citizens of Canada who are against the loan and who would use this argument for political purposes, I believe the times are too serious to adopt such an attitude. Rather I would ask these people to suggest practical means of coping with the situation. I am in favour of constructive criticism. No national problem has ever been solved by appealing to the passion of the masses through the medium of destructive criticism.

I imagine some people will not appreciate the ideas I have expressed, but I thought it my duty to submit these remarks for the consideration of the government. I would ask my colleagues to remember that it is a much easier job to watch the flock than to be watched by the flock. By this I mean that I could have let the resolution or motion go through without offering my ideas for the consideration of the people of Canada. But the very first act I was called upon to perform upon my entry to the House of Commons was to swear that I would be loyal and faithful to my country, so that I feel under obligation to join in the debate and express my thoughts, even though some people may not share my views. Even if I am wrong, I hope they will give me credit for being sincere. In other words, if I favour this loan it is because I think it is in the interests of Canada. Even if the failure of England were at stake I would try to help, but not at the expense of Canada. But if England fails and Canada has to follow the same course, then it becomes too serious to take any chance.

Mr. W. G. CASE (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped there would be a degree of unanimity on this important bill. It did seem to me that those who are charged with the responsibility of viewing the important features of this loan must have given it a great deal of consideration; and for the psychological effect it would have seemed to be in order for us to accept the report of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) and give this loan early approval, since indeed it will have much to do with our future prosperity.

The hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Dionne) spoke of Britain driving a hard bargain. Well, there was a time when her bargaining powers were limited; but we who

indeed were her debtors morally were willing to accept her decision in the greatest game ever played on an international scale, during the tragic war just concluded. So that for a few moments, if I may, I wish to direct your attention to Britain's position in the days before the war and trace something of the contribution and the tremendous sacrifices she made during that trying period. I do not intend to refer to her bravery or sacrifices on the field of battle, but rather to her economic sacrifices, to her position in world affairs which she was prepared to risk in order to stand forth as the stalwart defender of freedom and civilization.

Annually before the war Britain bought more goods of every kind than any other single country in the world. That is a fact which should not be lost sight of, inasmuch as it indicates the key position she occupied; and I believe world economists recognize to-day that unless she is able to regain some semblance of that position the recovery we are all so anxious to bring about may be hampered. Not only was Britain a large importer of goods; she was also a great exporter. One-fifth of the world's foreign commerce moved through Britain's ports. So that when we think of the position Britain occupied in trading with the whole world, we cannot avoid gaining some conception of how important it will be for us to seek to channel commerce and trade through the same ports which have served the world so well in the past.

What is the position to-day? What is known as the sterling bloc accounts for almost one-third of the world's trade. Britain now is indebted to this sterling bloc for goods received during the war to the extent of $14,000 million. If we try a squeeze play, if I might use that term, we may drive Britain to trade within this sterling bloc, to which she will be bound to export her goods in order to satisfy her creditors; and while this huge volume of trade is going on we in the dollar bloc will suffer most. As a matter of fact, in my opinion it would be nothing short of a tragedy were we to allow a competitive situation to develop between these two great trading blocs. The hon. gentleman who preceded me mentioned the hard bargain that Britain drove. Well, when it comes to surviving the bargain would be harder still, because Britain and the whole sterling bloc would be pitted against the dollar bloc and fighting for survival in the most tragic economic war one could possibly imagine.

During the war Britain cut her exports by more than sixty-six per cent, in her all-out effort to stem the tide. Her whole energy,

every fibre and force of her being, was directed in one course. It was to bring about some degree of security to determine that an ideology which had no place among freedom loving people would not gain a dominant position in world affairs.

I come now to the purpose of this loan. As I understand it, this loan has a direct relationship to the loan now pending approval in the United States of America. The best authorities there indicate that the object is to stabilize currency. It is said that with this credit and the credit which will be passed by Washington there will exist a dollar exchange so that this country, whether trading in a sterling area or in a dollar area, will have funds which will be readily convertible into dollars or pounds sterling. It seems to me that this is a move in the right direction which we have sought to make for many long years.

Most people agree that there must be a lowering of tariff barriers, or trade barriers if you will. You are not going to accomplish your purpose if you set up a barrier more difficult to hurdle, a barrier of currency which cannot be exchanged into funds which are acceptable in our own country. I can visualize a tremendous volume of trade from this one and a quarter billion dollar loan which we would otherwise lose. I do not think there is any doubt about that in the minds of those who are present to-day.

We should not charge Britain with being a hard customer to deal with. I think we can adopt a rather selfish attitude with respect to this loan inasmuch as Canada will stand to benefit from it just as much if not more than Great Britain. As a matter of fact, without this loan our agricultural industry and hundreds of our workshops might have to shut down. If you can visualize the situation resulting from a condition of that nature then I think you will agree that the loan means as much to us as it does to Great Britain. When in the days of the war it was necessary to supply Britain with ammunition and implements of warfare, guns, ships and so on, we never hesitated. We furnished those things which were needed solely for destruction.

It has been said that probably Britain will turn around and lend money to other nations in Europe. I would have no objection to that. I do not think we should seek to follow through. If we supply goods to Britain and she in turn can pass them on to others who are in need, having arranged the necessary credits or exchange, that would seem to me to be good business. It would be setting up the scheme which we are seeking so hard to set up, world trade, trade throughout the civilized world.

When we read the press comments on the situation in Europe we realize that Europe is on the verge of starvation. Not many people in this country know what it means to be without food, without the necessary nourishment to keep body and soul together. Food is the one thing that probably will save Europe from anarchy or revolution. If the people there face starvation, if their calorific intake is not sufficient to maintain them, the result will be that disease will run rampant, tuberculosis and other tragedies will wait upon the human race.

If we are to bring about a better world it would seem that this will be achieved through the channels of trade. I have said before that we come to know better the people with whom we do business than we do strangers. This is our opportunity to play our part at an important moment in world history. I doubt if many of us realize just how serious the situation is. Without this loan and the loan now pending approval in the United States we do not know what forces will come into being, seeking in a competitive way, in a hard, cold, clear way, to gain dominance in world trade.

I recall Britain's position after the war. She found herself hopelessly indebted, both in the sterling bloc and in the dollar bloc. The dollar bloc countries have realized already the importance of maintaining Britain's trade position. I think it must be admitted that Britain is the one nation in the world which has been proved in the past to represent the frontier of democratic civilization. We must endeavour to protect our great ally who during the war years was willing to sacrifice all her foreign investments. No sacrifice was too great for her to make, and her foreign investments were sold in order to create credit with which she could purchase the necessary instruments and implements for war.

I hope we do not delay too long in coming to a decision, in making up our minds that this is possibly one of the most important bills to come before the House of Commons. It is our opportunity to indicate, not in a begrudging way but in a wholesome, encouraging way that we still believe in Britain, that we believe she is good credit, that we believe she is the world's best customer, carrying on trade, as she does, with so many other countries.

I leave my hon. friends who will follow me with this thought: This is our opportunity to endorse what has been said by others who

have viewed critically the precise position of Great Britain and who believe that this is necessary for her survival. Without her survival there will be nothing but chaos. The result of that will be that we in Canada will suffer hardships which we do not anticipate at the present time. Together with Britain and the United States we can march forward and bring about that world of to-morrow which has been held up to those who have fought so hard for existence. I am sure the result will justify the action we take at this time.

Mr. H. R. ARGUE (Wood Mountain): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the principle of this bill I think I shall take my cue from the last member who spoke and make my remarks brief so that we can expedite the business of the house. I expected that this debate would take two or three weeks, but I heard over the grapevine that it would be wound up before the recess at Easter. For that reason I have to get in on the debate quite early.

The bill we have before us contains more than one principle. One principle is that a large sum of money owed by Great Britain to Canada shall be cancelled. Some hon. members have referred to that as a gift. To me a gift is something that we give now or in the future, whereas this is a debt that was incurred in the past and we are now cancelling it. I am glad that we are cancelling it.

However, when I think of the amount of this cancellation that we are making to the people of Great Britain I also think of some of the debts and hardships facing certain people of Canada. I have in mind our old age pensioners. It would be a fine gesture on our part if we could see to it that the caveats are removed from the homes and properties of people who receive old age pensions. There are people in Canada, home owners and farmers, who have secured debts against their properties. Some of those debts have been attached to those properties for twenty or thirty years, and I think this government would be supported in any measure they would bring forward, to cancel those particular debts, and as well the $17,000,000 odd which the soldier settlers of the first great war owe under the Soldier Settlement Act. At this time when we are cancelling $425,000,000 of a debt that is owed to us by Great Britain this government should certainly be able to cancel the $17,000,000 that is owed by the soldier settlers.

Another principle in this bill is that for a number of years the loan shall be interest-free, and after that the rate of interest shall be low. That, too, I think is a very good principle. It is a principle that we have seen developing in Canada over the past twenty years. The government bonds floated in the first great war paid five per cent interest. Most of the bonds floated by the government in this war paid three per cent interest. The banks used to charge eight and nine per cent interest on loans; they now charge six per cent. I think that is a good thing. I am opposed to interest at any time on anything beyond the amount of interest that is necessary to cover the charges of making the transaction and carrying the debt. It was a revelation in irony to see on the same order paper on which the resolution appeared for cancelling the debt to Great Britain another resolution reducing the rate of interest which the soldier settlers of the first great war have to pay on their debt to three and a half per cent. We are at this time making a loan to Britain that will carry two per cent interest. Yet at the same time we are asking that the Canadian veterans of the first great war pay three and a half per cent interest, or 150 per cent more interest than we are asking the people of Great Britain to pay. Surely we do not love the people of Great Britain more than we love our own veterans. I suggest that the veterans of both wars be given interest rates not greater in any event than two per cent. I think also that the interest rate charged by the farm loan board might be reduced from five to two per cent and that bank loan interest should be reduced to two per cent. We should take our action on this loan to Great Britain as a criterion of the amount of interest that shall be charged on loans to Canadians. I am opposed to Canadian workers, farmers and small business men paying more than two per cent interest on any type of debt.

We, in this group should examine this proposition, if possible from the point of view of orthodox financial policy. I regret very much that I have not with me a statement to which I can refer closely as did the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) in the address that he delivered yeserday, and I shall have to attempt to get along by referring to a few heads.

In the past the people of Canada believed and to-day they are being told by people in many quarters that for Canada to prosper we must have large amounts of exports; more than that, that we must have an excess of exports over imports, and to the extent that we have that excess of export over imports we shall have prosperity at home. The argument is a fallacy, but in some ways it worked pretty well in practice under the present economic set-up. If we have an excess of exports over imports the Canadian producers of those exports are not

getting pound sterling or United States dollars for what they produce, but are getting Canadian dollars and deposits in Canadian banks, and because they have those deposits they are able to purchase the things they need. If we are to follow the argument, which I do not agree with, that prosperity in Canada depends on a large export trade over our imports, the government would have been wise in the interests of this system to make this whole loan a gift, because then they would not have to be faced, as they surely will be faced, with the difficulty of having imports come to Canada in large quantities to pay for the loan.

I believe that Britain will pay back or will be prepared to pay back the amount of this loan. We shall be making from now until 1951 a loan to Great Britain of $1,250,000,000, which is a capital export. After 1951 Great Britain will start to pay back that loan and then there will be an import of capital into Canada, which will accompany the import of goods.

From 1919 to 1928 Canada on the average exported annually capital amounts of from $500,000,000 to $700,000,000 and we had prosperity. We were exporting more than we were importing. We were exporting goods much of which no doubt we could have consumed, but we had prosperity. The years 1929, 1930 and 1931 saw capital exports and capital imports almost balance, and then we had a severe depression on our hands. If, when Great Britain is paying back this loan, we are not able to find other investments for Canadian money, we shall not have a large export of capital and we shall again, I am certain, be faced with a depression.

This loan is different from other investments in that it is made to a government. I believe that the day is past when financial interests in Canada or the United States could invest their money in the natural resources of any country to exploit the people of that country, and the government of every nation in the world is going to watch very carefully in future the amount of foreign capital that is being sent into the country. So that if we want to export our capital we shall have to do so through government bodies. I do not think governments of other nations will be prepared after a few years to accept our capital exports, and I do not think the people of Canada will be prepared to give them. Therefore, if we are to accept payment for this loan we shall have to import more goods than we are exporting. If we attempt to import more goods than we export I can foresee that a great howl will be set up in Canada by all the financial interests, monopolies and cartels, and they no doubt will have an even greater effect in the future than they have had in the past in influencing the budget such as was brought before the house at the last session. If the financial interests are successful in preventing from coming into Canada the imports that are necessary to pay for the British loan—and judging from experience I think under our present system they will be successful—Great Britain will face an adverse balance of payments. Britain, facing an adverse balance of payments, will find the shortage of United States dollars and Canadian dollars very difficult. She will try to increase her exports by any means possible, and there will be a long time of disequilibrium in the balance of payments.

In order to increase her exports Britain will be forced to depreciate her currency. This depreciation will encourage British exports to Canada; it will at the same time discourage Canadian exports to Britain. We saw in September, 1931, the conditions which faced Canada that year, and they faced her also the next year, after Great Britain had devaluated her currency. We saw that the products of Canada, sent to the markets of Great Britain and turned into pounds, brought fewer Canadian dollars to the producers of those products. In November, 1932, we saw the price of wheat on the Winnipeg grain exchange hit an all-time low of forty cents a bushel, basis No. 1 northern, Fort William, and the depression was certainly on. We saw few jobs in Canada. There was no effective demand for goods. Canadian boys by the thousand rode the rods. If we are not to have those conditions return we must take full cognizance of the situation which will face us after 1951. There is only one way whereby we can accept more British imports, and that is by having full employment in Canada, having everybody here who is willing and able to work, working and obtaining a decent wage or salary. They will then have the money to buy from Great Britain the imports which will add materially to the welfare of all our people.

There is another thing we shall be forced to do. I believe that never again in the future should the people of Canada acquiesce in the idea that the price they obtain for their products in Canadian dollars shall be governed entirely by the price paid for those products on the world market. Canadian farmers at this time need, shall we say, $1.55 a bushel for their wheat. At this time there is no real relation between any so-called world market price and the price the farmers receive for their products. But our farmers are enjoying more prosperity than they did in 1932 when their prices were hooked up with world

prices. The price the farmer receives for his products should be such that out of an economy of full employment in Canada he shall receive his fair share of the national income; the same with the worker; the same with all classes of people. Surely never again do we want to hook our whole economy to a fluctuating world market price. If anything important is going on in the world to-day in the changes which all governments are making in their outlook respecting the industrial and financial life of their nations, it is that almost everywhere governments are deciding that they must have complete ownership and control of the banking system. If we are to have the full production and full employment which will be necessary to permit Canadians to use the goods which Britain will have to export, we must of necessity socialize the banks so that the government will have available to them at the cost of banking, which is very little, the Canadian dollars that are necessary to pay to the people of Canada as a reward for their labour.

I believe this measure which is before the house will serve a useful purpose to all the people of Canada. We see the government at this time cancelling a $425 million debt of Great Britain, at the same time that we are lending to Great Britain on favourable terms $1,250 million. Surely we shall never again hear in this house what a minister told us the other day, in talking about payments for social security for people who are unable to earn their living, that $100 million is a very large amount. Surely, if we can get $1,250 million to loan to Great Britain we can get $100 million to provide security to these people in Canada who through no fault of their own are disabled and cannot obtain jobs. Surely we shall not again have an answer from the government—or a talking out of a motion, which is even worse—that there is not available $100 million for irrigation in all of the area of western Canada. If the government intends to make the present system work at all, this loan makes it more imperative than ever that we shall have full production, full employment, adequate social security; and these measures, I submit, can be brought about only by socializing the banks, whereby we can make the currency available which is necessary to run the economy of Canada as it is best suited to the needs of the people of Canada.

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): Speaking upon this bill, I wish to say in the first place that I regard the credit of $1,250 million to Britain simply as an assurance of employment in this country. It is neither more nor less than that. Without extending the credit we shall be poor, because our people will not be employed; if we extend the credit the reverse can be true.

Reference has been made in the debate, both on the resolution and on this motion for second reading, to what has been called good commercial practice. The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) spoke of the need a merchant sometimes found of extending credit in his own interest. In respect of this credit I think we can very well liken ourselves to a man of business who has had customers over a number of years who gave him a great deal of business, well-to-do customers who made up about forty per cent of his business, and then these customers became temporarily embarrassed and could not deal with him any longer on a cash basis. Faced with that prospect, any merchant if he were wise would know what to answer. He would certainly say to such customers that they could continue to obtain their needs from him without cash. He would know that if he could hold the business by granting credit he could carry on as before; he could keep his employees employed as before; he could, as they say, maintain his organization, and perhaps he could even expand it. Eventually he would be repaid in full; and altogether he could regard the situation as one which held for him a good future. Incidentally—but only incidentally in the business view—he would be helping toward a less austere life the people who had been his good customers.

That is exactly our position at the present time; at least it is as near to an exact comparison as we can get in likening an individual's business to a nation's business. Such a comparison can never be quite exact, but I believe it is close enough in this case for us to begin to see clearly the nature of this proposition.

I wish to comment further on the employment and unemployment features which present themselves to me in the consideration of this bill; but before I do so I should like to deal with some of the criticisms that have been made. I noted the objections of the hon. member for Richelieu-Verchères (Mr. Cardin). He thinks this loan is for the grandeur and prestige of England. He looks on it as a prop for the central structure of an empire. This, to him, seems to be colonialism. I regard his approach as a grave mistake. The motives underlying the loan are purely economic and purely Canadian. I am not denying that there is altruism in the country, but the compelling motives are economic and Canadian.

What strikes me in listening to charges of subservience to England is that these excessive warnings tend to become ludicrous. I believe if that sort of thing is continued, then, when some real danger does arise, of a kind about which the hon. gentleman, as an elder statesman, might wish to warn us, his vibrant voice will be without authority at all owing to the fact that he has continually and for a long time been trying to make our flesh creep with scare talk about a bogey-man that does not really exist.

As a matter of fact, it seems to me that if we had been warned about being imperialistic it would have been better.

I have always understood that the imperialist lent money in order to bring a nation into thraldom or to keep it in thraldom. Here, we are the lender; not the borrower. It is the borrower that becomes a colonial. If he had warned us against striving to become imperialists by this measure the warning might have been more apt. He ought to warn England, as being in great danger, according to the doctrine usually put forth, of becoming a mere colonial spot in an empire of which this nation is to be the centre. That is the sort of warning that would have been more logical.

I wish to deal also with criticisms of the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot). Just as I have great respect and, indeed, affection for the hon. member for Richelieu-Verchères and would be sorry to make him angry with me over any criticism that I might offer of his remarks, so, too, I think the friendliness, the wit and the good humour of the hon. member for Temiscouata are an asset to this chamber. It would be regrettable if we did not long enjoy those attributes. But such feelings are not a sufficient reason for refraining from a critical analysis of the proposals that he puts forward in connection with this bill.

Mr. POULIOT: That is what I am asking for.

Mr. MAYBANK: Very good, and that is what the hon. member is getting. Certainly I am sharply critical over the idea of endeavouring to acquire colonies such as Jamaica and Bermuda—

Mr. POULIOT: And the United Kingdom.

Mr. MAYBANK: —yes, and the United Kingdom, in return for any loan we may make. After all, what benefit would it be if some piece of territory could be granted to Canada in return for this loan? We could not exchange a slice of those islands for employment in this country. There would not be any person in Rivière du Loup who would be employed by reason of our owning Jamaica. You would not even get your rum any cheaper there when you were unemployed.

Something else occurs to me when I think about that. We have gone through this war the one nation in the world of which there was no criticism or suspicion of any sort—never any fear that we were trying to get any advantage. Other nations also may have had no ulterior designs, but there was probably no nation except Canada respecting which there was not suspicion. It was believed by some nations that England wanted eventually to get certain additional territory. Such was the belief in some quarters about the United States, about Australia, and of course, about Russia. Canada alone among all the nations was never criticized or under suspicion in that respect. We alone were accorded the unique motive of desiring only to win the war against diabolical doctrines about which we all know so much by now. It is the hon. member for Temiscouata who is the first to suggest that we should change, and that we should get "on the make". I prefer the reputation we have had, and would not trade it for any new territory that might be granted in return for any of our loans. Our reputation is far superior to any material gain that we can get.

I should like to say a few words more about this "colonialism" charge, and I do not now refer particularly to the hon. member for Richelieu-Verchères or to the hon. member for Temiscouata. But there do come from time to time innuendoes and hints, charges and statements from some hon. members that a great number of us who do not live in the lower province are not Canadians. We hear it every once in a while, or we hear suggestions of it.

Of course I realize how false the charge is. Speaking as I do with other Canadians across the country and with their representatives in this House of Commons, I see how wrong it is. I know that, so far as I am concerned, I am never moved by any considerations that are not purely Canadian. Although I see the incongruity of the charge, it does appear that some people are of the opinion that we who have not that great advantage of the two languages are not Canadians, that we look at all propositions first with the eyes of English and, second, with the eyes of Canadians. I tell the house, frankly, I get very tired of what it seems to me is a sort of frenzy of Canadianism. I think some of those hon. gentlemen who put forth that sort of criticism are sometimes very much like the Pharisee who spent a great deal of his time in thanking

God that he was not as other men. I remember hearing of a man of whom it was said that he used to go to the rain barrel and yell down into it, declaring his own virtues in order that they might be sounded back by echo into his ears; and to him this was as music. Such is the attitude of some of those who would charge others with being non-Canadian. They smite their breasts extolling their own Canadianism. I submit to you, sir, it is about time that sort of thing stopped. We are all Canadians.

People will approach an economic question of this sort from different directions. Some will be more moved than others over the benefit that may be gained by some place remote from their own country, not because they love their own country less, but because they think that from the point of view of their own country that gain which would help another country will be best in the long run for their own. I have no hesitation in saying that it has always been my view that the best way to help your own country is to help another country. I do not believe there is any doctrine as good in an economic sense as the golden rule. It is a fine rule ethically; but speaking quite coldly, it is a good rule in economics too. We shall do well, whenever we can to help another nation, because we have to deal with other nations. If we deal with them in the strength of economic health we can get the benefit of that health. If they are not in economic health we get the dis-benefit of their unhealthy condition. If I view the problem in this way that is not to say that I do not view it as a Canadian; it is not to be said that I view it as an Englander, or as a foreigner. Mine is a Canadian approach.

I sometimes think people who are inclined to make charges of un-Canadianism or less than 100 per cent Canadianism against some other people are really troubled by an inferiority complex which is unworthy of them. Sometimes it is called a persecution complex. If they have not such a complex there is danger of their being thought to be thus afflicted. One does not have to go around hunting Englishmen to spit in their faces in order to be a 100 per cent Canadian. That is not necessary at all. I am not denying that there may be a few people in the country who do not always view matters from a Canadian angle. There probably are some who still have a colonial mind but they are very few in number by now.

Mr. POULIOT: Hear, hear.

Mr. MAYBANK: There are a few, but they are hardly worth noticing. One should not even waste the wind that is necessary to say, "Hear, hear", over such people. For example, with respect to any virtue that a person may have, or with respect to any belief that he may have, it is not necessary to be blatant about it. One does not have to be blatant in order to be well-founded in his beliefs. In order to be sure of maintaining one's virtue one does not have to beat his breast about it all the time, and everlastingly point the accusing finger at someone else. It is an entire misconception of virtue in one who feels it necessary to act in that way.

So far as these few colonial people whom I have mentioned are concerned they are really a pathetic people. One should not upbraid them; one should not condemn them or abuse them in any way. They are negligible; they are sick. They are to be pitied; but no person from any part of Canada has any right to judge the generality of English-speaking Canadians by this handful. No person has any right to do that at all.

This credit to Britain is simply for our own welfare and that is the way we ought to look at it. If we extend it we sell goods. If we do not extend it we do not sell goods. Selling goods means selling our work products. If we do not sell goods, we do not sell our work products and that means unemployment. This is a premium on a policy of insurance against unemployment. As a result of this loan we know Britain will spend a certain amount of money in a year. We can take any figure that we like for purposes of illustration. We can think of Britain spending $500 million in a year. That will do for illustration purposes at this moment, although it is quite probable that the purchases will be greater than that. How many hours of labour that will purchase it is hard to say. If the average rate for labour were fixed at $1 an hour it would mean 500 million hours of labour. It might be fair to say that the expenditure would give half a billion hours of work, because we can think of the rate as being fifty cents an hour. However, we have to remember that some of the labour that is bought has already been expended, and is in our country at the present time in the form of machines and other kinds of works. Anybody pursuing the idea of the value of British purchases upon Canadian employment can get much statistical data of interest. Statistical stories over the years tell us that whenever we have had a high level of employment it immediately followed a high level of export trade. Conversely, whenever we had a low level of employment it was consequent on a low level of export trade. For example, we reached the peak of our export volume pre-war in 1928. It was followed in 1929 by the highest level of employment and

the highest level of income. Again in 1932 we had the lowest level of export trade, and it was followed in 1933 by the lowest level of employment and income.

Our export trade is largely British. Our net exports to Britain have been greatest by far in the ten years before the war. We sold to her in that period $1,647 million worth of goods more than we bought. That was the net. Incidentally our dealings with the United States were just the opposite, because we bought a billion dollars worth more than we sold. The excess of exports to the United Kingdom were increasing just before the war. The average in ten pre-war years was $164 million of a net; but in the later years it was averaging $240 million.

The question we have to ask ourselves as Canadians is, do we want the employment that comes from that sort of business? If we do not want that kind of employment, then we should not extend the credit. If we do want that kind of employment we should follow the policy of the sensible merchant, to whom I referred a little while ago and extend the credit.

Let us consider for a moment what happens if $1,000,000 is spent on lumber products, for instance. Let us take as a unit of measurement 1,000 board feet of lumber. In my hand I have a graph which shows the amount of labour involved in the various products coming from a log containing that amount of lumber. Apparently the log itself represents one man's work for one day. In sulphite pulp it represents three days' work or, if it is exported, the measure becomes four days' work. If it is in newsprint it represents three days of labour, but if it is exported that figure becomes four days. If it is in bags or cartons the number shown here is nine days; if those products are exported, it becomes eleven days. So that one can follow upon this graph all the products that may result from the cutting down of a tree in the forest. From this we can get some idea of the exact results from the expenditure of $1,000,000 on lumber. That would represent approximately one million hours. In a 300-day year at eight hours a day a man would work 2,400 hours, so that it would take him 417 years to work enough hours at $1 an hour to use up that $1,000,000 or the same as 417 men for one year.

One can look at the industrial picture in this way, not only with respect to lumbering but with respect to every other industry. We might consider the result of spending such a sum of money in some of our mines, perhaps our copper mines. We might estimate the number of hours that would be required for the extraction and exportation of the copper which would be represented by the expenditure of $1,000,000. Of course, it is not only copper or lumber products that are to be bought; in all probability Britain will buy with these moneys the same sort of things she has bought in the past, when her purchases were very much diversified, and $1,000,000 is only a fraction of what will be spent.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MAYBANK: Mr. Speaker, before the house rose at six o'clock I was giving some figures based upon a certain assumption as to the probable employment given by the expenditure of moneys from this loan by Great Britain in Canada. Varying the assumption somewhat, I have attempted to arrive in another way at an approximation of the employment content of these expenditures, assuming that half the proceeds of the loan will be spent in the purchase of non-agricultural products and not considering the length of time in which those purchases will occur.

In 1944 our national production excluding agriculture and excluding payments to the armed services, was registered at $9,110 million. That production was the result of the work of 3,280,000 people. It will be found that that represents an output of $2,770 per person. If we apply that factor to the expenditure of $625 million, one-half the loan, on non-agricultural goods we find that employment will be given to 200,000 persons for a full year.

As every person must realize, this employment will affect a great variety of people in all walks of life, the lumberjack in British Columbia, the miner in Quebec, the factory worker in Ontario, the dock worker in the maritimes, the manufacturer in Toronto and the wholesaler in Montreal. On the basis of four persons to a family, these expenditures will provide a livelihood for 800,000 people in this country for a full year.

I have said that this might very well be regarded as insurance against unemployment. Conversely, I could have said equally well that it is a subsidy for employment. It is a better sort of subsidy for employment than the subsidies for public works of which we sometimes hear. I am not decrying subsidies for public works when the need arises for them. I hope that never again will relief be necessary, but if it is I hope it will never be given except as payment for work. Public works are necessary at certain times, but a subsidy of this sort is of much greater value

in the creation of employment. This sort of expenditure means a diversification of the types of work created. Public works cannot employ such a wide variety of people as this type of expenditure. I think I can say with confidence that this sort of subsidy is the best subsidy we could have.

When an international loan is viewed in the way of creation of hours of employment I think we are justified in using an expression such as I have used, that it is a subsidy for employment or insurance against unemployment. Whether such expressions are apt or not, surely it is clear that such a loan is based firmly upon considerations of Canadian welfare. Some people may look upon this as aid to Britain. They have slight justification for taking that view.

It is certainly not a benevolence. We may not preen ourselves upon any altruism in the making of this loan. One may be tempted to say that it is just hard-boiled business, although I do not like the use of the expression "hard-boiled" with reference to it. We are not taking advantage of anybody. Undoubtedly the loan will be a great help to Britain, undoubtedly she is desperately in need of it and she wants it badly. We can be very glad that it will be of help. Just the same it does not seem to me that altruism alone is sufficient ground for the Canadian parliament making this loan. If it were not in our own interests I do not think it would be possible for it to be made.

But I want to interject and say that I like to think of our actions as having some element of altruism and a consideration of other people's welfare in them, as well as a marked consideration of business principles. I said somewhat earlier that the doctrine of the golden rule not only is sound ethically, but is good economics as well. I cannot help being reminded that the whole cost of a war is not paid during the years of a war—the costs go on. During the last war I think we gave to the utmost of our capacity, or at least we approached the limit of our capacity to give. But unlike other nations, we do not have to pay a great cost of the war at the conclusion of the war. We are not paying like Great Britain is paying. The cost of a war is to be seen in the condition in which a country is left after the war. Unquestionably Britain has been left much poorer in 1946 than she was in 1939, but we cannot say that about ourselves. We are not poorer to-day than we were in 1939; we are better off.

Forgetting for a moment ordinary business principles, it does seem to me that one might with justice favour this loan merely on the ground of fair play in order that we may continue to bear our own costs of the war. There are countries in the world to which we are indebted in a way that we can never repay. We are bound to think of the disaster that would have fallen upon us had Britain succumbed, a disaster from which none of us and none of our children would ever have recovered. We cannot say quite the same about certain other nations, but we are indebted to other nations such as, for example, Greece. I do not wish to make comparisons or to compile a list of those countries to which we are indebted, but there are many countries to which we owe much for the way in which they fought to avert the fate which would otherwise have overtaken the world. It is but fair when considering a measure of this sort to remember that these people are still paying the cost of the war, Great Britain probably in greater measure than any other, and they are all much worse off than they were in 1939. We are not in that position; we are better off. Therefore, while we should look at this loan as a business proposition, we should not overlook these other factors.

Not only is this loan in our own interests as a subsidy to employment; but we should remember that finally it will be paid not by us, but by Britain, so that the end result will be the subsidizing of employment in this country, not by Canadian dollars, for the subsidy will eventually be paid in pounds, shillings and pence.

There is one other thought which gives me a good deal of pleasure, and I wonder if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) may think it is a malicious pleasure. At any rate, may I say that Britain's manner of paying back this loan will be by supplying us with goods. That is the only way in which she can pay it back over the next fifty odd years. She will send us goods and some part of the price of those goods will go into her repayment fund. We have always maintained tariffs and other restrictions against British goods and, generally, they were too high. To permit her to pay us back in goods we cannot allow these impediments to continue. We shall have to make it possible for Britain to repay the loan, and so it comes about that all the sound arguments of the past against trade impediments get a strong reinforcement in the fact that we have to allow Britain to repay her debt to us. The logic of our trade position, and the logic of our position as a creditor nation now combine to make British importations easier. This is an aspect of the matter that we should not overlook. It is an aspect of the matter that, as I say, is pleasing to me,

because I have always been a rebel against restrictions of the sort I have mentioned, and maybe if I live long enough the day will come, as it does with lots of rebels, when they are not called rebels any longer but patriots; for, as hon. members know, when the battle is won a rebel is always a patriot. Such may be the attitude some day toward those of us who have constantly fought against trade impediments. It may come about that all others some day will have the same point of view and that these impediments will in large measure be wiped out in order that we may get our due in the way of interest and principal in the repayment of this loan.

Mr. WILLIAM BRYCE (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill because I have seen the people who are going to get this money. I cannot discuss this loan in the same manner as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) or the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) because I have not had the financial training to be able to do so. But looking at this loan from the point of view of an ordinary layman, if it will create work and wages in a country where there are so many idle people, I say that that is one good reason why we should support it.

During the last two debates in this house we have heard a lot of people talking about Canadians and Canadianism. I came here twenty-eight years ago and have tried to be a good Canadian ever since I came here. But still everybody says I am a Scotsman. That may be so. But do not ever think I am not a Canadian. I am a Canadian, and I want to be a good Canadian. I may be right down at the foot of the ladder, but I am going to be the best Canadian that ever was. We talk about building a better world. Well, here is our golden opportunity to show that we really mean what we say, by helping our fellow men and our sister women in those lands across the sea which have suffered so much that we might continue to live in a democracy. I was over there; I have seen the conditions, and they have taken an awful trimming. I am sorry that some ministers on the other side of the house have not taken the time to tell this parliament of the actual conditions over there. Anything we can do for the French or the English or the Scotch people over there will not be nearly enough.

Mr. GRANT: What about the Irish?

Mr. BRYCE: They can generally look after themselves. I did not rise to take up time but simply to make this earnest appeal to hon. members of this house on behalf of those countries and those men and women who fought that we might live here. They did a great job. Their factories have been destroyed; their houses have been destroyed; their flesh and blood have been destroyed, and yet we grudge giving them this money! What is money compared with life? Look at what they have suffered for us. I support this bill wholeheartedly, and I hope that every man in this house will support it wholeheartedly because this loan is really needed over there.

(Translation):

Mr. PIERRE GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time that I rise to take part in a discussion in connection with a gift or a loan of a billion dollars to England. Unlike the two hon. members who have just spoken, I have no intention to make a dissertation on Canadianism. I prefer to give expression to my Canadianism through action rather than words. It is based on my confidence in my country's potentialities in natural, human and intellectual resources. Every time I had an opportunity to express it, I did it, as often as possible, through action. Experience has shown that deeds are much more valuable than words.

As I lay no claim on being a financial expert, I intend, after frankly stating what I believe to be perhaps elementary truths, and I shall nevertheless state them, to stand on a very special ground in order to justify the attitude I am now taking. I consider this matter of a billion dollars loan to England from a point of view probably altogether different from the standpoint of the hon. members who spoke before me. I must first state that although I have unlimited faith in the human and intellectual resources of my country, I believe we must be guided by this principle, which is very dear to me as well as to a large number of Canadians. "Charity begins at home." When I say Canadians, I mean members of every racial group in Canada and not only French or English Canadians. When I use that expression, I mean all those who believe that Canada may one day become a sovereign state, enjoying complete autonomy; a really sovereign state, not autonomy on paper only, but one that has proven by the achievements of its public men, that even if our country is not entirely self-sufficient—since absolute national self-sufficiency is unattainable, as proven by the collapse of Hitler's regime—that it is absolutely free to act as it pleases in all internal administrative matters. I cannot venture to say as much in relation to trading with other nations, whatever they may be, for, as I said before, absolute national self-sufficiency is unattainable and no nation can be sufficient unto itself.

To-night I shall discharge a responsibility which I have been forced to assume on another occasion, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will not call me to order even if I spend a few minutes in recalling a rather stormy period which, however, has now spent itself. I wish to revert, to-night, to a day in 1940 when, in this house, we were discussing a measure known as the National Resources Mobilization Act. On that occasion, I very naively requested the house to grant me twenty-four hours for the purpose of consulting a few leaders in my constituency so as to be in a position to give an opinion on a matter which had not come up during the election campaign that had just ended. I would not go so far as to say that my request was considered ridiculous, but, nevertheless, I have noticed that many hon. members were then smiling—

Mr. POULIOT: It was a smile of approbation.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Not altogether. In some cases, yes; in others, it was a condescending smile. I remember that, the day after, I had to assume my own responsibilities. I also recall that, a few days ago, when we were discussing changing the name of Dominion day to that of Canada day, a delay was asked. Public opinion had to be canvassed to a certain extent. I was not of that opinion because I had not forgotten that, on a similar occasion, I had to discharge my own responsibilities, and, of course, I have been elected to this house for that very purpose.

I would not say that experience incites me to take a positive stand on the question of the billion dollar loan. No; my attitude is due to the fact that, after the general election of June, 1945, I came here with a very clear mandate. After having spent two years in the opposition, I returned to the Liberal fold at the request of my electors, but only after I had made my position clear. "You ask me, in this campaign, to support the present leader of the Liberal party," I told them, "and your wish will be much more explicit if you give me a clear majority over all my opponents." They gave me a clear majority over the other two candidates, and therefore, I am here to support the leader of the Liberal party and his policy. However, on nomination day, I had also stated: "Since it is your wish, I shall go to Ottawa to support the leader of the Liberal party, but I intend to keep on defending the ideas which I have heretofore upheld and which I shall uphold for a long time to come, while attempting to have them accepted by the organized party." To-night again I speak in order to fulfil once more the pledge I have given the electors of Portneuf. Just the same, I shall not resume my seat without having stated some of the truths to which I referred in my opening remarks.

We are asked to grant a loan of $1,250,000,000 at a very low rate of interest; in fact, too low to suit me. If Canada is to act as a prop not only for the United Kingdom, but for the British empire, it should be allowed some guarantees, as follows: It should be able to count on trade relations, based on fairness and cooperation; it must count on trade with the United Kingdom and the rest of the empire, trade relations that are frank and straightforward. Now let me at once give my reasons for that statement. One day, while looking over the report of a British empire exhibition, I noted that Canada had entered some samples of very fine honey, the world's best no doubt, which however had been labelled "a British empire product" instead of "Canadian honey." Moreover, while chatting recently with a returned man, I was told that he had always had much trouble in finding the Canadian brand, that is the Canadian "stamp" on goods sent abroad from this country during the war. While I am prepared to support this bill, I want to make it plain to the United Kingdom that we shall expect a fair and open-handed treatment; that when our goods are sent over with the label "Canada," they shall still carry that label overseas. We don't want those goods to be re-exported to other countries under any other name, whether they be branded "products of the empire" or otherwise, as we feel entitled to ask whomever we are helping to grant us the cooperation that is our due.

I now repeat what I have previously said in this house, Mr. Speaker, about imperialism, that without the empire, the United Kingdom cannot survive. It is a fact, on account of the many raw materials which the United Kingdom must seek in Canada. It is a point on which I lay special stress inasmuch as we have been shown that in making this billion and a quarter available to Great Britain, she will be in a position, with Canadian dollars, to purchase our raw materials and to manufacture chiefly in order to rebuild the United Kingdom trade throughout the world.

I am not afraid of using blunt words, and I purposely say "to rebuild the United Kingdom's trade throughout the world". I know by experience that products from the United Kingdom are now on our market while our own supply of some goods is still so short that they cannot be put on the market, biscuits, for instance.

Mr. POULIOT: You could mention scones as an example.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said that I would discuss this matter from a different angle, not because I fear to deal with it from a financial standpoint, although I do not believe I am qualified to discuss this question from a strictly financial angle. Some have said in this house that the British empire had to be maintained at this time. Such a statement has come not only from members who endorse the loan to England but also from others who oppose it to a certain extent. I think they are right, in view of the international situation in Europe today; England, Ireland, Portugal and Spain stand against Russian imperialism. There is a strong communist element in France. Besides, Hungary, Bulgaria, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and the part of Germany that is occupied by the Russians have groups that are considerable and quite strong from the standpoint of communism.

You would say, no doubt, at least some would, that going into this aspect of the question is dangerous. I do not think so. Following the close of the war, we have witnessed the rise of a third imperialistic set-up, possibly more powerful than the other two; in other words, Russian or, I would rather say, Slav imperialism, induces us, at a great cost, to contribute to the maintenance of the British empire, at the present time. I claim that were the British empire to fall, were the nations of the commonwealth to go their separate ways, the American empire would be left alone to face this European and more particularly Asiatic power. I do not think we have the right to run the risk of giving these two empires the opportunity of coming to grips, first in the economic field and eventually in the military field. It behooves us rather to assume our respective responsibilities and endeavour to stabilize the international situation.

I have often given proofs, Mr. Speaker, that I am not an imperialist and that I will never be; I have also demonstrated that I do not flinch at stating hard truths. That is what I have done to-night; I again give expression to my opposition to any tendency originating in Canada, no matter what racial group may be its promoters, to allow the interests of an empire, British or other, to supersede purely Canadian interests.

It is all very well to state that imperialism exists only since the last war, that the British empire might be threatened and that its destruction might be detrimental to the American empire, but we require some proof that will bring out the mentality of those whose extraordinary power is alarming not only for the Anglo-Saxon coalition, as it has been called, but also for the Latin countries.

I shall quote from a book by Henri Massis, a member of the French Academy, to show, Mr. Speaker, that the Slavonic empire is no myth and that it has been wielding its power for quite a long time. Listen to what Lenin had to say:

> It is but a matter of expediency, said Lenin, a few months before the October revolution. I am a pacifist if I can thus injure the capitalist states.

We are the capitalists.

> But if I should come to power in Russia, then I shall be anything but a pacifist. Under a bolshevist regime, we, as Russian patriots, will not hesitate to take up arms against our neighbours should it be necessary in the interest of our country and the revolution! Let us not forget that war is queen of the universe.

Listen now to another communist, Tiochev, who proferred the following words when speaking of the philosophical and historical antagonism between Russia and Europe, I quote:

> Between her and ourselves there can be no negotiations, no armistice. The life of one is the death of the other.

That is clear. Let us listen now to another bolshevist theorist, Zinoviev, whom I have already quoted in this house. Speaking at the Baku Congress in 1920, he said:

> Russia extends her hand to Asia not because she adopts her ideals, not because she shares her social ideas, but because she needs the eight hundred million people of Asia to crush European imperialism and capitalism.

And Lenin had said before him:

> Let us turn towards Asia, we shall vanquish the West with the help of the East.

American experts who went to Russia admitted that the productive capacity of the U.S.S.R. already greatly exceeded that of the best equipped countries of Europe, and that Russia's iron, manganese and even oil production was equal to that of the largest producers of the whole world.

Now let us listen to another bolshevist theorist, Dostoevski, who said:

> Russia's destiny is pan-European. To be real Russians we must stand upon the meeting grounds of all the European enmities.

And Soloviev added:

> Our intellectual and civilizing forces leave much to be desired, whereas our political strength is quite definite, absolutely firm and tremendous.

Let us heed this, Mr. Speaker. This is exactly what has just taken place in Iran.

They had foreseen this move, they had prepared for it. It was their normal march towards the conquest of Asia and Europe.

I quote:

We must destroy Turkey, crush Austria, overwhelm Germany, take Constantinople and, if possible, India.

Imperialism is the thing we have to overcome. In taking my stand to-night in favour of a billion and a quarter loan to Great Britain, I take the view that we cannot afford to risk leaving American imperialism alone to face slavonic imperialism. In 1930, the French ambassador, speaking in Moscow, was saying:

As at the time of religious wars, it is a propaganda which challenges reason and which, from this very fact, derives its variety and its strength.

And he gave instances. Again I quote:

In Germany, it speculates upon the desire for revenge and in France upon the need for peace. It contends against the white race among the blacks of Africa and of the United States, but champions the European outlook among the Mohammedans of central Asia. In Palestine, it has just taken on an Arabian character by declaring itself antisemitic.

Let me now quote Lenin, founder of bolshevism, and father of the revolution of 1917:

Never mind! The wood is being split; let the chips fly. Even if ten million human bodies were required to build up communism, there would still remain enough to people our land.

Such were the words of the leader of communism. As for Stalin, when he was being reproached with spreading sufferings in order forcibly to industrialize Russia, he replied:

We are sometimes asked if we could not slow down the pace, and check our progess. No, the pace cannot be slowed down; on the contrary, it must be speeded up. Compared to progressive countries, we are fifty to a hundred years behind; and we have only ten years to fill the gap. Either we shall succeed, or we shall be crushed.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, they are firmly determined to keep on the march, a march which started not only with the appearance of bolshevism in Russia, through the revolution of 1917, but a march that was going on at the time of the czars. Czarism has merely taken on another name; to-day it is known as bolshevism. An so, as ever, panslavism marches on.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but are not his remarks on communism a bit too lengthy and his views on the measure before the house too brief?

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): But, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The bill under review has to do with a loan to Great Britain.

[Mr. P. Gauthier.]

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): I was merely proving my statement and pointing out the reason why I endorse the loan to England. Now, if I am not in order, I shall simply resume my seat. However. I believe I owe it to the house to prove what I state and to justify my stand. That is why you find my remarks somewhat protracted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to interrupt the honourable member, but he will admit that a well known rule of this house provides that on the second reading of a bill the discussion must bear only on the principle of the measure. I understand what the honourable member wishes to prove, but I wonder whether I should let him continue to quote many more pages to explain what are the views of the communist party now that we are considering a bill providing for an agreement between the Canadian and the British governments in connection with a loan. Concerning the hon. member for Portneuf I am compelled to take a stand similar to the one I took with respect to other hon. members, when the second reading of other bills was before the house, and I deem it my duty to do so as far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I do not remember what stand you took on other matters, but I shall refrain from discussing that point. However, I believe that a financial principle is involved in this loan to England if, as we have been told, the object is to make work available for our people, for those who produce, and to increase or at least preserve our trade with the British empire.

I believe that there is another principle at stake in this loan; those who do not completely share the bankers' views on this question, even though they may not consider the financial side of the matter, have a right to examine it from the no less important point of view of the ideas and the moral danger involved for the other nations of the commonwealth to which we belong.

Mr. POULIOT: This is high metaphysics.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Possibly. If I must resume my seat, Mr. Speaker, I think that I have said enough to make it known to you and to the house that I am in favour of the loan to England for the reasons I have given, but I repeat...

Some MEMBERS: Continue.

Mr. POULIOT: Continue.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): But I repeat that we have the right to warn the United Kingdom that in return for the sacrifices we

are making to help it survive, we expect cooperation and candour in our commercial relations.

Mr. MICHAUD: Quite right!

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): I am sorry I cannot make my point, Mr. Speaker, but I abide by your decision and resume my seat, though I may perhaps expound my thesis again some other time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not wish the hon. member to think for one moment that I will not allow him to prove the argument he has put forth in the house, but may I say this to him: it is one thing to quote a few pages, one or two for instance, from a work to build up his case; but it is quite another matter to prove one's point by reading to the house quotations from a book on communism in support of his statements. The hon. member is giving to the house the impression that the debate centres on communist policy, a matter which is not under discussion at present, rather than on the bill now before the house.

The hon. member may go on developing arguments without taking up the time of the house by reading a book on communism.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if we agree—

Mr. GAGNON: It does not seem so.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Portneuf): —if we consider the question from the same angle; but I claim that, to prove that Pan-slavism is dangerous, it must first be demonstrated that it exists. Furthermore, if I approve the loan because I feel that we must help the United Kingdom to stabilize the world economy, I must also prove that these people are aiming at universal supremacy. Now, and I do not want to abuse the kindness of the house, and I hope I have said enough to show that these friends of the Slavs are aiming at universal supremacy. Although they have been our allies during the war, they have given away their play and they still are doing it, not only by words but also by deeds.

If any further proof of my claim is expected as to Pan-slavism having been active since the time of the czars, we have but to open the 1945 soviet calendar. It contains two pictures, one of Peter the Great and the other of Catherine of Russia. Now, Peter the Great advocated the same doctrine as the bolshevists are now propounding, namely the necessity of promoting Pan-slavism in Europe.

In conclusion, I may add that if I support the loan to England it is because I am confident that the government will compel those with whom we will trade, either the United Kingdom or other countries, to whom we make loans at a very low interest rate, to respect the word "Canada" so that the goods that we will ship to them are not disguised but will remain Canadian goods overseas, even if they are re-exported from the United Kingdom to be sold and consumed in other countries.

Mr. MAXIME RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, we are asked to approve an agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom, under which we would make both a direct gift and an indirect gift, the latter in the form of an interest-free loan. The Right Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) and others have told us that this was a straight business transaction which, to be fully appreciated, must be studied in the light of our future economic interests, as was done in the United States. I intend looking into the matter from that angle, taking into account all facts, past and present.

The bill calls for an outright gift of $425 million to the United Kingdom. Not much was said, during the last two days, of this outright gift to Great Britain, as hon. members spoke mostly of the interest-free loan, which is really an indirect gift. But we should particularly bring out in their true light the gifts to be made under the agreement reached between Canada and Great Britain. We are giving $425 million to a country that can afford to grant profitable loans to others. At the same time, we settle for $150 million a debt the exact amount of which we do not know, but we have reason to believe that it is much more than $150 million, so that I do not exaggerate when I say that the outright gift to Great Britain represents much more than these $425 millions.

Can anyone seriously suggest that this will be a profitable business transaction? That amount will only be added to the billions we have already given. First, we made an outright gift of one billion; then, we gave a billion and a half by way of mutual aid, which was really a gift in disguise and was finally recognized as such. It is interesting to know how that money was used, because it came out of the pockets of people who are already very heavily taxed. I have before me a clipping taken from the *Star* of November 27, 1942. I quote:

(Text):

Australians take a shot at Canada and also at Britain for Canada's $1,000,000,000 gift to Britain and how the fund is handled in London.

Canada put up the money to enable Britain to continue to buy Canadian products but, in effect, Britain lends part of it to the other dominions and asks repayment in sterling.

(Translation):

So that the money given to Great Britain was used to do business with Australia; the goods sent to Great Britain were sold to Australia and paid for in sterling.

Now then, what will be achieved by this new gift to Britain? She will lend money to other countries at a fairly high rate of interest. Allow me to quote from the New York *Times* a few lines reporting a member's question in the British House of Commons, on the subject of a proposed loan to Greece:

(Text):

D. L. Lipson, independent, said it was unfortunate the loan should be made when Britain herself was seeking a loan from the United States, because opponents of the loan to Britain may pick on that as a sign we have money to spare.

(Translation):

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have always been and I am more than ever opposed to making gifts to a country which uses them to extend interest-bearing loans to other countries, as is the case here. Great Britain has also offered a fairly substantial loan to Russia. I read in *Le Canada* of March 9 last, that Great Britain had offered to lend 30 million pounds, that is $133,500,000 at 2½ per cent interest to Russia while we were making gifts to her and extending to her a loan free of interest. Well, if the object were to help starving countries, I would agree. It would then be a matter of humanity. In the past we have supplied Great Britain with considerable quantities of foodstuffs, although she was not the only nation to suffer from hunger. On the contrary, she suffered less than other nations. In this connection, may I be permitted to quote an excerpt from a speech delivered by Mr. Attlee on February 27 last, with respect to consumption in England:

(Text):

There is a better distribution to-day than there was in 1938. The poorest people in pre-war unemployment areas are certainly consuming more than they did in 1938.

(Translation):

According to the New York *Times* of last April 6, Mr. Hoover, former president of the United States, who has just toured Europe to size up the food situation in the various countries which are at present suffering from a want of food, is reported to have said:

(Text):

The former president spoke at a press conference of the current efforts of the American people to supply additional bread grains to the hungry peoples of Europe and Asia. He also firmly but definitely told the British people that though their record of subsisting under difficult conditions during the war was good, their food position was not too bad.

"Your health statistics," he said, "do not support the conclusion that Britain is suffering from famine."

He refused to place Britain among the "hungry countries." He also pointed out that the United States' per capita consumption of wheat was lower than the British consumption by nearly one-third—

(Translation):

Let us give to the needy. Since charity begins at home, let us first look after our own and then think of the most unfortunate, since our motive is humanitarian.

I have with me statistics tabled in the house during the last session which show that nearly all the foodstuffs we exported since last June 1 were shipped to Great Britain: wheat, salmon, fish, flour, bacon, cheese were all sent under mutual aid, that is, as a gift. I will say no more on this matter. I maintain, however, that when the people of our country endure hardships and are rationed, and when some are even without a roof, we should think of our own before handing out presents to others.

With respect to the loan, why such a difference between the terms arrived at with Great Britain and the far more exacting conditions imposed by Canada on other countries before granting them an advance? The Right Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) listed these loans and I noticed that the interest exacted on loans to Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, France, the Netherlands, the Dutch East Indies, Norway and Russia varied from 2 per cent to 3 per cent and a little over.

Further, refunds are set to begin in 1947. If, as we are told, this is simply a business proposition designed to export our products and keep our workers employed, are France, Belgium, Norway and the other countries not presenting the same advantages as England? Is it not in our interest to lend them money on equally favourable terms? Let us, as some suggest, put aside all sentiment and look into this bill purely from the business angle, but comparing the terms imposed on other countries with the conditions enjoyed by Great Britain I cannot bring myself to believe that economic consideration rather than sentimental considerations prompted the loan to Great Britain.

The Right Hon. Minister of Finance has stated that the loan granted by Canada to Great Britain was on the same basis as that subscribed by the United States to the United Kingdom. The agreement negotiated between Canada and the United Kingdom and the one arrived at between the United States and the United Kingdom display striking differences.

If we compare our national revenue to that of the United States, our neighbours should have lent six times more than Canada because their national income is six times larger

than ours. As the Americans are reputed to be far-seeing businessmen, they would surely have lent more if they had looked upon it as a profitable venture. Then, section 6 contains a provision which we do not find in the American agreement, which reads as follows:

Section 6 of the American agreement contains the following provision:

It is agreed that the United Kingdom will use other funds than the credit now granted in order to meet her obligations outstanding in other countries on the date on which this agreement becomes effective.

This means that the United Kingdom will not have the right to use those funds except for purchasing goods from the United States. Such is not the case with the agreement concluded between Canada and the United Kingdom, for section 2 of the financial agreement entered into between Canada and the United Kingdom provides:

Purpose of the Credit. The purpose of the credit is to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services in Canada and to assist in making it possible for the United Kingdom to meet transitional post-war deficits in its current balance of payments, to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars and to assume the obligations of multilateral trade.

Nowhere is it stipulated that the United Kingdom agrees to use the proceeds of the loan for the purchase of Canadian goods. Nowhere is this stipulated, whereas the agreement concluded between the United Kingdom and the United States included the special provision that I have quoted.

On March 5, 1946, the Secretary of the Treasury made the following statement in the American senate:

(Text):

The loan was in exchange of American dollars for empire trade preferences.

(Translation):

This means that the United States will enter into negotiations with the United Kingdom in order to obtain certain imperial preferences, and, as it happened in the past, they will be granted at our expense.

We are told that the purpose of the loan is to assist in marketing our products and provide employment for our workers. For the present, this contention does not hold water. We do not produce sufficiently to satisfy the local demand. Rationing had to be resorted to because we do not produce sufficiently to meet the local consumption and at the same time ship foodstuffs and other goods overseas. So it was not necessary to make a gift to England nor to grant her an interest-free loan to stimulate Canadian export trade. Furthermore, the part we ship to England could be sold to other friendly countries, as the minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) stated last January. I quote a dispatch from London, as reported in the *Gazette* of January 16 last:

Stating that Canada had the firm intention of strongly relying on the economic future of Great Britain, Mr. James MacKinnon, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, said today, in London, that "Canada is now selling here, at less than world prices and on credit, large quantities of wheat, in spite of the heavy demand for this same product on the part of Latin American countries, who settle their accounts on a cash basis in dollars.

When local markets are not fully supplied, there is no need for exports at the present time, we have shortages in building materials, domestic articles, etc.

Our people are without shelter and clothing, food is rationed and there are scarcities of all kinds of goods. Could it be that the purchasing power is insufficient? No. But we export these things to foreign countries. By this bill we reduce our purchasing power. We lend money to England, without interest, so that she may buy the things we could use. Our best market is still the local market, why not supply it adequately?

How does Great Britain intend to use this loan? According to the *Financial Post* of March 16, 1946, here is how Great Britain intends to utilize it:

(Text):

The British came to Ottawa February 4, seeking an interest-free loan of $1·25 billions and cancellation of an additional $1·1 billions of outstanding war claims and indebtedness. They based their case on "economic and financial necessity."

As reported elsewhere in this edition, the British have set aside an estimated $30 millions as the amount they will spend in Canada during the next twelve months on "manufactured goods" . . . against $115 to $130 millions of recorded exports of fully manufactured goods from Canada in pre-war years.

(Translation):

The Right Hon. Minister of Justice claims that the loan to England will have the effect of keeping our industry active and ensure work to our people, he is contradicted by the declaration I have just quoted. According to that statement from those who have come here to negotiate the loan, a sum of 30 million dollars only will be used for the importation of manufactured goods, whereas before the war our exports of those goods from Canada represented from 115 to 130 million dollars. Surely it is not by exporting 30 million dollars forth of manufactured goods to England that we are going to ensure work for our people, and prevent unemployment, as is claimed. Our exports will consist mainly of foodstuffs and raw materials, but only of a small quantity of manufactured goods.

I wish to quote the other figures of the *Financial Post*:

(Text):

Manufactured goods, $30 million; foodstuffs, $600 million; raw materials, lumber, $200 million; freight and transport, $170 million.

(Translation):

Those figures cover the greatest part of the loan. So that the myth which is now being created, namely that the interest-free loan extended to England is likely to secure jobs for our workers and to prevent unemployment is wholly groundless. This loan will merely allow England further to develop her trade in the whole world, to recover the markets she lost during the war and insure her trade supremacy as before.

I wish to call the attention of the house to the opinion of an American economist on the matter of loans, such as the one the government is at present contemplating. Here is an excerpt from the New York *Times* of March 18, 1946.

(Text):

Some Consequences of Foreign Loans

. . . a great deal of confusion exists even regarding the motives for which these loans are being made. At one moment they are presented as a form of international relief supplementary to UNRRA, and at the next as a hardheaded business transaction designed primarily to increase our own exports. In so far as we make such loans for this second reason, we are in danger of several forms of self-deception.

To the extent to which foreign loans are not repaid they represent a clear national loss to us. We are simply giving goods away without return . . .

But even many foreign loans that would be fully repaid are not wise under present conditions. We are in the midst of an inflationary boom which even OPA rulings and unparalleled strikes have been unable to stop. Our aim should be to halt inflation, not to increase it. Yet increased export trade financed by governmental loans is clearly inflationary. It means directly or indirectly the issuance of new monetary means of payment for American goods; it means that the shortage of goods in America will be increased by the amount shipped abroad (or more strictly speaking, by the excess of exports) . . .

It would be interesting to know just what goods there are in such surplus supply here that foreign markets have to be artificially stimulated to absorb them. . .

It is just as much an error to stimulate foreign trade artificially as to restrict it artificially. If our export industries are expanded unduly by foreign loans, they will either have to be supported by continuous foreign loans or eventually cut down again, with disrupting readjustments in our structure of production . . .

But the volume of exports by itself is irrelevant to employment. If it is offset by an equal voulme of imports, as much American employment is "lost" by the imports as is "gained" by the exports. A continuous excess of exports, on the other hand (with "invisible items" considered), would mean merely that we were giving our goods away.

[Mr. M. Raymond.]

(Translation):

And this, to my mind, is the situation at the present time. As for the future, we may be sure that England, as is her right, shall be guided by her interests. And I do not blame her. But past experience has shown that it is so, and the fact is confirmed by certain statements of British representatives who have been entrusted with the task of negotiating these financial agreements with Canada.

To sum up, what happened before the war? In 1932, Canada entered into trade agreements with the United Kingdom at the time of the imperial economic conference held in Ottawa. In Canada, the depression and unemployment were at their height. What did England do? She bought huge quantities of Russian pulpwood, at the prejudice of Canadian industry; in 1939, British importers bought nearly ten million dollars worth of canned salmon in Japan instead of buying it in Canada; in 1938, Canadian wheat had a preference of six cents per bushel on the London market. In order to comply with the requirements of Anglo-American trade, we were asked to relinquish that preference.

In 1939, England bought 200,000 tons of wheat from Roumania and other foreign countries, at a time when our store-houses were overflowing with wheat and when our wheat was selling at ridiculous prices. What reason would we have to expect that England would to-day disregard her own interests for the benefit of Canada? Please note that I am not blaming England for looking after herself in the first place. It is a logical and natural process. But I would like to see Canada protect her own interests also.

Let us consider the present situation. Allow me to read from the *Financial Post* of January 6, 1945, a statement made by Lord Keynes during his visit to Canada:

(Text):

When Lord Keynes and other British officials were here recently, they made it clear that United Kingdom is quite prepared to take a very tough attitude toward future relations with "hard" or dollar currency countries like Canada.

Britain said in effect: "Beyond what assistance you give us under free gift or mutual aid, we are determined, in future, to stand on our own commercial feet. We will deny ourselves Canadian goods rather than go into debt or take your surplus products on credit."

(Translation):

England is now establishing trade relations with every European country. I do not find fault with that; she is right in looking after her interests. But when after three years the loan has become exhausted, if it suits her better to buy her bacon from Denmark, she will do so; if it suits her better to get in Sweden the minerals that she needs, she will

get them from Sweden; if it suits her better to import her pulpwood from Norway or Finland, she will buy them in Norway or Finland and will not care for Canada.

In December, 1944, I believe England had a contract with the Noranda company whereby she was to buy the whole of its production of copper. What happened? England notified the company that she was cancelling the contract. The directors of Noranda went to England in an endeavour to maintain that agreement but without success. The contract was cancelled because it suited Great Britain better to purchase her copper from Rhodesia. Again, I do not blame her; she was merely looking after her own interests.

To-day Great Britain's main concern is to increase her export trade. On February 27, 1946, Mr. Attlee, speaking in the British House of Commons, stated:

(Text):

We have to create an export trade on a greater scale than ever before.

(Translation):

What are the goods which England is going to export? They are goods which some day will compete with our own. Let us remember that, since the war, Canada has become an industrialized nation, an exporter of manufactured goods. To-day we are manufacturing goods which England also produces; in order to be able to export our goods to England we shall have to buy from her. How shall we be able to do so without harming our industries and depriving our workers of employment?

At the beginning of the war our debt hardly reached three billion dollars; it will soon amount to 16 billion dollars. Can we afford to make such considerable gifts? Can we afford to make interest-free loans, out of money which will have to come from the pockets of Canadian taxpayers, who already have a heavy burden to carry, especially when it comes to lending funds to a country which is able to loan? Why borrow when one is in a position to lend? Here we have Britain lending to Greece, and ready to lend to Russia, as well as to many other countries, in order to restore her foreign trade.

Shall we deprive our people of opportunities, jeopardize our economic reconstruction so that another country may develop even stronger trade relations than before the war and thus become our competitor? We were not elected to deprive our country of such capital as is needed for its economic and financial development and to insure the welfare of our people.

Our farmers would gladly accept interest-free loans for the development of their enterprises; however, at the present time, they cannot borrow from the farm loan board at less than 4½ or 5 per cent. Our workingmen would also be glad to borrow without interest, for the construction of decent houses; but on all such loans from the government, interest must be paid at the rate of 4½ per cent. We are not in a position to increase old age pensions; but we can afford gifts to England.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but he has already gone beyond the forty minutes he is allowed.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I am not in the habit of taking up too much time in the house, so perhaps I might be granted a few more minutes—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carry on.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Instead of giving away our money or lending it without interest, let us develop our natural resources, our oil fields, our coal mines and so on. Let us build houses for our people and enhance the beauty of our country.

Before the war, we lacked funds to spend on public works, but we found billions of dollars for destruction. We keep on lending and giving millions to foreigners while depriving the provinces of revenue so sorely needed for social security.

Before resuming my seat, I wish to quote from a statement made by the Right Hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on March 30, 1938. Those words hold as much truth to-day as they did at that time. Here is what he said:

It is said that Canada's powers are not unlimited and that we are not in a position to sustain indefinitely a great effort. We have a tremendous task to accomplish in our own country; we must build houses for Canadians: care for the aged and the crippled; alleviate the distress caused by unemployment and drought; build highways; shoulder the responsibilities of an enormous national debt—

Our national debt had not even reached three billion dollars.

—prepare for the defence of Canada and raise our standard of living and of civilization in keeping with our present knowledge. Our own resources will hardly suffice; so that we shall have to choose to a certain extent between looking after our own affairs and trying to save Europe and Asia.

(Text):

Mr. GORDON B. ISNOR (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that, apart from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), no private member representing a constituency in the maritime provinces has taken part in this debate, I felt that I should briefly express the views which are held in that part of Canada. I certainly consider I can speak for Nova Scotia and say that the

people of that province, as well as, I believe, the people of the maritimes generally, together with the great majority of the Canadian people, approve this measure.

I was particularly interested in the definite, plain and comprehensive explanation given by the Minister of Finance when he introduced the resolution. I was also impressed, from a business point of view, with the manner in which the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) presented his views. With the financial background that he has, he was able to sum up the benefits of the agreement in a way which would, I believe, appeal to anyone at all interested in business or who has followed a business career. I was indeed pleased, therefore, to find so high an authority definitely placing himself on record as approving the agreement.

It must have been gratifying to the Minister of Finance, who introduced the resolution, to know that he had the support of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, of the members of the C.C.F., of the Social Credit party and of the great majority of the members sitting on the government side. It is true that there is a very small representation from one particular quarter of the dominion who apparently are opposed to the measure. From a business point of view, I do not understand why any hon. member should take such an attitude. This measure will bring about what we are all working for, greater employment, greater production and a market for a large amount of our goods. When one considers that we are just following along the course that a good businessman would take if placed in a similar position it is difficult to understand how any hon. member could oppose this bill. We are dealing with Great Britain which has been one of our outstanding customers over a long period of years. Manufacturers to-day and for years have had to face a similar situation in so far as jobbers and wholesalers are concerned. Jobbers and wholesalers have had to deal with retailers in the same way. It is not uncommon for a wholesaler or a manufacturer to find himself in a situation at some time or another during his business career where he needs financial assistance. After a long period of years a manufacturer is able to size up the situation and extend credit over a long period or, if necessary, advance cash in order to put his customer in a position to continue to be a good customer and thus help the employees in that particular manufacturing concern.

I look upon this agreement in very much the same light. As I see it, it is a good business arrangement for both the buyer and the seller. From a sense of loyalty Canada should do what the finance minister proposes. From the point of view of common decency, which has already been mentioned by one hon. member, there is no other course left open for Canada than to grant this credit.

I shall now deal with the export business of Canada. Other hon. members have already mentioned this but I think it will bear repeating. In 1938 our export business amounted to $837 million. In 1939 there was an increase to $924 million. In 1940 there was a further increase to $1,179 million, and in 1941 it amounted to $1,621 million. There was a further increase in 1942 until in 1943 it reached the huge amount of $2,971 million. Of this total the United States took $1,149 million, or 38·7 per cent, and Great Britain took $1,033 million, or 34·8 per cent of the total exports of Canada. Thus it will be seen that the two countries together took a total of 73·5 per cent of our entire export business.

I believe that hon. members and Canada as a whole recognize the fact that we are doing business with one of our largest and best customers. My purpose in rising to take part in this debate was to put these views of mine briefly on the record so that the rest of Canada and the house in particular would know that we in the eastern maritimes approve this measure which I hope will be passed by the house with an overwhelming majority. If we should not do so it would have a bad effect not alone on our own standing in the eyes of the United States but on their decision with respect to the loan that is pending, which I feel sure will have the approval of the people of the United States just as this loan will have the general approval of the citizens of Canada.

Again I come back to the question of production. This measure is bound to create greater production. If it creates greater production, then we must have a market for that production if we are to benefit from it. In our production we are creating a new market or a continuous market for our products. Thus the question of employment enters into the picture in a definite manner because a new market brings about employment. With the employment comes increased spending power, and out of that increased spending power comes a higher standard of living. We are all striving to maintain that high standard of living which we in Canada are so fortunate to enjoy at the present time.

I have briefly outlined the reasons why I support the bill. From an economic point of view I do not see how any hon. member can do other than support this measure. Loans have been made to other countries on

a sound business basis. They have already been placed on the record. A total of $642 million has already been lent. The loan under discussion amounts to $1,250 million at an interest rate of two per cent, payable over a period of fifty-five years. To me it is a sound business proposition, and from the point of view of common decency I do not see how we can do other than give our wholehearted support to it.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, after all the fine speeches that have been delivered in the last two weeks each one of us should be entitled to several honorary degrees of universal learning. International finance also reminds me of children who ask for more cake to finish their jam and more jam to finish their cake. There is no end to it.

We are told that some hon. members have been very generous in admonishing the big powers that this is the last time that they will vote for a measure of this kind; nevertheless, they will vote for it. What does England, Russia, France and China care about any admonition from members of the parliament of Canada when the government of Canada pays no attention to it themselves?

I have a certain fear, and it is this. Although everybody is in earnest at the present time no one can tell that no political party will play politics with it in the future. If I start from your left, Mr. Speaker, I find there are several seats that are now empty, but on the other hand there are seats which are occupied by prominent members of the Progressive Conservative party. I wonder which one of the Conservative members had a power of attorney from the party to replace the leader of the party in expressing the views of the party on this great matter. Was it the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell)? Perhaps. Was it the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church)? Perhaps. Was it the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Case)? Perhaps. Since I have never been in the councils of the Tory party, I cannot say which one it was. However, I am greatly surprised that on this matter, which represents an expenditure of a billion and a quarter and taxation on the Canadian people, the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Bracken), the loyal opposition of His Majesty, has not risen in his place to speak with authority as the leader of a great party. Instead of that, he has gone to Montreal to speak of the kingdom of Canada. When it comes to such a huge expenditure he leaves it to others to express the views of his party. I have great respect for my hon. friend personally, but I cannot understand it.

Mr. BRACKEN: If the hon. member really wishes to know where I stand on this matter, I stated my position very clearly in my address on the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, yes, I appreciate what my hon. friend has said. He read a pastoral letter at the beginning of the session, and it is good for five years. How is it that other hon. members rise to expound the policy of the party? It is because the policy of the Progressive Conservative party is like the two faces of Janus, and their utterances can be read forward and backward. They can be read like those written in Arabic type and those published in Chinese characters; they are read forward and they are read backward. The hon. members who are here are no minor quantity; they are heavyweights of the party. I start with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and in a moment I will tell him why he has not yet spoken on this matter. I challenge him to rise and express a definite view on it. He will not, because the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario said as much against the loan as he said for it, and his conclusion is that he must support it. The plates of the scale were even. It was only his last word that decided that the plate in favour of it should become a little heavier and go down.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I trust that the hon. gentleman will go on and explain what he meant by that. I may be a very stupid man, but I thought I had spent some thirty minutes of the time of my hon. friend and others yesterday in making it very clear—at least I tried to make it very clear—that I was in favour of the loan. So that if the hon. gentleman would be good enough to explain what he meant by that I should be grateful.

Mr. POULIOT: I will explain it in a moment. In the first place I do not call my hon. friend stupid; he calls himself stupid and he is wrong. If his explanation was so clear I was the stupid one not to understand it.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I must interrupt my hon. friend again to say there are none so blind as those who will not see.

Mr. POULIOT: I am not only stupid in the opinion of my hon. friend, I am also blind. The next time I shall be deaf and afterwards I shall have one eye.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dumb.

Mr. POULIOT: Or I shall be dead. But that is not all. There is the hon. member for Queens (Mr. McLure), the nearest to your

left, Mr. Speaker. He has the gift of speech, but he has not said a word. There is the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling), a former minister in Mr. Bennett's cabinet, the only one now in the front row. He has had experience in the cabinet; he is a wise man; he commands the respect of the house. He has not spoken a word. There is my very dear friend the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green).

Mr. GREEN: You talk so much there is no time for anybody else.

Mr. POULIOT: Perhaps so; but if my hon. friend is ready to speak he will have an opportunity later, and his words are always so full of wisdom. He knows that himself; otherwise he would not ask so many questions on the estimates. But he has not said a word. There is my hon. friend the member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol), who surely would have risen if the refusal of this loan had meant any danger to the empire.

Mr. MacNICOL: But I am for the loan.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend is there with his genial smile, but he has not said a word.

Mr. MacNICOL: But I am for the loan.

Mr. POULIOT: That is not enough. You should tell me why, in order to convert me to your views. Then there is the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks), a colonel in the army, a man of experience and an old member. He has not said anything. Mum's the word. There is the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser). He is neither deaf nor dumb. He can express himself with great fluency, but he has not said a word. I say nothing offensive to him; I pay him a tribute, because I like him personally.

Mr. FRASER: May I say a word?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

Mr. FRASER: I am in favour of this loan, and the reason I am in favour of it is that I believe the British government will pay it back. If you look at British *Hansard* for February 19 you will see that at that date they had 8,897,000 people working on export trade. That means they will be able to pay back the loan.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, and it means so many less people in Canada will work. But that is a point of view. I have performed a miracle; I have succeeded in having these hon. gentlemen who have not said a word since the beginning of the debate rise in their places and give what I might call short speeches.

Mr. FRASER: This is the second time the hon. gentleman has spoken. He should give somebody else a chance.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, and this is the second time my hon. friend has spoken, so that I have performed a double miracle.

Mr. FRASER: And you have not said anything yet.

Mr. POULIOT: There is my hon. friend the commander, the member for Trinity (Mr. Skey), who can speak very well also, but the password has been "silence." He has not said a word. There is the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Harkness), a genial gentleman with university training. Not a word. There is the hon. member for High Park (Mr. McMaster), a brilliant lawyer. Not a word. There is the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Bradshaw), a brilliant man. Not a word. I do not want to make any mistakes. There is the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Murphy). Not a word. I see my hon. friend the member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Hazen), who has authority in this house and is respected by all. Not a word. They have abdicated their personalities for this time and have left it to the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario, who is one of the most gifted speakers in the house, to give the pros and cons, to endeavour to interest the whole house and yet not compromise the Progressive Conservative party. Well, now, there is something to-night. After a few months the Conservative party, which is more loyal than the king and queen put together, will say, "We have warned the country about what is going on. There is more and more unemployment; there is more and more dissatisfaction, but we warned the government through our spokesman not to be too quick, to be careful about it." That will be good political propaganda, but since it is unnoticed now by the Liberal party I tell them to watch their step because they are on dangerous ground.

Yesterday I expressed a certain opinion regarding this measure. Not so long ago a doctrine was enunciated in this house which makes one think seriously about the future of this country if such financing goes on any longer. This is what was said:

> I am sure that hon. members can recall the grave international problems and difficulties which arose in the nineteen-twenties and nineteen-thirties from the huge international war debts which had grown up during and immediately following the last great war.

And again:

> International debts, on the other hand, can be settled only by the transfer of goods and services from the debtor country to the creditor country.

Such transfers can be made, only if and to the extent that the creditor country is prepared to accept goods and services from the debtor country for not only principal payments but also annual interest charges. In other words, the creditor country must be prepared to see an increase in its imports or a decrease in its exports, or both.

That is horse sense; that is very well said.

Experience has shown that countries will accept these payments in the form of imports only to a limited extent on balance, if at all. To do so, of course, exposes their producers to more intense competition from abroad, and the excess of imports serves as a deflationary influence which appears to be unwelcome in normal peace times. On the other hand, the inability of debtor nations to make payment when the creditor nation will not readily accept imported goods and services in payment, is bound to lead to international misunderstandings and frictions. Consequently, there is a practical limit to the amount of international debt which can be satisfactorily carried and repaid, particularly when such debt arises from the economically wasteful processes of war. The experiences of the last twenty-five years are too well known for me to labour this point at greater length.

Mr. FRASER: Will the hon. member tell us what he is reading from?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes. In the first place, it is not from a speech given by the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser). It is not from a speech given by any Progressive Conservative member. It is not from a speech given by the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres (Mr. Cardin). It is not from a speech given by the leader of the Bloc Populaire (Mr. Raymond). It is not from a speech given by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe).

Mr. FRASER: Page Temiscouata.

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, no. Those words were uttered on March 18, 1942, and we read them on pages 1420 and 1421 of *Hansard*. Who said it? It was said by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) who was responsible for the commitments made by the Acting Minister of Finance, the then Minister of National Defence, army. Hon. members will find out that what I have said is more prophetic than anything that Keynes has said. Here we are. What is the limit of financing for a country? There are limits for an individual and there must be limits for a country. It was said that there was a limit.

I remember the time when Mr. Bennett was Prime Minister of Canada and he said, "We cannot borrow any more; we have reached our limit; we have only our home markets." At that time there was no rationing. Mr. Bennett was only a child. He was a powerful and rich man but he had not reached the astronomical figures that we have reached to-day. That was said in 1942, four years ago, and it is on record in *Hansard*. It is because of what was said by the Minister of Finance on March 18, 1942, that I am in duty bound to vote against the second reading of this bill. If the Minister of Finance had not spoken as he did on that occasion I would have had a certain doubt and I would have given the government the benefit of that doubt. But he was explicit, he expressed a profound truth. I do not blame him for that; I cannot congratulate him, but he has my sympathies for many reasons. He said:

Consequently, there is a practical limit to the amount of international debt which can be satisfactorily carried and repaid, particularly when such debt arises from the economically wasteful processes of war.

I ask him now: What is the demarcation line? Are we within it or without it? Are we outside it? Did we go any farther and, if so, how much? Who established that line?

Mr. ILSLEY: May I ask a question? Was I not speaking about international debt there? In this case it is the debt that Great Britain could carry in relation to Canada. Is that not what I was speaking about there?

Mr. POULIOT: Here is the quotation for the minister himself to see.

Mr. ILSLEY: I find that I was right. I said:

Consequently, there is a practical limit to the amount of international debt which can be satisfactorily carried and repaid, particularly when such debt arises from the economically wasteful processes of war.

That is precisely what I have said in this debate. If this loan were made at a high rate of interest with no waiver of interest in the earlier years, and if we were to insist on trying to collect the full amount owing on the air training plan and so forth, we would be pushing the United Kingdom beyond the limit of her capacity to carry this international debt because, as I said then, there is a limit to the amount of international debt which can be satisfactorily carried and repaid, particularly when such debt arises from the economically wasteful processes of war. Canada and the United States have both considered that question, and it was not because they were foolish that they provided these terms calling for a waiver of interest, but because they took into account and appraised as closely as they could the capacity of the United Kingdom to pay.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank the minister, and I think he is a great sport for admitting that I quoted him accurately. If it had been Arthur Meighen he would have said that I misquoted him.

What is an international debt? A debt of Canada to Great Britain is an international debt, and a debt from Great Britain to Canada is an international debt? If that were not so, it would mean that the government of this country is perfectly non-existent, that we are governed by Great Britain. Our financial relations with Great Britain cannot be otherwise than international. Otherwise we might as well put the padlock on the parliament buildings in Ottawa and say that it is no use trying to do something for the government of this country, that we are all under Westminster.

Who decides about the limit? Precisely those agencies of the Old Lady of Threadneedle street and Wellington street — the experts in robber banks, robber banks of currency. They fix the limit that they want. That is their dictum and it cannot be changed, because it has been decided by those who know—the experts! Things go on like that; these experts have received their training from the small group of international finance leaders, and now they control the destinies of this nation as they want to control the destinies of the world. As a liberal I strongly object to that. I think it is a crime to threaten the humble folk, the underdog, those earning small salaries, putting out the temporary employees and leaving in the service those who bring this country to ruin. The cleaning-up should not be downward to the lower grades but upward, and we should dispense with a lot of useless branches all over the civil service. It will not be done because there are some pets and friends who are in there and they are considered more important that the members of parliament.

But I want to afford my colleagues an opportunity to think of so serious a matter as that of ministerial responsibility. I want them to remember what is their duty and to remember the trust and confidence their electors expressed in them when they honoured them by voting for them. These people deserve some consideration, and we are here to perform a duty which is often unpleasant but which nevertheless has to be done, without fear or favour, not only for those who are now citizens of Canada but for future generations, to prevent this country from being engulfed in the neighbour state, the United States of America. We are going toward it, and we do not know what will happen if this government has not the power that once it had in a free country, the power and the duty to act in accordance with the constitution and in accordance with the old principle of British parliamentary traditions, which are so often forgotten. It is a strange country where everything is known except fundamentals, where everything is remembered except the essentials, where one pays more attention to detail than to vital facts. I am sorry to-night that a larger number of my colleagues have not risen to express their views and those of their constituents on a matter of such magnitude. I have said repeatedly, and I must say it again, that the atmosphere of Ottawa is pernicious to the members of parliament because when they are here they are disposed to forget what are the views of their own people back home.

If one says that the British people deserve sympathy I agree entirely, and if we can help them, all right. I have as much respect for the poor people of Whitechapel as for the rich. But at the present time it is not a question alone of sympathy for Great Britain; it is a question also of sympathy and a question of duty to our own Canadian people. Matters are going from bad to worse. Some members think only of catering to the views of those who have controlled the policy of Canada for so long, since the time of Macdonald; I mean those who have nothing Canadian about them except perhaps the name they give to themselves occasionally as a surname, those who have no Canadian aspirations and who do not think of those who are close to them but only of those who are far away, and the farther away they are the more they must be suffering—that is what I hear all the time.

I respect the views of everybody, but I am not to be lectured by any Right Reverend and hon. gentleman like the member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Maybank). He gave us a combination which was half sermon and half business course. Well, he may call his colleagues "Pharisees"—an expression I never used—or tell us in circumlocution that those who do not think as he does are crazy. It does not make any impression on me. But I will tell him one thing which will astound hon. members; he knows nothing about the demon rum. For instance, we now have to pay $5 for a 26-ounce bottle of third rate rum—is it not a shame?—and it is precisely because we belong to the sterling area. If we were out of it, it would be easy to have rum from the American plantations.

Mr. NICHOLSON: How much is it over there?

Mr. POULIOT: I do not know, but I know it is cheaper. He said something else, and with this I will conclude. He said Canada was the unique country that wanted only to win the

war without expecting anything besides winning the war; that Canada desired no material gain; and he gave a special word of honour to our country on account of that disposition. Well, if Canada is alone in doing a thing does that mean that she is right to do it? All other countries are looking for something as a compensation for their losses and sacrifices in the war. Canada is above that. Canada has the spirit of sacrifice for other nations. It does not pay. Who will pay for it? All of us will pay for it. The Canadian people will pay for it, and they will not stand for it very long. At the present time there are various parties which fight each other at election time and discuss in this house matters of national interest. We have relative peace in this country. But there is an underground trend which is dangerous, and very little will be needed to arouse the feelings of the people of this country, as has happened somewhere else. I say that as a warning. It is dangerous to create in the minds of the people a distrust of parliamentary institutions. At the present time parliamentary institutions do not enjoy the respect which they did years ago. It is not a complaint against one member in particular, which would be normal. Sometimes people are dissatisfied with a member of parliament; they complain about him; they vote for another candidate at the following election and the matter is settled.

But now we hear everywhere and at all times discussions about parliament itself, and people are losing confidence in parliament. We have had some examples of this; I will not refer to it any more now, because the hour is late; but I want the government to think of it seriously. The only way to keep the confidence of the people is to take into their confidence those who represent the people and who are in touch with them. Any back-bencher has a superiority in this respect over any minister who sits on the treasury benches. None of these hon. gentlemen has the contact with the people that we private members have when we go home or when, even here in Ottawa, we meet people, listen to them, and try to make them understand that there are difficulties, that it is hard to settle certain things, and that the ministers should be given a chance.

But there is inevitably an end to this. I have tried to be as patient as possible. I have tried to make people understand the difficulties of the government. I have told them that the members of the cabinet meant well, that they had not the opportunities of other members to meet the Canadian people individually. But they are not satisfied with these explanations. This piece of financing will do more to promote communism in this country than all the propaganda of those who have been arrested, put together. It is a serious matter. I wanted to say this to-night; I have said it, and I want hon. members to think about it. I may be wrong, but I have spoken earnestly and with sincerity, and I want hon. members, and I want the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) to think of what I have said. This measure is a provocation to all those who are in need and receive no help. It is a provocation to all those who suffer and receive no consideration. It is not an intelligent attitude to require us to wait until the next dominion-provincial conference for an adjustment and for us to be told, "We will see what can be done some time later." The answer is, "If you have enough money to give a billion and a quarter dollars to another country whether she deserves it or not, I want it and I want it right now. If you have enough to give all this to another country, give it to me; I am a Canadian and I want it."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you.

Mr. J. H. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy hearing the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) speaking to this house, because his speeches are informative and inspirational.

I am sorry that my knowledge of the French language is not anything to write home about, but I was trying to follow as closely as I could the remarks of the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond) a little while ago. If I caught the trend of his speech it was to this effect, that the people of Great Britain are not nearly as hungry as they make out they are, and that in some insidious way they are trying to put something over on Canada. It brings to my mind a remark we used to hear over the radio some years ago—

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Would the hon. member permit me?

Mr. MATTHEWS: Certainly.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I quoted the words of Mr. Hoover.

Mr. MATTHEWS: We used to hear the remark over the radio, "Vas you there, Sharley?" I happen to be one of those who

were fortunate enough to come here from the United Kingdom, forty-one years ago, and with many others here to-night I pride myself on being a good Canadian; but I cannot forget that in the home land I have a mother still living, and by the grace of God she is now enjoying her ninety-third year of life. I want to tell this house to-night that my mother in all her ninety-three years has never known such conditions in Great Britain as exist this night as a result of the war through which they have passed. We have been told repeatedly that the people of Great Britain have had to draw in their belts, and I for one do not think for one minute they are doing that and imposing on themselves certain restrictions in order to put anything over on Canada. I feel proud to-night that Canada is able and willing to step into the breach in this, Great Britain's decisive hour, to the extent of the loan she is now prepared to make.

Certain members have spoken in opposition to the loan. Even so, they must have known how ineffective their opposition would be. I know that when we speak in this house from time to time we are apt to express our own personal convictions and opinions, but I am convinced to-night that in speaking in support of this loan I am voicing the views of the largest percentage of the people of my constituency. I believe they are 100 per cent behind the loan, and I believe that because I know they have been following the trend of events. They know what Great Britain has suffered and they know that we in Canada have been exceedingly fortunate; for we have not been asked to make the sacrifices which the people over there have been called upon to make.

I am therefore heartily in accord with the proposed loan which is now before us. Yet I cannot help having a feeling of regret over the action taken in this house on Wednesday afternoon when we had before us that resolution which sought to give our aged citizens, our old age pensioners, a more adequate income in their old age. That proposal was talked out just because the government is not prepared at this time to do anything for those people. I know that all across this dominion there is a sense of disappointment and frustration in the minds of those old people.

It is not so long ago that, in the first flush of victory, we were expressing our rejoicings and were glad when the boys were coming back from overseas, and on almost every railway station throughout the dominion one could see the sign, "Welcome home, boys; you have done a good job". Canada sought to express her gratitude to the men who had done so nobly overseas. But the time has come when Canada should publicly recognize her indebtedness to those men and women who were the pioneers of this country and who made Canada what she is.

Canada, I believe, is an exceedingly wealthy nation. We are demonstrating that by the very fact that we are willing to lend billions to nations in their need. But, as the hon. member for Temiscouata said a few moments ago, though he may not have used these express words, charity begins at home. I would not say one word against making this loan, but I believe that Canada should exert greater efforts on behalf of our aged citizens in their declining years. Let us try to bring something of comfort, peace and well-being to those people.

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): I wish briefly to express my unqualified support of the bill and to say how much I enjoyed the lucid manner in which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) presented the subject to the house. I have listened to arguments against and for the bill. I have listened to what I consider rather unusual speeches. I listened to a few members as they spent thirty-nine minutes and forty seconds in pulling the bill to pieces and then telling the house in the last few seconds that they intended to support it.

I have listened also very carefully to the speech of the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), and I think he is entirely out of perspective when he talks about dealing with the sufferings of our own people in the terms he did in relation to the people of Europe at the present time. Regardless of the things that have to be done in Canada, the things that require to be done in the near future, I say that with the exception of those who have lost loved ones, and the men who went overseas, there is not a portion of the world to-day that is as fortunate as we are in Canada.

When the hon. member for Temiscouata was speaking, his arguments reminded me of the story of the church janitor who found the parson's notes on Monday morning as he was cleaning the church. He picked them up. The parson had made various notations in his manuscript, and at one point he had, "Argument weak; raise your voice." At another point he had, "Argument very weak; wave your arms"; and at still another point he had, "Argument terribly weak; wave your arms and yell like hell".

I think the arguments in favour of the bill have in some cases over-emphasized the economic advantages. I know we have to consider the matter from that point of view. But I am rising to express my support of the bill on the ground that we have a moral obligation to assist those who have suffered in the defence of democracy. We had to pool our resources to win the war, and I am quite sure that we shall have to pool our resources to win the peace. I look upon the bill, with its period of no interest and with its lower interest rates, as a step in the right direction. Because of that I support the bill unqualifiedly.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): I do not expect to take a great deal of time, as the two previous speakers have indicated the importance of this bill, and if there are no other speakers I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we can pass the bill to-night. I do wish, however, to make a few observations because I believe that there are important principles involved in this measure.

I have listened to arguments pro and con and I am not going to say that the argument is all on one side. There are arguments for both sides, although at the outset I wish to say that I support the bill. The bill provides for two separate amounts of money. One part of the bill provides for the cancellation of any debt that the United Kingdom may owe us in respect of the commonwealth air training plan; the other part provides for the extension of credits to the extent of one and a quarter billion dollars in order that Great Britain may purchase goods from Canada. The first item of $425,000,000, which is the United Kingdom's share in the commonwealth air training plan, will constitute, I take it, a direct gift to Great Britain, not from now on, because the gift has already been made.

May I suggest that we must have had to borrow the money in order to pay Great Britain's share in this commonwealth air training plan and our borrowings therefore have been used. They have been spent for the purpose of that plan. In other words, we have borne Britain's share of that plan to the extent of $425,000,000. This money has to be paid back. I cannot tell where this particular money came from because we have been raising billions of dollars throughout the war years by means of victory loans. I imagine that a large part of the $425 million is now owed the chartered banks of Canada. I believe I am right, even though it may be a guess, that a good deal of the $425 million constitutes expanded credit which the banks now hold as a debt against the Canadian people. It can be paid back only by taxation. The people of Canada should realize this. There is one painful cry that goes up from the people of Canada to-day, namely, the cry of the pain of over-burdening taxation.

It is all very well to talk about extending credits and cancelling debt, but the people of Canada should know that every time we cancel a foreign debt there is a corresponding debt here in Canada which has to be paid, and it can be paid only by taxation; of course, as the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Hlynka) reminds me, under the present system. That is what we are operating under, the management of this system by the Liberal administration of this country. Suppose, instead of giving the loan to Britain we should ask the people of Canada whether they are ready to foot the bill to the tune of $425 million by taxation. If we did that it would put a little different complexion on this question in the minds of the people of Canada. I will make this observation. The government does not seem much alarmed at the cancellation and the eventual payment of debt to the tune of $425 million. That is strange to me, because a few years ago when we had plenty of goods for everyone in Canada and asked the government for a few paltry dollars they could not supply the money.

Mr. ILSLEY: May I just ask the hon. gentleman a question? How does the cancellation of $425 million of debt add to the taxes of the people of Canada if the debt is beyond the capacity of the debtor to pay?

Mr. POULIOT: That is a good admission.

Mr. HANSELL: I will answer, and I do not propose now to match my economic brains with those of the Minister of Finance; but I think he will agree that any debt that exists is a debt that is caused by the expansion of credits, and any expansion of credit is a debt to the banking institutions of Canada. To that extent it must be paid by the people of Canada.

Mr. ILSLEY: It was incurred years ago.

Mr. HANSELL: It might have been incurred years ago, but it is still here and is perhaps a little bigger now by the addition of accrued interest.

Mr. ILSLEY: The hon. gentleman has not answered the question.

Mr. HANSELL: I may not have answered the question to the satisfaction of the Minister of Finance, but that is my answer and it is satisfactory to me.

Let me ask the finance minister a question. Why is it that Canada can now provide $1,250 million of credit to Britain when she could not provide much less than that for the people of Canada a few years ago? I have paused, and the minister has not answered.

There are two ways of approaching the argument in respect of this loan. Many of the speakers in favour of the loan have spoken of it on the basis that it is good business. A second argument is that there is a moral obligation. I wish to ask hon. members if they think the extension of these credits to Britain to the extent of $1,250 million is good business? Let us look at that because a previous speaker said that there would be greater employment, greater production and greater export trade. It is true that for the time being there will be greater employment. But let us remember this, that greater employment here on goods to be exported means greater unemployment to the importing country. I know we are not living in normal times economically to-day. There is a disequilibrium in our economic set-up in these years because of the war and so forth, but I am talking now of whether the loan is good business. Exports mean that you are exporting your unemployment. To the extent that export trade increases employment in one country, generally speaking it means corresponding unemployment in another country. I ask, is that good business? It may be for us and only for a time.

I come now to the matter of greater production. It will mean greater production, but let us remember that the greater production is to go out of the country. What we are really doing is shipping our real wealth out of our own country. We may be provided with a certain amount of money through increased employment, but the real wealth is gone. I ask, is that good business? Perhaps some of the orthodox minds would say that it is. Some person will say that it is good business because it means greater exports. It just so happens that at the present time we need the goods. Is it good business to ship out the goods when we need them here? Let me follow that up. When a credit is paid by the importing country it is paid by that country importing goods. When Great Britain pays the money back she pays us by sending us goods. Therefore the position that we are placed in is that we are shipping out goods now when we need them, but we shall be taking them back when we do not need them.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Is the hon. member opposed to shipping them out now?

[Mr. Hansell.]

Mr. HANSELL: No. I suppose this is the crucial time, anyway, for Great Britain certainly needs them now. I am not talking against the bill; I do not want my hon. friends to misunderstand me. What I am trying to make clear is that there are two ways of looking at it. One is from the point of view of whether or not it is good business; the other is whether there is a moral obligation. I am not supporting the bill because it is good business. I think it is the business of lunatics. I am supporting the bill because we have a moral obligation toward the people of Great Britain.

While we are talking about whether or not it is good business, let me dwell for a moment on this matter of inflation. Oh, how the cry used to go up some years ago when we wanted a few extra dollars. The same hon. gentlemen now sitting on the treasury benches replied, "Oh, that would be inflation." We dared not talk in terms of $100,000,000 without its being called inflation, but now here is $1,250 million. When we proposed a little extra money there were plenty of goods to correspond with any such increase, but the cry went up that it would be inflation, and we could not have that. Now, however, we can supply a billion and a quarter of money when we have no goods behind it. From the point of view of business it is not good business, because this will aggravate inflation, the very thing we want to prevent. I say, then, that from the point of view of whether or not it is good business, I do not believe it is. We have a shortage of goods here, perhaps more shortages than we know about. I went to buy a pair of socks to-day. Since the Minister of Finance asked me a question I should like to ask him where I can buy a pair of socks. I have darned the ones I have until I cannot darn them any more, darn it, and I should like to know where I can get socks.

The only reason remaining for the loan, as far as I can see, is from the moral aspect. The hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Matthews) has expressed it as adequately as anyone could in a few minutes. I too, have an aged mother there, and we feel very much concerned about this thing. The fact is that Great Britain has suffered; she has been in the front line alone throughout the war. Her real wealth is gone. Her machinery is worn out. The present scarcity in the United Kingdom is such that they are almost at the point of starvation; at least they are at the point where the government is now talking of rationing bread. This is so in spite of the fact that a few years ago we reduced our production of wheat and paid our farmers

not to grow it. That was the policy of the present government. If hon. members do not think this a lunatic policy I do not know what we can be thinking about. You see, the Lord was so good to us, but we thought he did not know his business. He sent us so much sunshine and so much rain that we had too much, so that the government went the Lord one better; they knew a little more. They said, "Well, we cannot very well reach up into the sky and turn off the rain. We cannot very well reach up and pull down the blind so that the sun will not shine, but we know what we can do. We can take this asinine financial system and pay our men not to produce, when the good Lord gives us the opportunity to do so." I did not like to say this when the legislation was brought down, but I feel like saying it now, that I had to choose between Gardiner and God.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would my hon. friend permit me to interrupt for a moment? He was kind enough to say he did not think he would be speaking until eleven o'clock, and I imagine that all hon. members are anxious to have this bill go through its present stage to-night. This is Friday night, and it is unusual to see so many hon. members remaining until this hour. If the house would agree I should like to move that standing order 7, which provides that we adjourn at eleven o'clock, be suspended in order that the house may sit after eleven o'clock this evening.

Mr. HANSELL: I shall be through in one minute.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my hon. friend would allow the motion to be put.

Mr. BRACKEN: Is there no limit of time on this motion?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I rather gathered it was not likely there would be many more speakers. If my hon. friend would wish a twelve o'clock limit fixed, well and good; I think that should be safe.

Mr. BRACKEN: I take it we shall not be asked to stay here after twelve o'clock?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Motion (Mr. Mackenzie King) agreed to.

Mr. HANSELL: I thank the Prime Minister for his motion, but I shall take only a minute or two. I was saying there was a time when we could have produced more, but the policy of the government was to pay people not to produce. Well, now the chickens are coming home to roost, and we have scarcity. That is the result of what I would call the blundering financial and agricultural policy of this administration.

There is one other point, with which the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) dealt just before he sat down. I believe he made the point that this bill would do more than anything else to promote communism in Canada. I believe that was an unfortunate observation. Personally I doubt whether he really meant what he said, but in any event he said it. The fact of the matter is that it is not the loan that will cause any trouble in respect of communism. It will be the financial policy of the country—and I am not talking about loans now but about the policy with respect to debt and taxation—that will do more than anything else to make people in Canada dissatisfied. I would say to the hon. member for Temiscouata and those hon. members from Quebec who have spoken against the loan that I appreciate their position. They are fine men; they have convictions, but if I could leave one message with them to-night it would be that the democracies of the world must stand together. They must reciprocate one with the other in the common interest of all. If they do not do that I am afraid communism will take over. That is something to be considered. We must live together or we shall die separately.

Once again I wish to emphasize—and I think I am speaking for my group, or in any event for some of them—that we support this bill on moral grounds. If we were in power, perhaps we would assist Great Britain even to a greater extent, but our financial policy would not be the one that the present government has. We support the bill because of a moral obligation and we trust, indeed we know that there will always be an England.

Motion agreed to, on division; bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

On section 1—short title.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the adjournment of the house.

He said: With regard to Monday's business we shall continue with bill No. 28, which we have been discussing this evening. If that measure is concluded, we shall continue with bill No. 7, relating to citizenship. Then there is the second reading of bill No. 9 and the second reading of bill No. 10. Probably that will be enough; if it is not, we can fill in the time with estimates.

Motion agreed to, and the house adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

INSTALLATION OF HIS EXCELLENCY FIELD MARSHAL THE RIGHT HONOURABLE VISCOUNT ALEXANDER OF TUNIS, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., C.S.I., D.S.O., M.C., LL.D., A.D.C., GOVERNOR GENERAL OF CANADA

Address of Welcome to His Excellency The Governor General By The Prime Minister of Canada

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister of Canada): It was with great pleasure and no small measure of pride that the people of Canada learned some months ago that the King had appointed Your Excellency to succeed the Earl of Athlone as His Majesty's representative in Canada.

We were all delighted at the word of your safe arrival at Halifax. We rejoice at your presence to-day in Canada's capital.

On behalf of the government and the people of Canada, I have the honour to extend to you and Lady Alexander the warmest of welcomes to our country. We in Canada have sought to make the family and the home the foundation of our national life. In Your Excellencies and your children, we recognize and welcome a happy family.

As Prime Minister it is my privilege to express to Your Excellency the satisfaction felt by members of the government, and by all Canadians that you have now entered upon the duties of your high office.

In welcoming Your Excellencies to Canada, we are reminded of the visit some years ago of the King and Queen. The fortitude and steadfastness displayed by Their Majesties throughout the long and cruel years of war are also much in our thoughts at this time. We should like our first word to Your Excellency to be one of assurance of Canada's fidelity to the crown, and of the devotion and affection of the Canadian people for Their Majesties.

We welcome you to Canada with especial warmth because of your close association with Canada's armed forces, as Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Armies in Italy, and, later, as Supreme Allied Commander in the Mediterranean. The Canadian veterans who served in the Mediterranean theatres, on land, at sea or in the air, are eagerly awaiting the opportunity to express anew the respect and affection you inspired in them.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

It is our hope that, during your sojourn in Canada, Your Excellencies may have many opportunities to visit all parts of our country. You will find, wherever you go, a welcome in the homes, and a place in the hearts, of the Canadian people.

We are all proud to recognize in Your Excellency one of the great military leaders in world history.

It is of interest to recall today that in the war of 1914-18 you gave early signs of the military genius and leadership which in the recent world war you displayed in such exceptional measure. The power to anticipate developments and the capacity to inspire confidence have been outstanding characteristics of your career.

The free nations have reason to be grateful for the manner in which, in the years between the wars, you devoted yourself to preparation and training for high responsibilities. In those years you acquired a wide command of languages and extensive first-hand knowledge of geography. Your varied experiences contributed to that generous understanding of men which enabled you to lead, in the greatest harmony, the forces of many nations. This achievement in itself inspired new hope in the hearts of men and women of many lands.

It has been well said that your career touched both the depths and the peaks of the war. In the chances and changes of war, you have been neither discouraged by defeat nor unduly elated by victory. We recall your resourcefulness and gallantry on the beaches of Dunkirk; your part in rebuilding the British army in the dark days of 1940; the stubborn rearguard action you fought in the jungles of Burma; the calm courage with which, at a moment when Egypt seemed all but lost, you assumed command in the Middle East. From

that moment, from El Alamein to Tunis, from Sicily to the Alps, the forces you organized and directed moved forward, steadily and relentlessly, to final victory. Your success in welding together the fighting forces of many nations is evidence of the highest qualities of statesmanship.

During the years of war, Your Excellency commanded the confidence of armies of many nations. As a trusted servant of the crown, you also enjoyed, in full measure, the confidence of their parliaments. That confidence was shared by none more than by the parliament and people of Canada. It is with equal confidence that, today, members of both houses of parliament welcome Your Excellency in your new capacity as the representative, in Canada, of His Majesty The King.

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

I am deeply touched by the warm welcome which you have extended to me and my wife on our arrival in Canada, and I thank you also for the generous tribute which you have paid to me personally.

In honouring me by this splendid welcome, Canada, upholding the traditions of two great races, has shown her feelings of loyalty and devotion to our King, whose personal representative I have the honour to be, and it will be my duty and pleasure to convey to His Majesty your sentiments of attachment to him and his Throne.

It is very moving and inspiring to witness, as I have in two world wars, the way the members of our empire family have rallied together in the cause of freedom. And of all the peoples of the British commonwealth, none have played their part more nobly or given more generously than Canada.

Your contribution to the common effort has been both remarkable and outstanding—worthy of your great position in the world, and typical of the great heart of your people. You have sent the riches of Canada in the form of vast quantities of food and material of all sorts and huge sums of money, and above all you have sent in no small measure your richest asset—your men and women.

During the fighting days it was my privilege to have under my command your magnificent soldiers, sailors and airmen, who took such a distinguished part in our victories in the Mediterranean. Canadian troops were in the van during the capture of Sicily, when the first breach was made in the nazi-held Fortress of Europe. Canadian troops broke the Hitler line at Ponte Corvo, where, as the spearhead of the 8th Army, they opened the way to the capture of Rome, and Canadian troops were again in the forefront of the battle when that great defensive position in the Appenines known as the Gothic line, the last German fortress covering the valley of the Po, was pierced at Rimini on the Adriatic coast.

It was not only a sad occasion for me, but a grievous loss to my armies, when this great Canadian Corps was transferred from Italy to the western front, where they went to join their own countrymen, there to gain fresh laurels for Canadian arms in the last great battles of the war, which led to the collapse of the nazis in Europe.

Canada may well be proud of her sons and and of the magnificent part they have played in final victory.

Can you doubt, then, that I and my wife are proud and happy to come here with our children, to make our home and to live amongst you?

Mr. Prime Minister, in your address of welcome to us, you used a phrase which strikes a very responsive chord in my own heart, when you said that you in Canada have sought to make the family and home the foundation of your national life. I believe as you do that the family and home are the very basis of a healthy, happy and prosperous people.

You have a grand country, but it has been made by the character of its people, who are blessed with enterprise, initiative, imagination and energy—four great qualities which make for success.

To-day we find the world restless and disorganized by six years of war, and consequently we face many grave and difficult problems. This, I think, is inevitable when we consider the magnitude of the struggle we have all been through, so we must not be unduly discouraged. I am convinced that we can surmount all our difficulties as successfully as we did in the fighting days, provided we stand firm in upholding those principles we have fought for and tackle the future with sober optimism and energy.

Although I have now said "Farewell to Arms", this does not mean rest and relaxation; on the contrary, there is lots of splendid constructive work to be done, and it will be my aim and privilege to devote myself wholeheartedly to the duties of my office, which will allow me to watch with sympathy and interest the progress, happiness and growing prosperity of the Canadian people, who have earned for themselves, by their own endeavours, the great position they hold in the world to-day.

Monday, April 15, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

FARM IMPLEMENTS

PRICES AND SUPPLY—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 31

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think it desirable to make a statement to the house in regard to the supply and price of farm implements. Throughout the war years, and continuing through to the present, the question of ensuring an adequate supply of farm implements is one which has consistently been given special attention by the government. Towards the end of 1941 when the needs of war caused acute shortages of steel and component parts, hon. members will recall that a rigid control and allocation of all forms of steel and components was found necessary and a far-reaching priority system was set up. When doing so, however, particular attention was given to the needs for farm implements and they were placed in the very special position of receiving a priority as high as essential war production in regard to production programmes agreed upon from time to time. A special international committee was formed comprising representatives from the United States, United Kingdom and Canada to screen the requirements of the allied nations for farm machinery and equipment so as to determine minimum essential needs in relation to agreed food programmes. This committee worked out the allocation of available materials for each country and maintained a fair balance in its distribution. When this had been accomplished it became the responsibility of each country to determine what machines and equipment were produced to meet essential needs.

Through these special measures hon. members will be interested to know that despite the most urgent pressures for direct war equipment the government was successful in providing for Canada a steady flow of farm implements throughout the course of the war.

Notwithstanding this fact, however, it is true that a greatly expanded agricultural production, obtained despite a serious decline in farm labour, has meant that the demand for machinery and equipment continues far in excess of available supply. A significant barometer of the demand in this field has been the fact that in farm auction sales, prices bid for used machinery and equipment have been often far in excess of maximum ceiling prices on new equipment.

[The Governor General.]

Immediately following the cessation of hostilities the question of diverting all possible industrial production facilities towards meeting the demand for farm machinery and equipment was taken energetically in hand. The urgent need for food is so apparent that I need not emphasize it. Suffice it to say that it is the obvious duty of all producing countries to increase agricultural production to a maximum and all practical steps toward this end must be taken.

In studying the measures necessary to secure a maximum production of farm machinery and equipment the wartime prices and trade board, to whose administrative jurisdiction this question is entrusted, has reached the conclusion that some recognition of the uncontrollable war-time increases in the cost of materials, labour and general overhead is simply inevitable if vitally needed machinery and implements are to be secured. This decision was reached after a careful study of cost information submitted by the farm implement industry. Accordingly, on Saturday, April 13, the board announced that maximum retail price ceilings for Canadian-made farm machinery and parts will be increased by twelve and a half per cent. Naturally, this step was taken with considerable reluctance. However, faced with the plain fact that increased costs of materials and component parts produced in Canada, or imported for assembly here, together with increased labour and other overhead costs, could not be absorbed at present price levels, it was obvious that a maximum production of farm machinery and equipment could not take place unless some relief was afforded. I should add that the analysis of costs conducted by the prices board indicated that a price increase of upwards of 30 per cent above 1941 levels would have been required to regain 1941 profit percentage margins for the farm implement industry. Consequently, the price advance of only 12½ per cent means, admittedly, a serious profit squeeze upon the industry, but in this transition period the government believes the prices board approach in the case of farm implements to be fully justified in view of the imperative need for holding down to a minimum, cost adjustments in the important basic industry of agriculture.

With one minor exception of a 5 per cent increase to adjust an anomalous situation on a small volume of implements (principally imported items) at the commencement of the price ceiling in the fall of 1941, prices have been held at or below the ceiling prices of the basic period in 1941. This rather remarkable record was made possible partly by

reason of large war contracts which expanded the volume of the industry and partly by insisting that increasing costs be absorbed by the industry instead of being passed on to the farmer consumer. Now that war production has swung over to normal supplies, however, the cost increases, as I have already stated, can no longer be absorbed and a reasonable price adjustment had to be worked out. In their submissions the companies disclosed increased costs since the basic period of 1941 averaging, roughly, materials and components 20 per cent, labour 28½ per cent, and general overhead 23 per cent. Unit costs in the coming year will run higher than this for some time due to premiums on castings, increases on imported components and higher than normal overheads which bring the over-all cost increase close to 30 per cent. In fixing the increase in the ceiling price at not more than 12½ per cent the board has in mind that only through volume production can the Canadian farm implement industry survive, under the present level of costs and selling prices so that the price increase now authorized means that the companies must do their utmost to achieve a maximum volume of production. That I should add is exactly what is needed to meet the chronic shortages of farm implements which exist to-day. It will be of interest to recall also that on July 1, 1944, the exchange tax and all customs duties were removed from imported farm implements so that farmers are now assured that the Canadian price level must be fully competitive with other markets. I am further informed that retail farm implement prices in the North American continent are at least 25 per cent lower than in any other market in the world to-day.

To sum up, I wish to say that with the price adjustment now authorized and with the steps taken to give priority assistance in the securing of raw materials, such as steel, castings and component parts, I believe that the serious shortage in farm implements will begin to be remedied this year. I must warn, however, that with the best will in the world all shortages cannot be overcome immediately and that factors beyond our control, such as, for example, the recent strike in the steel industry in the United States, and the present coal strike, can seriously upset all forecasts or plans. It follows that strong inflationary influences are present in this field, both here and in the United States where about 50 per cent of our supplies of farm machinery and implements are obtained. For example, the United States farm implement industry during the months of January and February, 1946, showed a production decrease of, roughly, 20 per cent over the same months of 1945, or figured in dollars a total of some $110,000,000. Because of the dependence of the Canadian farm implement industry upon the United States for certain essential components, such a sharp decrease there inevitably affects production here.

The squeezed down price increase which has been allowed in the Canadian field of manufacture will, with the cooperation of the farm implement industry, ensure a maximum production in our own field of manufacture to the full extent that materials and labour are available, but there remains a very definite hazard that more serious price advances in import prices, over which we, of course, have no control, may yet be witnessed.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has just made a statement with respect to the announced policy of raising the price ceiling on farm machinery by 12½ per cent. He has sought to justify that policy on the grounds of increasing costs to the manufacturers and of the need for human food.

I want to commend the minister for making this statement, because it gives us some idea of the justification the government offers for this proposed increase. When the house adjourned on Friday evening we learned of the forthcoming announcement to be made through the press—and I am sure we are pleased to hear from the minister to-day. But I do not think I should let this opportunity pass without saying two or three things about the matter.

Speaking for those around me on this side, I think the government is going about the process of removing controls in the wrong order. Here is an increase in the price of farm machinery with no corresponding increase in the price of farm products. It is an increase in the price of farm machinery at the time that farmers are starting to seed their crops, and at a time when the world is short of food. As I say, I think the government's policy is to be criticized for the way in which the government is going about it, and for the timing of the announcement. The machinery which the farmers need to-day is already in the shops, and yet the prices to be paid for it are tomorrow's prices and not yesterday's. I welcome the minister's statement, but I am afraid we cannot support the policy or the reasons he has given for it.

It follows an announcement of a few days ago of an increase of $5 a ton in the price of steel, at which time there was no announcement that anything would be done to make possible an increase in the wages of steelworkers. I submit that the plans for the

removal of these controls ought to be better correlated than they are, according to the evidence we have.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman. I permitted him to make a few remarks but, as he knows, statements made by ministers at this stage are not debatable. That is a rule of the house.

Mr. ILSLEY: I thought myself that debate was not permissible, but I should certainly like to say something in answer to what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. COLDWELL: Could not an arrangement be made whereby this particular matter might be discussed by the house? There are many of us representing agricultural constituencies and we should like to say a word and incidentally to revise our whole attitude towards the stabilization of agricultural prices. An opportunity should be given before the house adjourns to discuss this subject.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I have already pointed out, statements of this kind made by ministers are not debatable. I understand that hon. members are of the view that it is necessary to debate the question. If they will consult *Hansard* they will see the information which the leader of the house gave on Friday night when he intimated that the house would probably be called upon to-day to resolve itself into committee of supply. When a motion to that effect is put to the house by the Speaker, hon. members will have an opportunity to discuss this matter. I consider it the duty of the Speaker to point out to hon. members that the minister's statement is not debatable.

Mr. BRACKEN: We accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, whatever it is. I simply wish to point out, however, that the minister has been allowed to make a statement and the house is denied an opportunity of saying anything about it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Under the rules he is allowed to make the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I regret the necessity of interrupting the hon. member, but I think it is my duty to refuse permission to the hon. member to make the remarks which he is submitting to the house. It is a well-known practice in this house, and one which is observed every day, that ministers may be allowed to make statements of the kind under discussion, but such statements are not debatable. That is not a matter of ruling by the present Speaker; it is a practice of the house. As I pointed out a moment ago, however, hon. members will have an opportunity to discuss their grievances to-day when the house is asked to resolve itself into committee of supply.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word with regard—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: Either this is debatable or it is not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot give the minister permission to engage in a debate.

Mr. BRACKEN: In view of this announcement to-day, and the fact that we are not allowed to debate the matter, I wish to move the adjournment of the house under standing order 31 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the government's policy as announced last Saturday of permitting an increase of 12½ per cent in the ceiling price of farm implements, without permitting a corresponding increase in the price of farm products and thus imposing on the farmers extra production costs just at the time when they are preparing maximum production to meet the critical food situation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member wishes to avail himself of the privilege afforded by standing order 31 to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a matter which in his opinion is urgent. Before going any further I would call his attention to a ruling given by the Hon. Mr. Rhodes, then Speaker, on April 5, 1918, which will be found at page 744 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition:

> There is one point mentioned by the hon. member to which I would reply, and more especially for the benefit of proper decorum in the house on the matter of urgency. Urgency, within the meaning of the rule, is not a question whether the matter proposed to be discussed is of urgent importance—

And I insist upon these words.

> —it may be of infinitely urgent importance to those affected—the question is whether it is urgent within the meaning of rule 39; in other words, whether it is a matter of that urgency which would cause harm to the public interest if the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the house were not able to permit the subject to be brought on early enough.

It is the duty of the Speaker to point out to the house that we have before us now routine proceedings and orders of the day and that preparations have already been made for the consideration of to-day's business. It is my duty to see that these orders of the day are followed. Hon. members have been apprised since Friday last of the business that would come on to-day and have prepared themselves accordingly. I realize that it is the privilege of every member to avail himself of standing order 31 and to move that

the business prepared for to-day shall be set aside to enable him to move the adjournment of the house. It is for the Speaker to decide whether the matter which it is proposed to discuss is of sufficient urgency and of sufficient public importance to warrant the suspension of the order of business. On this question the Speaker has not to decide "whether the matter proposed to be discussed is of urgent importance," but to decide whether it is urgent within the meaning of standing order 31. If hon. members will look at *Hansard* of Friday they will see that the leader of the house stated that probably on Monday the house would be asked to resolve itself into committee of supply. Every hon. member knows that, except on Thursday or Friday, before going into supply the question is put by the Speaker, and any member has then an opportunity to rise and discuss grievances. I would ask the hon. gentleman to wait until there is a motion for supply, when he will have the opportunity to discuss this matter. For that reason, I must rule that there is no urgency sufficient to justify setting aside the orders of the day to enable the hon. member to discuss the matter.

Mr. BRACKEN: Then Your Honour's decision is against me?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, it is.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I have an opportunity of saying a word with respect to the ruling?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps I might intervene just for a moment. I noticed His Honour the Speaker mentioned that there would be an opportunity to discuss this matter on the house going into committee of supply, and drew attention to the fact that I said we might go into supply to-day. But I preceded that possibility by a statement to the effect that we would go into supply if we concluded the measure dealing with the United Kingdom loan and also the measure on citizenship. I do not believe there is a possibility of concluding either of those measures to-day. In these circumstances, I would direct the attention of the house to what His Honour the Speaker said in the first instance, namely, that leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the house when made for the purpose of discussing any definite matter of urgent public importance must be asked after the ordinary daily routine of business has been concluded and before notices of motion or orders of the day are entered upon.

My hon. friend has brought forward a perfectly proper motion, but again at the wrong time. If he will wait until the daily routine of business has been concluded and before questions, notices of motion or orders of the day are entered upon, I would submit he might then bring forward his motion.

Mr. BRACKEN: If Mr. Speaker would like me to bring it forward again, I shall be very glad to do so. I thought it was proper to bring it forward after the minister had made the statement. I would point out to Mr. Speaker that there was no undertaking by anybody that we would go into supply to-day. That order stands on the order paper every day throughout the session.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have called the attention of the hon. member to the fact that it was announced Friday by the leader of the house—

Mr. CASSELMAN: The Prime Minister denies it.

Mr. COLDWELL: If Your Honour will read what the leader of the government said on Friday evening it will be seen that there was a full day's business announced. The leader of the house then said, with a smile, as I remember it, "Probably that will be enough; if it is not, we can fill in the time with estimates." We shall certainly have no time to fill in if we follow the government's programme.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member knows that the Speaker's decisions are not debatable.

Mr. COLDWELL: The motion was made at the wrong time; therefore, the Speaker's decision will probably have to be given again.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that I have not to question when the motion for the house to go into committee of supply will be called. But it is my duty to remind the house that the motion is on the order paper of to-day, so whenever it is called, any hon. member will have the opportunity to discuss this urgent matter.

Mr. COLDWELL: With all due respect I am pointing out that the business of the house is so heavy for to-day there is almost no chance, in the Prime Minister's own opinion, to reach estimates. This is a matter of urgent public importance and should not be blocked by such a ruling.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORTS AND CERTAIN ESTIMATES TO RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING COMMITTEE

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table the following reports in English and French:

Annual report of the Canadian National Railway system for the year ended December 31, 1945; annual report of the Canadian National Railways Securities Trust for the year ended December 31, 1945; report to parliament of George A. Touche & Co., auditors of the Canadian National Railway system, for the year ended December 31, 1945.

Copies of the reports are being distributed to hon. members this afternoon. By leave of the house I move:

That the annual reports for 1945 of the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian National Railways Securities Trust and the auditors of the Canadian National Railway system, tabled this day, and the annual report for 1945 of Trans-Canada Air Lines which was laid on the table of the house on April 11, 1946, be referred to the sessional committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government, together with the following items of estimates for 1946-47:

Vote 422, Maritime Freight Rates Act—Canadian National Railways;

Vote 423, Maritime Freight Rates Act—railways other than Canadian National;

Vote 469, Prince Edward Island Car Ferry and Terminals—deficit 1946.

And that the resolution passed by the house on March 28, 1946, referring certain estimates to the committee of supply, be rescinded in so far as the said resolution relates to votes Nos. 422, 423 and 469.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN FORCES

REINSTATEMENT IN CIVIL EMPLOYMENT ACT, 1942 —REGULATIONS GIVEN STATUTORY EFFECT

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 54, to amend the Reinstatement in Civil Employment Act, 1942.

Mr. FRASER: Explain.

Mr. MITCHELL: I expected that.

Mr. FRASER: We expected it, too.

Mr. MITCHELL: We are in unanimous agreement. In 1942, parliament passed the Reinstatement in Civil Employment Act, to provide assurance to members of the armed forces of their right to reinstatement upon discharge, in the employment they were engaged in at the time of acceptance for service. The act provides that such reinstatement shall be on conditions not less favourable than if such persons had continued in the employer's employment without interruption.

In administering the act at earlier stages of the last war, a number of uncertainties arose on matters of interpretation and on the application of the act to circumstances which probably were not contemplated at the time the act was passed. It was, of course, important that reinstatement should not be held up on account of these uncertainties. Therefore regulations under the authority of the War Measures Act were passed in January, 1945, which included not only matters of procedure under the act but also provisions designed to clear up the uncertainties relating to the interpretation and application of the Act. These regulations have now been in effect for some fifteen months and I am advised have been found suitable and effective to carry out the purposes of the act.

Employers and labour organizations have extended the utmost cooperation in reinstatement of veterans and have shown much initiative in working out plans to this end in individual establishments. In consequence, the number of cases requiring the intervention of the officers of the Department of Labour administering the act have been comparatively few to date. The purpose of the bill is to incorporate at this time the regulations approved by the governor in council under the War Measures Act as part of the provisions of the Reinstatement in Civil Employment Act and thus give statutory effect to them.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

SENATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 17, respecting the marking of articles containing gold, silver or platinum—Mr. MacKinnon.

Bill No. 29, to amend the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, 1929—Mr. Claxton.

FARM IMPLEMENTS

INCREASE IN RETAIL PRICE CEILINGS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 31

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I made a motion which was declared out of order, possibly on the technical ground raised by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that it had not been brought in at the proper stage of proceedings. If the motion is out of order I think that should be made clear on its merits, rather than on any technical grounds. I understand this is the proper time to bring it in. I would therefore move the motion again; and if on its merits it is out of order a ruling can be so made and it will be obeyed.

Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), the adjournment of the house under standing order 31 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the government's policy as announced last Saturday of permitting an increase of 12½ per cent in

the ceiling price of farm implements without permitting a corresponding increase in the price of farm products, and thus imposing on the farmers extra production costs just at the time when they are preparing maximum production to meet the critical food situation.

Mr. SPEAKER: A few moments ago I had the opportunity to give to hon. members the practice followed in this house as far as these matters are concerned. Now, since there is some objection, and since the house is master of its own proceedings, I will put to the house the question whether or not the hon. gentleman shall have leave to proceed.

And leave having been given:

Mr. BRACKEN: There is very little more I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, in addition to what I said a short time ago. Had the house permitted me to make that brief statement we would have let it go at that. I simply wish to point out that the best order was not followed in removing these controls, and that the timing was not well considered in this instance. At the very time the producers are starting to sow their crops they learn that farm machinery is going to cost them twelve and a half per cent more.

One other criticism is this. Last Friday evening we heard of a forthcoming announcement to raise farm machinery prices, which was carried in the newspapers on Saturday morning, and to-day we have the decision of the wartime prices and trade board explained by the minister. He brings it in at the opening of the house, with hon. members given no opportunity to debate it. I took what opportunity there was to say something against it; when I was denied the privilege of saying a word or two more, this motion had to be moved if others were to be allowed to speak.

I simply wish to say that the way these matters are handled—with decisions made outside the house, then explained here by a minister at a time when they are not debatable—it simply makes of this parliament with respect to these matters nothing more or less than a listening post.

I have said all I wish to say. Here is a measure increasing the cost of farm machinery without permitting an increase in the prices of farm products, just as two weeks ago another government decision was made which increased the price of steel by $5 a ton without at the same time making provision for some increase in the wages of steelworkers. That is my criticism. The policy is most unbalanced and inequitable. I could take longer, but this is the protest I wished to make, and those are some of the points I had in mind.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I want to support the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) in his criticism of the procedure, though I know it is in conformity with the rules of the house. When an announcement of this importance is made I do believe hon. members should be given an opportunity to debate it; and I am pleased indeed, Mr. Speaker, that you have afforded hon. members that opportunity, because of course I realize that it was quite possible for you to deny hon. members the right to discuss this matter under the usual procedure of this house.

May I say to the government through you, sir, that we in this party have been warm supporters of the idea that the government must have certain powers in order to exercise control to stabilize prices generally so that there shall be no runaway inflation, and we have supported that policy both in this house and in the country. But several things that have been done recently by the government have tended to increase the cost of producing agricultural products. Recently in western Canada we had increases in the cost of gasoline, fuels and so on. Now we have an increase of 12½ per cent in the prices of agricultural implements. May I add here that while I rise this afternoon to protest against this increase, we recognize that if the price ceilings are to be removed from one set of commodities, the prices of all other commodities will have to be adjusted as well. There must be no inconsistency in our attitude in that regard. Some of my hon. friends of the official opposition who have been urging the removal of price ceilings are now protesting against the removal of the price ceiling on agricultural implements. We are not in that position of inconsistency.

May I say this, while I am on my feet, that in 1938 this house established a committee, of which I was a member, which went into the question of the high prices of agricultural implements. We found at that time that in many respects the high prices which then existed on agricultural implements could not be justified. We made certain recommendations to the house and to the government with a view to lowering the prices of farm implements in the interests of agricultural producers. So far as I know, up to date at least none of the major recommendations of that committee has been adopted either by the government or by the companies.

I wish to support very strongly the protests made against this increase. At a time when we are trying to maintain a certain measure of stabilization in our economy we have this increase in prices of farm implements. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) has mentioned that we have also had an increase in the price of steel. Again I agree with him that this increase of $5 a ton in the price of steel was exactly the same increase as was made in the United States. But in the United States that $5 increase was granted on the condition that a certain increase should be made to the workers in the steel industry. In our country there has been no conference with the workers and no such condition. But the $5 increase has been handed out, and probably to some extent it is reflected in the announcement made to-day that the prices of agricultural implements are to be allowed to increase by 12½ per cent. That is not the kind of policy we expect from the government, or that the people of this country expect from parliament. If we are to have stabilization, then let us have stabilization. If the farmers are to be compelled to accept stabilized prices for their products—prices well below American levels, as has been pointed out incidentally—then I say that other industries upon which farmers rely for their supplies should also be held at proper levels.

I can see no justification for this—either for the increase in the price of steel, or from my recollection of the results of the inquiry into the high prices of farm implements. We found then that the cost of distributing farm implements was excessive. We found that the costs shown as charged to farmers for service rendered by implement companies were excessive. Now we find ourselves faced with an increase which is indeed very serious. We know that tariff adjustments have been made in the interests of manufacturers; the matter of diesel engines was discussed at the last session. In all these things it is indicated clearly that while workers are being held at certain wage levels, and farmers are being held at certain price levels, some of these large manufacturing concerns are to be allowed to increase their price levels. This house, every side of it—at least those of us who represent constituencies which are agricultural—should protest against the putting into effect of this kind of policy.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) in protesting against this increase in the prices of farm machinery, which comes as the result of an order made last Saturday by the wartime prices and trade board. I had intended to raise this question at the proper time, and to move the adjournment of the house as has already been done by the leader of the opposition. I am pleased to note, sir, that you have been good enough to grant us this time to discuss a most important matter—because I do believe it is important. It is a matter which should receive the earnest and full attention of every hon. member.

My reasons for preparing to ask for the adjournment were as follows. In the first place the order will have no less effect than to increase the cost of the production of farm products. The farmers will simply have to pay higher prices for their machinery. Everyone knows they have been paying too high prices already, owing to the protection afforded farm machinery manufacturing in Canada. The farmers in our country have certainly been at a great disadvantage owing to the high prices they have had to pay.

In the second place, in my judgment the increase in the prices of farm machinery threatens to defeat the all-out food production programme announced by the government just about a month ago. I feel certain, from the reaction of farmers already indicated, that this doubtless will cause widespread consternation among them. They certainly will not be ready to go forward willingly—as I am sure they were ready to go forward at the call of the Prime Minister in his food programme.

In my judgment the board's order intensifies the already serious handicap under which farmers have been operating for some time past, that of having their farm produce prices stabilized at levels lower than world price levels. It has put them at a terrific disadvantage as compared with the position enjoyed by farmers just across the line immediately to the south of us. Not only are our prices stabilized at levels lower than world price levels, but the border is closed to the export of cattle and live stock generally. This makes it difficult for our farmers to carry on in competition with their American neighbours. Unless remedial action is taken at once, this order of the wartime prices and trade board will have the effect of curtailing the production of agricultural goods at a time when every pound of foodstuffs is of the utmost importance in filling the world shortage, the great world need.

This is even more serious, coming as it does at a time when the spring work is about to begin. The farmers have already made up their budgets and plans for the year. It comes also at the end of six years of shortage

of farm machinery, and at a time when farmers find it absolutely essential to increase their depleted stocks and to replace that which has been worn out.

The board's order imposes upon the Canadian farmers a burden of cost which they simply cannot bear, particularly so long as the level of taxation remains as it is in Canada, and so long as the farm commodity price stabilization policy continues in effect at present levels. In my judgment the board's order has precipitated a crisis in agriculture in this country. Therefore it does become a matter of grave urgency, and one to which the house should give its closest attention.

As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has said in his statement, it may be that some revision of prices should be made at this time. I am not fully convinced of that yet. I should like to have further figures to supplement the statement already made by the minister. However, I have always taken the position, in connection with the control of prices, that should it become necessary to revise, let us by all means consider the revision carefully. Let us do it along sane lines, and make certain that any increase in prices is justified. That is why I am certain that hon. members, and particularly farm members throughout Canada, are anxious to take part in this discussion to see to it that these price adjustments are justified. Should it be found that the increase of 12½ per cent is justified then, to ease the minds of farmers, and to make certain that they will feel like continuing an all-out effort to relieve the food shortage throughout the world, I suggest that the government take into immediate consideration the absorption of those price increases by continuing the present prices of farm machinery to farmers, the difference being made up by a subsidy gathered through taxation from all the people of Canada. That is the only justifiable way of handling the situation.

My colleagues and I strongly urge that this action be taken to set at rest the minds of the farmers, to let them understand that we are aware of their problems and that we are attempting to assist them in their all-out effort to produce food in large quantities sufficient to satisfy the need.

I am happy to join in this effort to understand the whole problem, and in the discussion of it. I do not wish to say more at this time.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): I should like to speak briefly, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want the house to think that this side is unanimously in favour of this price increase. I do not know whether it was the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) or the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) who said that this increase of 12½ per cent would not materially increase production of machinery so far as this year's output is concerned. The increase is in the retail price, and these implements to a large extent are already in the hands of the retailers, and so I agree with the hon. member that this price increase will not materially increase the production of farm implements this year. I disagree with the leader of the opposition on many things, but I certainly agree with him that the wartime prices and trade board are starting at the wrong end of this thing. They are trying to build the roof on the house before they have laid the foundation. I think it is the duty of the Department of Agriculture once more to run agriculture and not to let it be run by a bunch of clerks down in the wartime prices and trade board.

I am also in accord with the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), the leader of the Social Credit party, when he says that if it is necessary to increase the price of farm machinery for these firms to operate, all right, let us do that. But again reverting to the leader of the opposition, let us do it from the proper angle. For instance, how long will the farmers have to wait to get this increase of four cents a pound on butter? That does not go to the farmer immediately. And now, overnight, without any consultation with the representatives of agriculture, this increase of twelve and a half per cent in farm implements is made. As representing a rural riding I definitely protest against this increase under present conditions.

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin): This is a very important question, especially for those who come from agricultural ridings, and I do not want to let the opportunity go by without saying a word.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) characterized this price increase, if I understood him aright, as a squeeze-down price increase. I do not know just what that means, but it seems to me that the minister is busily engaged in pushing down prices in an upward direction, because that is what it amounts to. I am not satisfied with the explanation given by the Minister of Finance. In telling us of price increases in steel and in labour he told us only part of the story, and we are entitled to hear the whole story. He did not tell us, for instance, that the cost of selling farm machinery in the last few years has gone down almost to the vanishing point, and that

advertising and salesmanship, if any is done at the present time, is now unnecessary to sell farm implements. It is no longer a job of selling the implements but rather of finding a place where you can buy them. So the cost of selling should not be a factor at all in the price increase. A dealer with any implements on hand does not have to run around among the farmers, burn gasoline and spend time trying to make a sale. All he has to do is to sign the order when it is made out by the applicant.

I think also the house is entitled to know what has been going on behind the scenes, and who are the people applying for this price increase. We should be told to what extent these implement companies are losing money, if they are losing money. We have not been told the whole story, and unless the minister is prepared to give us a much fuller statement than he did to-day, it is up to us as representing the farmers to register our protest in the strongest possible terms against this price increase.

The minister has not told us whether before this decision was taken the members of the party which supports the government were taken into the confidence of the government. We have already seen that one evidently, was not consulted, and that he does not care for this decision. I should like to know how many more members of the party are of the same opinion. I should like to know how many members representing western Canada are in agreement with this price increase. Were they consulted, and what is their opinion? This is a matter of great importance, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think the house should let this opportunity go by without squeezing, to use the minister's own word, a great deal more information out of the government than has been so far given.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): I should like to add my voice to those who have already protested against this increase in the price of farm implements. I was very much surprised that the government should take action that would be likely to discourage production at a time when increased farm production is urgently needed to help the devastated areas of Europe, and for that matter all countries of the world.

It will be remembered that during the nineteen thirties thousands of our farmers became bankrupt, and a great number of them financially embarrassed, and as a result they were not able to buy the farm machinery which they badly needed. They were also unable to replace buildings that had become dilapidated. During the war the farmers found themselves in a better position, but owing to the lack of supply they still were unable to buy farm machinery. Now that the farmers are in a better position to buy machinery, because in the first place they have the money and because in the second place the machinery will become available, we find that the price is to be increased by 12½ per cent.

I am not satisfied that there will be no increase in the price of machinery that has already been produced. I am afraid that we shall find this increase placed on machines already in transit or in the hands of the dealers. That has been our experience in the past, and I should like to know what guarantee the minister will give that there will be no increase in the price of any farm machinery already produced. The member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) does not think that this increase will add very much to the price of farm implements. But on a tractor, for instance, it means an increase of $235.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Pardon me; I never said that at all.

Mr. QUELCH: The hon. member did not think that the farmers would have to pay this increase on implements already in the hands of the dealers.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Pardon me. What I said was that I did not think it would materially affect this year's production. I was following the argument of a previous speaker. I would ask the hon. member not to put words into my mouth that I did not use.

Mr. QUELCH: Certainly not. I understood the hon. member to say that he did not think the price would be increased on machines already in the hands of dealers.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No.

Mr. QUELCH: That is fine.

Mr. ILSLEY: May I say that this price increase relates only to farm implements made in Canada. Tractors are not made in Canada; therefore the instance given by the hon. member does not apply.

Mr. QUELCH: The price of tractors will not be increased?

Mr. ILSLEY: This order does not affect the cost of tractors at all. It applies only to Canadian-made farm implements.

Mr. QUELCH: Does it affect the price of combines?

Mr. ILSLEY: I have not the list.

Mr. QUELCH: They are produced in this country. It will mean an increase of from $250 to $350 in the price of a combine, which is a very considerable increase.

I want to deal for a moment with the position of the machine companies. We remember that during the depression no substantial reduction was made in the price of farm machinery. There was a substantial reduction in the production of machinery, but not in the price. The reduced production arose out of the reduced demand because the farmers did not have the money to buy the machines. In 1937-38 the price of farm machinery went up 7·8 per cent, and the excuse given at that time was that owing to the lack of sales the overhead had increased and the price must be increased. One may well ask if there was any justification for an increase in price even at that time. I recall that the committee which was set up in 1937 found that the profits earned by the International Harvester company from 1926 to 1935 were 6·5 per cent. That, at any rate in the later years, was a period of low production. Yet in spite of the fact that they earned a profit of 6·5 per cent up to 1935, they increased the price by 7·8 per cent in 1937. Incidentally this increase in price came just after the report of the farm implements committee, which was very critical of the high prices, was tabled in this house and concurred in—the increase showing an utter contempt on the part of machine companies apparently, for the opinions of this house. At that time an interesting report was given to the house on the operations of one of the large machine companies in this country. I hold in my hand a volume of *Hansard* of 1938 containing the report of a speech made by the chairman of the farm implements committee when moving, on March 11, concurrence in the report. This is what he had to say regarding the operations of the Massey-Harris company, as reported on pages 1238 and 1239:

> We find that the Massey-Harris company does 60 per cent of its business outside of Canada. In 1891, when the Massey and Harris interests were merged, together with some other manufacturers, they had a capital of approximately $3,500,000, of which only $300,000 was put up in cash, the remainder being given in exchange for the assets of the constituent firms that were merged. In that period, 1891 to 1912, the capital remained at $3,500,000 leaving out of consideration for the moment another $1,000,000 that was put in in 1911. What do we find happening during that period? On a capitalization of $3,500,000 this company was able to pay cash dividends amounting to $11,212,349 and stock dividends of $8,500,000, or total dividends of $19,712,349; to create a rest account of $6,500,000; to set up a special contingency account of $1,680,000 and to retain unallocated in surplus account $1,061,000, or a total of $28,959,349. That is a very substantial return on a capital which amounted to $3,500,000 at the inception of the company and which remained at that figure until near the end of that period, when an additional $1,000,000 was put in. I am sure no one would say the prices this company charged its customers during that period were not sufficient to pay them a good rate of interest on the original investment, to give their stockholders sufficient in the way of dividends and still leave a very, very wide margin. Such is the situation with regard to that company, and broadly speaking it may be said to apply to many of the other companies, with perhaps a little less force.

That is from the speech made by the chairman of the committee which had been investigating these companies; I think therefore it bears a fair amount of weight.

I do not suppose there is any doubt that these companies have done pretty well for themselves during the war. It is not likely that they have been producing at a loss. In the earlier stages of the war I read reports in the *Financial Post* as to their profits, which at that time appeared to be very satisfactory. What is the situation to-day? Unquestionably the volume of business for the machine companies will be very heavy, and the greater the amount of their business the larger the reduction, of course, in their overhead cost. It was brought out in the committee investigation in 1937 that costs of collection and losses incurred through bad debts were quite heavy, representing in the neighbourhood of five per cent. As I understand it, that loss will be entirely eliminated, because as a result of certain legislation passed in this house farmers will be able to pay cash for their machines, as they can go to the banks and borrow the money. Machinery companies will not be selling their machinery on time, so losses such as they suffered in the past as a result of bad debts and heavy collection fees will be wholly eliminated. This should make it possible for the companies to reduce their costs quite considerably. If, however, as the leader of this group pointed out, it should be found that the companies must be allowed to increase their prices in order to carry on, we shall have to do one of two things; either remove the ceiling on the price of agricultural products so that the farmers will not be obliged to sell at a loss, or have the additional cost absorbed by the people as a whole instead of by the farmers alone, as we did during the war. We imported goods which cost more than the price at which they were sold under the price ceiling, and the government subsidized those firms so that they could sell at a discounted price in this country without losing money. If the govern-

ment feels that the machine companies must increase their prices by 12½ per cent in order to avoid loss, let the government subsidize them to that extent and let the cost be borne by the people of Canada instead of by the farmers alone.

This government has unfortunately contracted the habit of subsidizing the people of this country and the people of the world in respect of agricultural produce and putting the full cost of the subsidy on the farmer alone instead of distributing it among all the people. We have a good instance of that practice in that we are selling wheat to Europe at $1.55 a bushel. Our party do not object to that for a minute, but in view of the fact that the world price is around $1.98—that is the selling price in Chicago—if we are to sell to Britain at $1.55 the farmers should not have to absorb that loss alone; it should be absorbed by the people as a whole. Indeed, the farmers are not even receiving $1.55; they are receiving $1.25, though of course they hope that at some future date the participation certificates will make up the difference.

I should like again to emphasize that we feel the government should do one of two things. If the government is going to take price ceilings off goods which form part of the cost of farm production, it should take the ceiling off agricultural products. You cannot continually increase the cost of the implements of production while keeping a ceiling on the price of the articles produced. If, on the other hand, the government is not prepared to do that, it should, as the leader of this group has pointed out, allow a discount on the price of machinery and subsidize the machine companies to that extent.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): My remarks will be very brief. I assume that the minister will be taking part in this debate before it is concluded, and if so, I shall appreciate it if he will answer at that time one or two questions I want to ask.

To-day I met a delegation of workers from Toronto. The position of those who are working in agricultural implement plants came up, and I asked them whether these plants were increasing or reducing the number of their personnel. Their reply was that the staffs are being reduced. My second question to them was whether wages were being increased or lowered, and the reply to that question was that wages are being lowered.

Those who represent agricultural constituencies have done a very fine job so far. I represent a working man's constituency, and many, perhaps a thousand, of my constituents work in one or other of the agricultural implement plants of Toronto. I should like to know whether the information I got from the delegation is correct. Are the staffs being reduced, and are wages being reduced? If wages are being cut, then I should like to know why the workers cannot be given more if the price of implements is being increased.

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): I should like to say a few words on this matter. What I notice especially is that the government has gone to great pains to put up a case for the manufacturer of agricultural implements and to explain the necessity for this increase. When I see the government going to great pains to explain an increase in the workers' wages then I will understand there are some changes being made in this country for the benefit of the people as a whole. In Sydney, Nova Scotia, the workers tried for a period of from two to two and a half years to get an increase, and then they were told to go and renegotiate and they would get it. They got it the other day, but it took them approximately five years to get it. These manufacturers have the friendship of the government and the workers have not. When the workers come to the government and ask for higher wages they get treated to a Dutch-uncle lecture by the Prime Minister. But the manufacturers get favoured treatment.

In the United States there was a $5 increase in steel—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. member says that when the workers come to the government they get a Dutch-uncle lecture from the Prime Minister. I hope he does not assume that one organization speaks for all organizations in this country or for labour generally. I have met three or four labour delegations within the past week or two and I may say to my hon. friend that by three of the four my attitude was highly commended.

An hon. MEMBER: "That ain't the way we heerd it."

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I thank the Prime Minister for his contribution, but as my hon. friend says, "That ain't the way we heerd it." In the United States a $5 increase was given in the price of steel, but there was a corresponding increase in wages. In this country the price has been advanced before any increase in wages. Now when the workers go on strike —and it looks as though they will have to— and ask for an increase in wages, they will be told they are encouraging inflation; and the companies will demand a further increase, and this will have a tendency to split the farmer from the worker. But it will not work, and there is one group in this house who will

see that it does not. The C.C.F. is that one. This action will have a tendency to affect every home in Canada. We listened to lectures during the war telling us how to keep down inflation, to buy bonds, and all the rest of it, but as soon as the war is over—here we go again. The manufacturers are to get their pound of flesh, and the people of the country have to give it.

Mr. PATRICK H. ASHBY (Edmonton East): Agriculture is big business. I do not know who designed these chairs, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes I wonder if those who erected and furnished these buildings had any imagination. Walking down these corridors I get a smell from the match factory across the river, and I say to myself, "What a Hull of a smell!" I sometimes wonder what imagination, sir, the individual had who gave you the title of Mr. Speaker; for I notice that you do the least speaking in the house, although I must admit you say more when you do not get on your feet than many hon. members do who speak from the floor. Instead of giving you a black gown as a symbol of your high office, had I the opportunity I would give you an old fashioned golden ear trumpet about the size of a fog horn, so that you could hear what is being said in the house.

I said that agriculture was big business, with many branches. There are the primary producers, and there are the farm implement manufacturers, the packing plants, the transportation companies, the wholesalers, the retailers, all serving the consumer. I do not think I can do better than to read from *Hansard* of December 14 last at page 3491. I may be criticized for agreeing with this, but I believe it was the statement of a great man:

> A member of parliament represents the people of the nation at large—all classes.

That statement was made by the Prime Minister, and I raise my hat to him for those words. If hon. members will appreciate the truth of what he said on that occasion they will realize we are not here to represent the farm machinery companies. We are here to represent the farmers as well—all classes. I do not see how any human being could utter greater words than those, and if the individual members of the Liberal party realize their significance, we would go far. In fact, I honestly believe that we in Canada would accomplish a great deal, if the Prime Minister meant what he said, and I am taking it for granted that he did. I am not listening to what other people tell me. He says that we are here to represent all the people, all classes, and I can assure the house that if we get behind the spirit indicated by those words and fight to represent the people of Canada, all the people, we shall go far. Indeed, I believe we can show the world that we in this great dominion can lead mankind out of chaos and into a period of prosperity and happiness such as has never been known before in human history.

The Prime Minister told my wife and me that he was seventy-two years of age. I believe he has an opportunity to leave his name with us for generations to come as a great man; for he has the opportunity to-day to see that all the people of Canada are represented here. I am not a Liberal. I do not believe in liberalism, conservatism, socialism, communism or any other "ism". I believe in results, and I will join with any individual or group of individuals—I think I can speak for this group when I say this—who will truly represent the will of the people. We will join with any party who will represent the will of the people, and we will give that party our whole-hearted support.

Let me read some more. The Prime Minister said:

> I do not think it is desirable . . . that any man should come here to represent any organization except his own constituency. I do not care whether it is a trade union organization or any other organization, a man ought to be here to represent the general interests of his constituents.

As things are to-day, with this 12½ per cent increase, there is only one way that it can be paid and that is by the farmer, through a lowering of his standard of living. And the farmer, of all people in Canada, is the one who has suffered most during this war. I know that, because I was farming during the war, and so were my wife and children and the wives and children of other farmers throughout Canada. They toiled and sweated, the majority of them without pay or remuneration of any kind. During the war our neighbour's boys were taken out of school to work on a farm, as was many a son, and those boys worked not for a mere eight hours a day but for ten and sixteen hours a day. I remember one night, when it started to rain those boys could not go to bed but had to continue working up until midnight in order to protect their crops and they were working with old worn-out machinery. Three of these boys did not want to bother their mother, who was already too tired from the day's work. They were too tired even to go and wash. They went to sleep in a shack which was filled with the fumes of a motor used for charging batteries, and the next morning the mother found her sons there, cold and dead. This is just an indication of the sacrifices that were made by farm boys, farm

women and men during the war. Those who are trying to carry on are now being asked to pay, and pay in hard-earned money, to replace their worn-out machinery.

What results do we desire? We want to live here in Canada, and we can live. The method that we are now using in dealing with this problem is not the only one. There are alternative methods, and I can assure you, sir, that we can reward the farm machinery companies with a 12½ per cent increase, enabling them to continue the service they are rendering to the workers in the factories and at the same time sell the machinery for less than 12½ per cent higher. We can cut the price twenty-five per cent lower than pre-war prices and sell to the farmers without loss to anyone. It is merely a matter of method. There are a dozen methods, devised and known, some good, some bad, which will enable us to do that. What is more, we can cut the price of farm produce to the consumer; for the ultimate object we have in producing is to enable the consumer to enjoy the fruits of the production. Just as we produced war materials to the tune of billions of dollars, shipped them overseas and delivered them to the enemy, absolutely free, so we can produce farm machinery and give it free to the farmers without loss to anyone. It is merely a little different method; that is all.

We can double the production of all farm produce at any time agriculture is free to go ahead. The machinery companies will produce the necessary machinery; I have no doubt whatever of that. They are the experts, and if they are given the opportunity to do so, they can produce machinery which will enable one farmer to produce as much as a hundred farmers did before. I can guarantee to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) that if farmers are given their freedom to produce, we can do more than double production; we can produce ten pounds of butter and ten quarts of milk for every pound of butter and quart of milk produced before, without increasing the number of live stock on our farms, without increasing the acreage in production, and at no additional cost to the consumer. In fact we shall be able to sell even cheaper. It is merely a matter of method. Therefore I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is wrong to force the farmer to pay more for his farm machinery. He can be given the finest machinery and pay less for it than he is paying now.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, in this case it is quite evident that the ruling was decided upon after the representations were made by the manufacturers of implements. I doubt very much whether the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) sought the advice of the farmers or any farmers' organization. I should be greatly surprised if they had approved it. There is more to it. I have often complained that members of parliament are not consulted. If we had been consulted we would have informed the government of the difficulty that the farmers endured during the war. They have been striving very hard not only to farm the land but especially to secure machinery. How many times did I write to secure jeeps for the farmers? The answer was no. How many times did I write to secure trucks and trailers for them? The answer was wait, wait. Sometimes I received one permit but there are many farmers who got nothing.

I was shocked the other day when I saw that in spite of the fact that the farmers of our community cannot get not only what they want but what they need, that boxes of trucks were shipped to Finland, for instance, a country with which we do not yet know whether we are still at war. It goes on like that. Everything is good for the outside and our own people are told to wait, to wait, to wait, and that they will be looked after in due course.

The increase in price may affect the farmers only if they can buy the implements. It may look a little strange, but if the farmers are precluded from buying the farm implements that they need the price may go up but it will be a matter of indifference to them. They will have to cultivate with their hands. Well, we have passed that age. I hope that farmers will be given due consideration.

I cannot congratulate the chair, but I shall tell Mr. Speaker of my appreciation of the fact that he has given hon. members of the house an opportunity to give some information to the government about the situation of farmers throughout the country. I complained many times about the dominion Department of Agriculture which serves no purpose in eastern Canada. I want the department to be abolished and the expenditures of the department to be distributed proportionately to the farmers in each province. This may be the view an extremist, but until that is done I hope that the farmers of the east will be given the consideration to which they are entitled. I hope that the department will not insist on putting into force a ruling such as the one we heard read a moment ago.

There is another point that I want to insist upon. The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Archibald) said just a word about it. We

are told that all the financial machinery of the government is there to prevent inflation. If there is an increase of 12½ per cent for the manufacture of farm implements that 12½ per cent increase should be for all, and then it will be a 12½ per cent step toward inflation. Now I use reasoning to the Minister of Finance and all the experts who surround him. We should not make prices higher because the country will be at a loss in a very short time if we pay more for this and if we pay more for that. If the farmers cannot get more and if labour gets higher wages that will be inflation. If that is not inflation, what is it? I am puzzled about it. I want the minister and the government to give the farmers the same consideration that they give to any other group.

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a few words on this matter. When I heard the minister announce a twelve and a half per cent increase in the price of farm machinery it seemed to me another example of the patchwork quilt policy of the wartime prices and trade board. They set up a price ceiling scheme shortly after the beginning of the war. Since then they have found it necessary to change that ceiling from time to time, to change something here and change something there, until it has become a fearful and wonderful thing to see, so that at the present time no one knows where they are at.

I am sorry indead that the minister's statement is not yet in print, because I should have liked to study it a little before making up my mind as to whether or not this increase is justified. I am not going to condemn the increase in the price of farm implements until I do know whether or not it is justified. I recall that a few years ago this house set up a committee of which I was member, to investigate the prices of farm implements. I know at that time a real attempt was made to prove that the prices of farm implements were too high, but I was never convinced of this. I thought the companies made out a very good case to show that their profits were fairly reasonable, and that they could not continue to produce if prices were reduced to any considerable extent. I also recall that at about the same time the present government saw fit to allow agricultural implements to come into this country free of duty, stating this was done in order to lower the cost of the implements of production used on the farm. The present increase does not look very much like lowering the cost of these implements of production If I were to make an offhand suggestion I would say that present prices may be legitimate and fully justified, byt I want to point out that once more, in relation to this price increase, the farmer is the forgotten man, because his interests have not been taken into account. I know the minister will say there have been increases in the prices of certain farm products. It is true that we had a recent increase of four cents in the price of butter and $2 in the price of hogs, but that does not begin to establish a balanced economy in this country as far as the farmer is concerned.

To a very great extent the farmer bore the brunt of increased costs of production during the war. Lately he has been getting a lower price for his wheat than is being paid in the United States. He has been getting a lower price for his beef cattle than he would obtain if he were permitted to ship them to the United States. He has been getting a lower price for cheese than he would receive if it were sent to the United States. I could go on down the line showing that the farmer has lost out in a great many ways. Now we are told that there is to be an increase in the cost of his implements of production. I wonder if this twelve and a half per cent increase will guarantee that the farmer will get sufficient implements with which to carry on. During the war the farmer was not able to buy the implements he required, and to day many of his machines are obsolete. Labour is also very scarce. In my own riding an investigation was made which showed that in this dairy county there was an average of only twelve men to every thousand acres. The farmer needs new implements, and unless he can get the money with which to buy them he will not be in a position to carry on. During the war the farmer was loyal enough to work twelve or fifteen hours a day in order to produce foodstuffs, but now the war is over he is inclined to sit back and take things a little more easily. That I think is what he intends to do, unless he is given a better deal.

I do not intend to say anything further, but I do believe that if this increase in the farmers' cost of production has been found necessary, there should have been corresponding increases in the prices of the things the farmers produce.

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I was not in the house when the minister gave his explanation for the increase in the cost of farm machinery; possibly if I had been here I would not have found it necessary to speak now. However, since eighty per cent of my constituents are farmers I know this is going to be a heavy burden upon them. In

the maritime provinces we have very little manufacturing of farm implements. Years ago we manufactured our own farm equipment, but as everyone knows this industry is now carried on in the central provinces, so with us it is all pay out and nothing coming in, as far as farm machinery is concerned.

It seems to me this twelve and a half per cent represents a very large increase in the prices of farm machinery. We all know that such machinery is very scarce, and we all know that during the war farmers worked with worn out machines. We also know that as a result we must have mass production, for there must be a tremendous need for farm equipment throughout the country, which also should mean mass sales. As some one has pointed out, this in itself should mean that the cost of farm machinery ought not to rise to any great extent. I mentioned that farmers have had to carry on with worn out machinery. We all know that if there is a farm auction anywhere in the district the farmers flock to it by the hundreds in order to purchase whatever machinery may be available.

My main reason for rising, Mr. Speaker, was to point out to the minister that one particular class will be greatly affected by this increase in price. I refer to the soldier settler, the man who has just returned after five years of service overseas; the man who is being encouraged by the Department of Veterans Affairs and by the government in general to take up farming. He is beginning from scratch, as it were. As the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) knows, we in the veterans committee are trying to make things as easy as possible for these soldier settlers, and I fear this is going to be a direct slap at these men, who have planned on buying their machinery at current prices. Now they will find they must pay twelve and a half per cent more, which I am sure will be a great disappointment to them. I hope that some further arrangements may be made which will be equitable as far as the veterans are concerned.

I might also point out to the minister, as other hon. members have mentioned, that here in Canada we are trying to stem the flow from the farms to the cities. Our cities and towns are greatly overcrowded; we have thousands of men and women in them without homes, while in the country we have hundreds of homes without people living in them. I think everything possible should be done to encourage the trek not from the country to the cities but back from the cities and towns to the country. Otherwise I fear we are going to have a very unbalanced economy, and a very unbalanced situation in this country. Increases such as these are going to make this great problem harder to solve, instead of helping us find a solution.

I do not think I have anything further to say. As I said before, I was not in the house when the minister made his explanation. There may be some good and sufficient reason for this increase; but as the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) said a few moments ago I feel that this burden should not be placed upon the agriculturists of this country alone but that some way should be found of having it borne by all the people. We should encourage our farmers. They are given four cents per pound increase in the price of butter, but the farmers in my constituency—and in that constituency they are chiefly dairy farmers—do not consider that increase was enough. They have tried to produce butter during the war at ceiling prices, with the result that thousands of them went out of butter production and sold their raw milk, or engaged in the production of cheese.

These matters should be carefully considered. I hope it has been well considered, and that it will not react unfavourably—as it seems it might—to the farmers of this country.

Mr. T. J. BENTLEY (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I listened closely when the minister spoke. This was one occasion when he spoke so that I could hear him, and for that reason I believe what he has said is clear to me. His statement indicated his belief that the evidence produced by farm machinery manufacturers was sufficient to justify an increase in the price of farm machinery, as indicated by the wartime prices and trade board.

I have here a brief statement, which I shall read:

> The demand for farm machinery will not be met completely until 1947, according to a statement made by F. M. Morton, vice-president of the International Harvester Company. Mr. Morton says the supply of parts is easing, but there is still a labour shortage. A shortage of man-power in the foundries particularly is preventing full production.

He made that statement some time around September of last year, and made no mention about prices.

There is a widespread opinion in the country that when what we in this corner describe as capitalistic or monopolistic enterprise makes a submission to the Right Hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) they meet a sympathetic judge. I do not impute any ulterior motives either to the minister or to the companies; but I submit that in each

case where a person is charged with a crime the judge permits the submission of evidence from both sides. The facts which can be gathered by either side are presented.

The people of this country have not had access to those facts. They have not had an opportunity of hearing the parties to the case. Surely the judges should be those who have always had to pay these high prices. But they have not had an opportunity to bring their side forward, nor have they heard the evidence to which the minister and his advisers have listened so courteously.

As was pointed out by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), the leader of this group, we have supported the government's policy of control, even though there has been some discontent in rural constituencies of the west, as expressed to us in letters. We supported the price ceiling of $1.55 for wheat on the ground of our belief that it was necessary for the reconstruction of the world, for the feeding of its peoples, and to make it possible for Great Britain and other countries to have sufficient agricultural products without suffering too heavily the penalties of war. If the present increase in farm implements is allowed to continue, any support I have given to a programme of that kind will have to be withdrawn, and I shall have to join forces with those who are demanding a substantial increase in the price of farm products.

If we applied the 12½ per cent increase to the price of wheat, it would bring that price to somewhere in the neighbourhood of $1.75. I was deeply impressed by what was said by the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks), when he referred particularly to the veterans. Under the Veterans Land Act the veteran is permitted to purchase stock and equipment to a value of $1,200. Those of us who know something about agriculture have known that this amount is utterly inadequate, at present prices, to obtain proper equipment for any young farmer who hopes to operate a prairie farm, and to make a living from it.

This increase of 12½ per cent just makes it that much more difficult, with the result that many young veterans will simply say, "Oh, what is the use?" As the hon. member for Royal pointed out, instead of going on a farm, the veteran will say, "I hope that somehow or another, through some process, I can get a job in one of these factories. Some day the government may allow an increase of one per cent of the wage scale in that factory, when they are allowing 12½ per cent on the sale of the product."

When I said at the outset that I believed all the evidence should be submitted, I was speaking seriously. Not only do I believe that, but I urge that such evidence should be as conclusive as possible. I had a reason for making that statement, because I would point out that, if an opportunity is given, better evidence can be submitted at a later time.

Let me go back a few years, to the thirties, and remind the house through you, sir, that the federal government in the United States, the government in Ottawa, and the Liberal government in Saskatchewan in 1939 each conducted surveys into the cost of farm machinery, and all found that farm machinery prices to farmers were too high.

Let me read now just one paragraph from page 10 of the report of the special committee on farm implement prices and distribution set up by the legislature of Saskatchewan. The report is dated March 27, 1939, and I draw attention to the date in particular, because it was a Liberal government which set up that committee—not a C.C.F. government. In its report the provincial government referred to the Ottawa inquiry. One paragraph, headed "Price structure", is as follows:

> Early in 1936, the companies announced an increase of price in farm implements amounting to 4·4 per cent as found by the Ottawa committee. It was this particular increase, announced after a substantial reduction in the tariff from 25 per cent to 12½ per cent, that gave rise to the Ottawa inquiry. Despite a further reduction in the tariff to 7½ per cent and despite the findings of the Ottawa committee that this increase was not justified and that the prices of farm implements had been, over the years 1913-1936, too high, despite, too, a definite finding that there was an excessive mark-up over cost on cream separators and repair parts, and that the prices of these should be particularly and substantially reduced, this committee finds that none of these findings were given effect to, and that, in addition, further price increases occurred in 1937.

They also occurred at later dates. With that evidence, and as a result of other submissions before this committee of the legislative assembly of Saskatchewan the recommendation came in that the committee did not—and remember that it was a Liberal government—believe that some things should be done concerning which recommendations had been made. That had reference to the recommendation that the government should take over the manufacturing and distribution of farm machinery. But they did recommend, and the government supported the recommendation, that cooperative organizations be set up for the purpose of doing that job.

I wish now to offer some evidence of what could be done in the future, and of what might have been done in the past had it not been for the war.

Mr. COLDWELL: That recommendation was in the Ottawa report, too.

Mr BENTLEY: Yes, it is in the Ottawa report, too. When this report came out the western farmers said, "All right, if the load is on us to do the job, we have already built quite a number of cooperative organizations in the past. We know we have been able to reduce the cost of manufacturing gasoline from crude oil. We have tried that out, and made it stick, despite the fact that the major oil companies submitted that they could not reduce the cost of manufacturing gasoline." I draw that particularly to the attention of the Minister of Finance. Our little cooperative in Regina reduced the cost substantially, almost cutting it in two.

When this recommendation came out the farmers said, "All right, we will try it." It will be remembered that this report came out in March, 1939, just a few months before the outbreak of war. In the following autumn they were ready to begin organizing a cooperative implement company. Canadian Cooperative Implements Limited took out a dominion government charter, and various provincial charters under provincial cooperative laws. The dominion government does not have a cooperative law, and perhaps the legal end of the government can explain why they did it as they did. Anyway, Canadian Cooperative Implements Limited got started. They were to raise capital. The idea was to finance themselves and then make a deal with one or more of the implement manufacturing companies to take a large proportion or all of their output, failing which they would buy or build factories and manufacture for themselves. They raised quite a bit of capital, but let me remind the house that the year 1939 was just about the end of what were known as the hungry thirties. There was no great amount of capital in the farmers' pockets to mobilize the necessary working capital to get Canadian Cooperative Implements Limited going quickly before we found ourselves immersed in a war, and the War Measures Act and war regulations started to take effect. Nobody complained about that, and we do not now, because the war had to take precedence over everything. One of the war orders was to the effect that no new business could be started without permission and that there must be no new outlets for consumer goods. So that Canadian Cooperative Implements Limited never got to functioning until quite recently, and now they are ready to go ahead.

Let me remind the house that in our inquiry as to the cost of making gasoline from crude oil we found that, in spite of what the major oil companies had said, their figures were too high. The cooperative proved that because the major oil companies met the competition of the cooperative, and I have seen no reduction in the price of their stocks as quoted in the daily market reports appearing in the press. In spite of the evidence which the Minister of Finance listens to so sympathetically and then tries to convince the house, I believe that there is no real reason for this increase of 12½ per cent in the price of farm machinery. Let me refer the house to Mr. Morton's statement. He never said, last September, that more machinery would be produced if the price was allowed to go up. He said that labour shortages were the main cause of the scarcity of farm implements and that it would be 1947 before the farmer had a full line of machinery available to him.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) and the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) have said that they do not believe this 12½ per cent increase will have any effect whatsoever on the supply of agricultural implements in the summer of 1946. Mr. Morton said that the demand could be met in 1947, but he did not say that it was necessary to have any increase in price whatsoever. Because of that I think the minister has been too ready to listen sympathetically to profit-hungry capitalistic organizations which have continually made more money than they required and had more economic and other kinds of power in this country than any group of people are entitled to and which have exercised that power over a very large group of extremely productive and important citizens, the farmers of Canada, who need infinitely more sympathy from ministers in charge of departments in this government than these companies need.

I should just like to give some indication of the sharp rise there has been in the price of farm machinery in the few years of which we have been speaking. I quote from the report of the special committee on farm implement prices and distribution adopted by the Saskatchewan legislative assembly on March 27, 1939:

> The Ottawa committee found, as a result of its exhaustive inquiry, that a binder was truly typical in all essentials of "small implements" generally.

On the next page the report shows the increase in the price of a binder from 1936 to 1939. This is the cash price at Regina, and is typical of the increase that has been made in the price of small implements. So that you can add the same percentage increases to the prices of any type of farm machinery, including binders and much larger machinery. A binder at Regina cost in 1936, $281; in 1937, $295; in 1938, $324.75; in 1939, $324.75. Those

prices are on top of the reduction that was made in the tariff from 25 to 12½ per cent by the dominion government in 1936, I believe.

In the face of that kind of evidence I urge the minister not to allow this increase in the price of farm machinery until Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited have got going to the point where they are manufacturing and having an influence on the cost of manufacture and distribution of farm machinery. Then, when we have a cooperative concern operating in competition with the combine of private companies—and that is what it is—there will be far better evidence to show whether or not an increase in the price is warranted. I can assure the minister and the government that, while that competition is going on, none of the big implement manufacturing companies in Canada which have made representations to him and the wartime prices and trade board to have this 12½ per cent increase put into effect will give up in despair. On the contrary, they will find some way to get along without this 12½ per cent increase.

I wish to bring one more matter to the attention of the minister. Every time that an increase in price has been granted to the implement manufacturing companies—I could cite many more tables from this little booklet which is good Sunday reading when you come home from church or at any other time—that price never goes down; it always stays there or goes up. If you grant this 12½ per cent increase, there it will remain, not considered by them as a concession on your part to help them over a difficult spot but as something they have a right to; and you will find them coming back again in a few months for a further increase in price. Whatever increase in price is granted to them they hang on to with a fist of iron. Then in a few months they will come back again to the government to sympathetic ministers like the Minister of Finance with evidence to show that their factories are going to tumble down, their homes be destroyed and the whole economic structure go to pieces if they are not granted a further increase.

No evidence has been produced to show that the implement manufacturing companies need this increase which the minister is authorizing at this time.

Mr. L. W. SKEY (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few observations on this question because in my riding farm implements are produced and many of my constituents are employed in their production. My observations, therefore, will be particularly directed toward the point of view of workers' wages. Before dealing with that, may I say that I believe it will be only a matter of minutes before some member of the government will rise in his place, look across at this side and say: What are you complaining about? You have been advocating the removal of price ceilings from many products.

I would therefore remind the government at the outset that foremost in our programme for raising ceilings is the raising of the ceiling on workers' wages, and, second, raising the ceiling on the price of farm products. Both of these policies are at complete loggerheads with the present policy of the government. Therefore the government must not be surprised if they find the Progressive Conservative party advocating that the present policy be given further thought. I believe the minister should tell us whether there is a wage increase for the workers in the farm machinery manufacturing companies which is to be discovered, perhaps, by the same means that the steel workers discoverd theirs, or whether this is a direct advance in price and the manufacturer will get the complete benefit. The minister should also tell us whether the wartime prices and trade board have any machinery of coordination with the national labour board, because it seems to me that the government is out of step with itself all the time; that these two boards do not coordinate their work, and that as a result, when the price of a commodity increases the workers must separately seek their share of the price increase.

But my real reason in rising, Mr. Speaker, is to deal with this as a fundamental question and not as one purely of the wages of labour or of an increase of price. In my opinion, there are three possible reasons for this price increase. It may be the result of pressure group action upon the government; it may be, as the minister says, to stimulate full production; or it may be to meet a corresponding rise in prices and costs in the United States. I do not believe that the government would submit to a pressure group at this time; at least I will give them credit for that. I do not think the minister can be convinced that a 12½ per cent increase of the selling price of farm machinery will result in full production or, indeed, increase it. I submit that this price rise is probably caused by the inflation of United States economy which is having its effect on us at the present time and which is being felt all across Canada. The position of this industry is only one instance of the ways in which our country is being influenced by United States prices of accessories and finished parts. The government are not tackling this problem from its fundamental cause; when they permit a rise in the selling price of one group of articles

they are not going to the root of the matter. The root of the matter is that our Canadian economy is not so organized that it can protect itself against the economy of the United States of America. Fundamentally, it cannot protect itself because the United States is suffering inflation at the present time, and in my opinion this is only a beginning of its effect on Canada. We are going to meet this problem in connection with many other lines of goods especially in cases where we find ourselves dependent on the United States for either fully manufactured products, semi-finished products, or articles which are assembled in this country. Instead of putting the wartime prices and trade board to work to figure out various price increases, we should put them to work to figure out ways to protect our Canadian economy from these dangers of inflation; and it should be the job of the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) to see that all these products which we have to import, to assemble and to use in the manufacture of this machinery should begin to be produced by ourselves here and now. Then the minister will be protected, and he will not have price rises forced upon him by inflation south of our border.

I rise simply to submit these two points to the house: that no mention has been made of wage increases; that no mention has been made of the fact that the Massey-Harris Company of Canada, which was on war work, has been unable to increase its wages, and actually, at a time of rising prices, workers are receiving less for their money than they were during the war. The minister should also try to find ways of protecting the Canadian economy from the dangers of inflation in the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend is talking about the Massey-Harris company. May I ask him a question?

Mr. SKEY: Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL: Has he any knowledge whatsoever that they have reduced the wages of their employees?

Mr. CASSELMAN: He did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL: The inference is there.

Mr. SKEY: I have not exact knowledge, except this, that I have been so informed by a number of constituents; and I know one man, whose income over a period of a month was $80. He has approached me and asked if I could find him some other employment. I can give the minister his name if he wishes it.

[Mr. Skey.]

Mr. H. E. BRUNELLE (Champlain): I wish to say a few words on this particular question, in spite of the advice of my doctor, who told me not to take part in any debate. However, I can say that my memory is still very good, and I remember what the government has done for the farmers.

I do not wish my words to be taken as an approbation of higher prices for farm implements. On the contrary, I believe the price of those implements should be lowered. But I am surprised at what I have heard and seen this afternoon. Apparently there are quite a number of people whose memory is not very good or whose memory is quite convenient. I notice that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn) has stated that the farmer is again the forgotten man. Then hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Ashby) reminded the house of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said at one time, that a member, once elected, was a member for the country at large, and he invited the Liberal members to realize that, once a member is elected, he represented the whole country. I also notice that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) stated that the government was proceeding the wrong way in allowing farm implement companies to raise their prices. If the leader of the opposition had come to the house earlier instead of being a political rover a few years ago, he would have known that the government had thought of the farmers before this proposition came before the house to-day.

Mr. FRASER: They thought of them but they did not do anything for them.

Mr. BRUNELLE: Let my hon. friend have a little patience. It would seem that his memory is failing, because he was here in 1944 when the government passed the following measure; an act for the support of prices of agricultural products.

Mr. STIRLING: What did they do with it?

Mr. BRUNELLE: The act, which was cited as the Agricultural Prices Support Act of 1944, was assented to on the 15th of August of that year.

An hon. MEMBER: What good is it?

Mr. BRUNELLE: Just wait until it becomes necessary for this act to be put into operation. I would remind hon. members that the government did think of the farmers in providing that the prices of agricultural products be stabilized. That act was passed in 1944. I have heard complaints to-day that the government was not thinking of the farmers. I repeat that the government did think of the

farmers in 1944, but apparently a great many members who were not then in the house did not know of that act, while other members who were in the house previously had forgotten about it. Let me quote section 3 of the act:

There shall be an agricultural prices support board under the direction of the minister consisting of three members, including a chairman and a vice-chairman, to be appointed by the governor in council and who shall hold office during pleasure.

I quote next from section 9, which deals with the powers of the board. When one farm product does not bring to the farmers a sufficient or adequate or profitable price the board shall have the following powers:

(a) to prescribe from time to time, with the approval of the governor in council, prices at which the board may purchase agricultural products in the market;

(b) to purchase at such prices any agricultural product, if such product, on inspection, meets standards as to grade and quality prescribed by or under any act of the parliament of Canada; provided that any agricultural product, for which dominion government standards have not been established, may be purchased by the board on such basis of quality as the board may prescribe;

(c) to pay to the producers of an agricultural product directly or through such agent as the board may determine the difference between a price prescribed by the board with the approval of the governor in council for such product and the average price, as determined by the board, at which such product is sold in the market during a specified period if such average price is below such prescribed price.

After hearing the remarks that have been made this afternoon, particularly those of the last speaker, who addressed himself to the Minister of Finance, accusing him of siding with the big interests in this country, I thought it was only fair that someone should show that the Minister of Finance and other ministers as well were looking after the interests of farmers before this date.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): I am very happy to be able to make a few observations on this particular item, representing as I do, for the most part, an agricultural constituency. When this announcement was made on Friday, through the radio and the press, I could not help thinking that here was another piece of glaring evidence of the result of government by bureaucracy. Over and over again, during my experience in this house, I have had to ask myself why we are here anyway. Particularly during the war years, even though we permitted a certain amount of authoritarianism to exist in government administration, I have wondered just what power parliament itself has really had. Announcements are made from time to time. Nobody seems to know where regulations come from. Ministers seem to reach into the air and suddenly, like a bolt from the blue, an announcement is made. No one is consulted. Parliament may be sitting at the time but parliament is never consulted. Things are done by somebody who sits at a desk behind the scenes and I almost have to ask myself, who on earth is running the country. Do the people's representatives after all have anything to say in the matter?

This particular announcement, involving as it does an increase in the price of farm machinery by 12½ per cent, is no little thing. It means a great deal to the farmer because 12½ per cent is quite a rise, quite a slice. If it had been two or three per cent they would, I am certain, have objected. But 12½ per cent is a lot. I do not believe that the method by which these price increases are made is the right one.

Take, for instance, as a comparison the matter of tariff items. When there is to be a change in the tariff the matter is brought before the tariff board, a body appointed to look into all such questions involving an increase or decrease in tariffs. Very often there comes to our desks a notice that the tariff board will be sitting on a certain date on a certain item, and the matter is known throughout the country. People can appear before the board and make their submissions as to why or why not such a tariff item should be increased or decreased. After that, it is included in the annual budget. It is brought into the house and debated and becomes part of the legislation of the country. That is all right. I do not complain in that event. But in comparison, here is a matter the effect of which is the same as an increase in the tariff structure and yet we have not had an opportunity of discussing it. An announcement is made. It is virtually the law of the land. When the minister is replying I wonder if he would mind telling us what the process is, what procedure is followed when it is decided to raise the price of a particular item. Does the wartime prices and trade board sit behind closed doors? Is the country aware that it is considering such an increase?

Will the minister tell us whether farmers' organizations were invited to make a submission on this particular matter. I should like him to tell the country what the procedure is when the wartime prices and trade board wishes to take certain action. I desire to know why such a matter as important as this—and it certainly is important—is not brought before the house in some way by which the minister can get the sense of the house by a vote. To my mind, a matter of this kind should have

some such procedure. A tariff item would. Why not this one? Notwithstanding all the government's technical, financial and economic arguments, I wonder whether they would take a chance on getting the support of the members of this house who are the representatives of agricultural constituencies, by putting this to a vote. I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government dare not do that. I will suggest what the government is doing. I will suggest that it is attempting to hide political party weakness behind bureaucratic authoritarianism. Now is the time when we can see democracy in action. Here is the opportunity for democracy to cut across party lines and I declare to you, sir, that it is my firm opinion that the government dare not take that chance. I challenge it to take it.

One of the minister's arguments for the rise in price—if I heard his announcement correctly—was that secondhand machinery had been selling at auction sales at a good price. I admit that is so. I have attended at some of these auction sales and I must say that I marvelled at the prices some farmers were paying. But that is no argument in this case, because at an auction sale there are some farmers who have a wad of money to spend, but there are others who have not and at an auction sale the small farmer may be at a disadvantage.

An hon. MEMBER: He always is.

Mr. HANSELL: Yes. Action is taken in this matter which affects all farmers, small ones as well as large ones. I protest because of that. I protest because of another matter. I do not know whether the minister will consider this to be important or not, but the increase in the price of farm machinery comes at an unfortunate time. It comes when the farmer is commencing his year's operations. Perhaps he will have to obtain a line of credit at the bank. I do not know what the procedure may be, but perhaps he will have to finance the year's operations. He now finds before he starts that he is likely to have a further burden in the rise in price of his machinery. Let us remember that to-day farming is carried on almost entirely by the machine. I do not know whether I should mention this, but it was not very long ago that this house took action to raise the salaries of certain people in this country.

An hon. MEMBER: In this house.

Mr. HANSELL: My hon. friend reminds me that I should say, "in this house". I was in favour of that. As a matter of fact, we have been fighting for the farmer for a long time and neglecting ourselves. When I went back to my constituency I found a certain reaction to that in some places. I thought I could explain it all right to some of these people. Nevertheless it did leave a bad taste in some of their mouths when our indemnities were raised. My reply to that was that they should have spoken before because the resolution was on the order paper for several months waiting to get the sense of the country. Be that as it may, we took that action, and I believe we did the right thing. But if it left a bad taste in some mouths, what will the taste be now when they realize that parliament can raise their own salaries and also the price of farm machinery? It is not good. I say it is unfortunate that it comes at this time for that reason. Whether the argument is a sound one or not I do not know.

There is another unfortunate thing about the timing. This is the month when the farmers are making out their income tax. They find that they have to fork out their money in payment of their income tax; they also find themselves faced with a 12½ per cent rise in the price of the machinery which they have to buy.

An hon. MEMBER: It is poor political strategy.

Mr. HANSELL: My hon. friend says that it is poor political strategy but I have never known the Liberal government to be far behind when it comes to political strategy. Do hon. members not see the strategy? It is not a party matter. That is what I said a moment ago. The party can hide behind some bureaucratic board and say, "Oh, we did not do it; the party did not do it. We have the wartime prices and trade board. They are competent men. Here is Mr. Gordon, a respected gentleman who is paid a large salary. He is deputy governor of the Bank of Canada. These men know their business. They have gone into all this. It was the decision of the board; it was not the government." That is the political strategy, and the government, which in the final analysis must take the responsibility, can now hide behind the bureaucrats.

Mr. PROBE: The government may have in mind reducing the price again by, say six per cent just before the next election.

Mr. HANSELL: That may be the idea. Perhaps they have a long-range policy.

In conclusion, may I say that all these things will happen just so long as the government remains confined to the present financial system. They are going to meet this over and over again. They are going to find they have solved one price problem only to find that

another bobs up somewhere else. I have made my observations. I shall repeat what I said a moment ago. Let the government bring in some little measure now whereby this house can vote on this matter and see whether the people, through their elected representatives, want this thing to happen. I challenge them to do so.

Mr. R. R. KNIGHT (Saskatoon City): Mr. Speaker, the fact that I have risen to my feet some ten times this afternoon should surely be sufficient proof, if there were no other evidence, that this is a matter of public interest and concern.

First of all, I should like to congratulate my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Bentley), who has given an excellent argument in regard to this matter, and also other hon. members from this side of the house. I am sorry I cannot congratulate with equal sincerity hon. gentlemen on the opposite side who have made a rather feeble attempt to defend the action of the government.

I should like to emphasize what was said by the hon. member for Swift Current in regard to cooperation. I believe cooperation has solved many of our problems in the west and, if given a fair chance, I believe it will solve this one also. In precipitating this debate I believe the government—or did they precipitate it?—naturally would expect every hon. member from a rural constituency in this country to be on his feet to speak to an order such as the one now under discussion. I do not represent a strictly rural community, yet I offer no apology for speaking on this matter, as one who represents a city in the centre of a farming area, as one who for some years of my life farmed, as one who has lived among farmers for at least forty years, and as one who knows that there is no question upon which farmers, and perhaps particularly western farmers, because they use more machinery, feel they have suffered more injustice than on this same question of protected farm machinery. I am not much of a politician; this thing is new to me, but somehow there is a feeling to-day of political electricity in the air, if I may put it in that way. Perhaps, sir, it is the beginning of the end; perhaps this is the Charybdis upon which this government will founder. I almost said "flounder," but then they have been doing that right along. So that I wish to protest emphatically against this order which will increase the cost of farm machinery without at the same time increasing to the same extent the price of farm products.

In connection with this situation I should like also to mention labour. I know the cost of labour on a percentage basis has always been a very small component in the selling price of farm machinery, and I am wondering whether labour will look upon this situation with equanimity, particularly after the, shall I say, not very courteous treatment one branch of labour received not long ago. I remember the protestations of this government and of the party it represents. I remember how price stabilization was mentioned to us as a reason for the purchase of victory bonds, particularly in connection with the last loan. I remember we were told that if we purchased victory bonds we would prevent inflation. Well, we bought the bonds; but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that soon we shall be surrendering our bonds, as we surrendered them the last time, in order to meet the rising costs of living owing to the inflation which will be produced by measures of this kind. I have great sympathy for the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). We have been on a spending spree. Now he thinks we have come to the time when spending will have to be curbed, and that is not an easy thing to do.

In connection with this business of farm implements I remember that when I was farming you sometimes needed an implement for which you did not have the money. They always sent around a nice, plausible young men with curly hair and blue eyes, a very pleasant chap, who wanted to sell you an implement. You asked him in for dinner. You did not even discuss such things as interest; you signed on the dotted line, and you had the use of the machine. But then came the dawn, or I should say then came the following fall or the fall after that. Instead of this fresh-cheeked boy you were faced with a different type of gentleman, a man with a very stern face who came around to see about the note. When you could not pay you discovered you had signed a little clause somewhere down near the bottom which entitled the company to charge twelve per cent on overdue payments. I have signed such a clause, sir, and I have paid the money on the basis of that signature.

Well, the Minister of Finance is finding some difficulty, and he will continue to find difficulty because this process is going to be progressive. He will find it hard to continue to be a Jekyll and a Hyde at the same time. I did mention labour a moment ago, but I want to emphasize that point. Is labour once more to be forgotten, as in the past the industrial worker has received little enough as his share of the cost of this machinery? What is he to receive now, if this measure goes through? The hon. member for Dauphin

(Mr. Zaplitny) threw out the challenge to rural members on the other side of the house. I shall be interested to hear what they have to say. For instance, I shall be interested to hear the opinion of my respected neighbour, the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), who represents the rural community next to my home city. I shall listen with interest to find out how the other rural members on the government side react to this order, which evidently has come to a great many of them with as much surprise as it has come to us.

As far as the arguments are concerned, Mr. Speaker, I feel that they have been well and sufficiently covered by hon. members on this side, and I shall let it go at that for the time being.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I do not feel it necessary to say very much, but I should like to comment briefly on some points that have been overlooked by those who have already spoken. First, I should like to remind the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) that on Friday last I asked him what action was being taken by the cabinet to reduce or remove tariffs on farm implements. At that time he told me these announcements were not made until the budget was brought down, and that therefore it would be out of order to make a statement at this time. Perhaps he had me in mind when on Friday evening the announcement was made of this 12½ per cent increase in prices of farm implements manufactured in Canada. Perhaps we shall get a 2½ per cent decrease in some of the tariff items; then in response to that we may have another increase of ten or twelve per cent in the prices of our implements, as has happened since the investigation of 1938.

Dealing with tariffs, I feel that we are forgetting these matters, which is something we should not do. From personal investigation I know that many of the things we are using in Canada can be purchased in the United States for one-half their price here. Why should that be so? At the same time farmers in the United States are being paid much higher prices for their produce than we are receiving in Canada. Perhaps that is what we get for the privilege of living in Canada, paying high interest rates, and taking the skim milk that is handed to us as farmers right along. Some reason or another may be found for not providing us with specific information as to the actual cost of our tariffs. The only information I have been able to get was away back in 1931, when the late Hon. Norman Rogers made an investigation which showed that the tariff cost Manitoba a net amount of $29,185,740, or $13.20 per capita. In the same year it cost Saskatchewan $29,228,285, or $28.16 per capita; it cost Alberta $27,909,396, or $26.93 per capita, and British Columbia, $37,737,247, or $22.33 per capita. I would remind the house that in 1931 we had a very low income because of depressed prices for farm produce. In the same year the province of Quebec had a net gain of $31,685,885, or $11.03 per capita. In the case of Ontario the gain on account of the tariff was $51,989,761, or $15.15 per capita.

To come back to 1938 prices, it will be remembered that there was considerable discussion in the house and in committee on the subject. I regret that I was not a member of the committee in that year. The hon. members for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) and Swift Current (Mr. Bentley) have placed certain figures on record; however, very little notice was taken of those figures, although on two occasions, while the investigation was taking place, the machinery companies increased their prices.

Perhaps the minister is not aware of the fact that one of the large manufacturing companies had a secret reserve of $40 million which was ferreted out by the investigators at that time. But did the minister, or the wartime prices and trade board, take advantage of this opportunity to learn whether the companies which are demanding these increases have secret reserves? Secret reserves seem to be all right for some people, particularly some of the machine companies and the chartered banks.

An appeal has been made by the government for increased production. As on many other occasions, the farmers of Canada have responded and have done their share. What would happen if the farmers at this time went on a sit-down strike, as did industry back in 1939, just a couple of weeks before the outbreak of war? If the farmers took that action it would be said that they are unpatriotic. I am not sure what they are going to do. Certain sections of the farming community are considering sit-down strikes or non-delivery strikes, if present conditions are carried on.

I am not in favour of that course of action, because I do not believe that in a democratic country we should be placed in a position where we have to do that sort of thing, and particularly so at this time, when food is so greatly needed in Europe.

In the speech from the throne we find this:

Every encouragement is being given to increasing production.

On the night of March 17 the nine-point programme was announced. Then on March 18 there was an increase of two cents a gallon in the price of motor fuels. That is sabotage of the agricultural industry, that, and other things which have happened since, have been unjust to agriculture. These things have been the means of helping to starve out still further those people in Europe who need food so badly.

What is the matter with this country, when we find intelligent business men carrying on a programme of that kind? In addition to the two-cent advance, we were also carrying a three-cent war tax which, it had been expected, would be removed when the war was declared to be at an end. The official pronouncement respecting the end of the war was made on January 1, but we still have our three-cent war tax, plus the additional two cents. Then, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Swift Current, cooperative associations have shown that it is not necessary to increase the price of gasoline.

I believe I need not say much more, However, again on behalf of the farmers of Canada I demand a percentage of the national income which will compensate them for their contribution, an amount of that national income to which we are entitled.

I believe there should be an adjustment of our income tax set-up for all the people in Canada, something which has been long overdue, and which might take care of this price increase. First of all, however, the increase should be investigated honestly to find out whether it is necessary. If it is found to be necessary, then the provision offered by the hon. members for Peace River (Mr. Low) and Acadia (Mr. Quelch) should be accepted.

Mr. H. W. HERRIDGE (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make only a few brief remarks, because even now I am fairly well exhausted, having risen thirteen times in an effort to take part in this debate.

May I express my disappointment at this increase in the price of agricultural implements, and at the manner in which this has been done. If labour requires an increase in wages, it has to submit proposals and figures which are made known to the public generally. Everything is done in the open. The press carries the facts concerning arbitration or conciliation boards, and nothing can be hidden. If the farmers want an increase in commodity prices they must come out in the open, give their evidence publicly and attempt to prove that they are entitled to increases in their prices, because of increased production costs. In the present instance, however, through the method of handling price increases by the wartime prices and trade board the increase is presented to us as a *fait accompli*.

I fully appreciate the difficulty facing the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), and I believe persons who discuss matters of this type should be constructive in their criticism. It is very easy to make general statements or off-hand remarks. As I said in the debate in reply to the speech from the throne, I believe we are entering into another phase of capitalism. We are developing in Canada a form of state capitalism, and if we are to negotiate the years ahead safely we shall have to use new techniques and develop new methods. This we must do, if we wish to prevent the vicious circle of prices, wages, and inflation.

I suggest that the Minister of Finance and the government consider the possibility of arriving at these decisions in a more democratic way. When it comes to a consideration of prices and wages I suggest that the government, the Department of Labour, the wartime prices and trade board and the ministers involved should call in for consultation representatives of labour, representatives from the farming community and representatives from industry.

I see no way of avoiding economic chaos unless we develop some technique of that type. Then, if we are to reestablish confidence in the country and in one another there must be frankness, and a placing of all the facts on the table. In this way I am sure decisions acceptable to the country at large and receiving its support can be arrived at. The government would still have—and must have—the responsibility for governing the country, but I am sure if we are to negotiate safely the years lying immediately ahead we must develop a technique of that type.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. RONALD MOORE (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock we were discussing the proposed increase in the price of farm implements. We have listened to a number of very good addresses on this important subject and I am glad to say that not one member thus far heard has spoken in favour of this increase. As a member representing one of the agricultural constituencies in western Canada I, too, wish to protest strongly against this increase in the price of agricultural machines. I fully realize the great difficulties in which the minister finds himself in dealing with such matters.

These are difficulties which are probably an aftermath of the war and I expect that they will increase in the future.

I was pleased to hear the minister say that the increase will not apply to the cost of farm tractors. The farm tractor is an important machine in agricultural production; but, as most hon. members are aware, it is not the only machine which the farmers use. Farmers have to buy many other implements, and their purchases will be large because within the next three or four years the farm implements in western Canada will practically all have to be renewed. That is one reason why I am opposing this increase in price.

I consider it a breach of contract to increase the price of farm implements at the present time. The agricultural industry of western Canada, indeed of Canada generally, was stabilized at a certain level during the war years. We had fixed prices for agricultural products, fixed prices in the labour market for wages, and fixed prices for agricultural implements.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member speaks of fixed prices in the labour market. Where does he get that idea?

Mr. MOORE: What I meant to say was that it was done through negotiation under P.C. 1003.

Mr. MITCHELL: No; the hon. member is wrong. There has been a measure of negotiation. It is easy for my hon. friend to say these things when he is back home, but he cannot say them here and get away with them.

Mr. MOORE: I will accept the minister's correction, but I understood that labour negotiations took place under P.C. 1003.

Mr. MITCHELL: That deals with labour relations.

Mr. MOORE: It is practically the same thing.

Mr. MITCHELL: No, it is not.

Mr. MOORE: It looks to me as if we were quibbling, hair-splitting.

Mr. MITCHELL: No. The hon. member was wrong; that is all.

Mr. MOORE: To proceed, Mr. Speaker, I say that the farmers of western Canada will consider this action of the government in raising the prices of agricultural implements a breach of contract, and they would have sound reasons for so thinking. We have set prices for most agricultural products, so that it is practically impossible to-day for these prices to vary except within certain limits.

Now, by reason of this increase in the price of farm machinery, it will be extremely difficult for farmers, especially in western Canada, to produce. That is the position in which they find themselves.

Western economy is largely based on agriculture and on stabilized prices. There was very little objection from Canada last fall when this government proposed a ceiling price on wheat of $1.55 and a floor price of $1 a bushel for a five-year period.

Mr. TUCKER: The price was not set at $1.55.

Mr. MOORE: If the price of farm machinery is now to be increased I think it is only fair that the farmer should be allowed to ask for some change to be made in the price of wheat.

I wish to say a word about the wartime prices and trade board. It seems to me that the board is controlled from above. We seem to have on the board representatives of large industries and financial institutions, people who more or less control the economy of this country; but we have not on the board people who represent the consumers or the farmers or labour, and I think some of the actions of the board during the last few months are a reflection of that. First, the price of gasoline was increased, and now it is farm machinery. Both gasoline and farm machinery have to be bought by farmers at these increased prices; but there are very few increases made in the prices of the products which the farmer has to sell, and I venture to say that one of the reasons for that is that the board is controlled by those who own the means of production. One of the solutions of the problem would be to appoint to the board representatives of labour, representatives of agriculture, representatives of the cooperatives and representatives of the consumers, so that there could be a full discussion from all angles on these subjects that come up for consideration.

With respect to this particular increase in the price of farm machinery, western Canada will use more machinery in the future than she has ever used before. One of the principal machines that will be used by the farmers of the west in the next five or ten years is the combine. I do not know whether this increase will apply to the combine or not; I think we ought to be told. The price of a combine is in the neighbourhood of $3,000, and if there is to be an increase of 12½ per cent in its price it will mean an additional $375. That is a serious increase. I hope that the minister and the government will see fit to rescind this increase in the price of farm machinery.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on this motion, I wish to say first that I am neither unmindful nor unappreciative of the difficult task that confronts the government in maintaining a stable price structure at this time. I would not rise at all at this moment were it not for the fact that I wish to draw the attention of this house to this fact. In maintaining prices and wages, which, after all, is the same thing because wages is the price of labour—or, as the Marxians would put it, the price of labour power—labour is the misery one goes through while delivering labour power.

Quite recently the steel manufacturers came to the wartime prices and trade board for an increase in their commodity, steel. That increased price was granted. Now we have the farm implement manufacturers coming to the wartime prices and trade board, and they have had their request for an increase in prices granted.

Mr. ILSLEY: Only about half. Not what they asked for at all.

Mr. MacINNIS: I did not mean to say they got everything they asked for. In fact, no one knows what they asked for.

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, yes. I said so.

Mr. MacINNIS: The minister knows, but I do not know. I mean that the ordinary rank and file member does not know, but just the men at the top. That is one of the things to which I object. Take the position of organized workers asking for an increase in wages. Generally they first have to take a strike vote. This procedure is to show that they mean business, that if something is not done they will go on strike. But that is a procedure which they have to go through. Then they have to make an application to the regional war labour board. On that board will sit the representatives of employers, representatives of the workers, and a supposedly neutral or impartial chairman or representative of the government. Then that board makes a finding. But that is not the end of it. After that finding is made it must be reported to the national war labour board. Either side, of course, may appeal to the national war labour board against the finding. There again you have the same thing; there will be representatives of labour, representatives of employers, and a representative of the government. But when the employers come for an increase in prices they go into a closed room. There is no representative of labour there. There is no representative of the consumer there. There is nobody there except the officers of the wartime prices and trade board and the people who are asking for the increase. We have one law and one procedure for the workers; we have another law and another procedure for business. And business during the entire war controlled the whole of our economy, and have come out of the war much better than they were when they went into it.

One case which has been brought to my attention is that of the Guelph Stove company, owned exclusively, I believe, by the T. Eaton company. The employees of this company asked for a raise in the basic wage from fifty cents to fifty-five cents. They went to the regional war labour board of Ontario, which granted the increase. The company appealed to the national war labour board. The national war labour board wiped out the increase granted by the regional board; it allowed the employees a few small concessions, something on overtime and perhaps holidays with pay, but denied them the basic increase which had been granted by the regional board. Why do manufacturers and business men, when they want an increase in price, not have to go through the same procedure, a procedure at which the public and labour are represented? If it is proper that employers shall have a voice in decisions on wages, I maintain it is proper that the workers should have a voice when it is a question of prices, because ultimately labour has to pay its share of the increased prices. The case I mentioned, that of the Guelph Stove company, is the first decision, I think, made by the national war labour board since P.C. 9384 was amended to make it easier to get an increase in wages. That just shows how "easy" it has been made. I suggest that if we are to have a reasonable, rational, fair deal in this matter of wages and prices, before any increase of either is granted, both applications should go through the same process.

I believe it was the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn) who, in speaking this afternoon, said that in the farm implements investigation during the session of 1937 the committee was not sure whether prices of farm implements were too high or not. I have before me the journals of the house for that session. I wish to quote from page 500, a part of the lengthy report which was made by the committee of the house. There are thirty-six recommendations. I will read just three:

28. That the profits to the farm implement companies on the sale of replacement parts is excessive, and the price of these to the consumer should be materially reduced.

29. That the increases announced by the companies in January, 1936, were not justified by an increase in manufacturing or distribution costs or by the financial results of the companies in so far as these were affected by the price level of farm implements.

30. That over the period 1891 to 1936—

That is, for forty-five years.

—retail prices of farm implements have been maintained at too high a level as shown by the financial returns to the companies engaged in the industry during that period.

With facts like these before us, surely before an increase of price is granted to the farm implement companies there should have been some other investigation than one behind closed doors where no one was present excepting those who were asking for the increase in prices and the members of the wartime prices and trade board. It is time we had a new deal in this matter of prices and wages.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I wish to say only a word or two. I shall not keep the house very long, but I think there are some things which should be said. The hon. member who has just spoken talked—no doubt with the best intentions in the world—about the "supposedly impartial chairman" of the war labour board. He said that it was necessary to have a strike, and that you had to do all these things, which were unfair, right down the line. But let me say this to my hon. friend, in a kindly way—

Mr. COLDWELL: Don't say it in a "kindly way".

Mr. MITCHELL: Well, in a kindly—

Mr. COLDWELL: Don't. You so often say it that we are getting quite used to it.

Mr. MITCHELL: You should get used to it. But it is sometimes as well to meet a jury of your peers here in the house, because so often we have to sit here while the boys are up and down the line making speeches.

Mr. COLDWELL: We are here to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL: I know, but six months in the year you are roaming up and down the country making speeches in the little red schoolhouses.

Mr. COLDWELL: We keep in touch with our people.

Mr. MITCHELL: I did not interrupt my hon. friends. We are sitting here trying to administer the affairs of the country, and I think it is admitted on all hands that we are defending the living standards of the working people. You cannot have it both ways. My good Conservative friends say, "Lift the lid and let the thing go to pieces." That is what they say in effect, because they do not admit it outright. Then you get the other point of view, the point of view of people who want us to sit on prices and let wages go up. Well, we are all grown men, and I think we all recognize that, as I have just said, you cannot have it both ways. You cannot eat your cake and still have it.

My hon. friend said something about an impartial chairman, or a supposedly impartial chairman. All human institutions have their weaknesses. There is nothing perfect, though some people seem to think that they are and that others are not. I said once before that I sometimes get sick of people wearing their conscience around their necks as a woman wears a lavaliere—or a halo around their heads, whichever way you like to have it. As one hon. member says, the halo sometimes gets a little worn and we get sick of seeing it.

Mr. GRAYDON: Sometimes it gets tight.

Mr. MITCHELL: This, I think, can be truthfully said, that in a broad way our system of wage stabilization has worked for the protection of the working men and women of the country. We have representatives of organized labour and of employers and a supposedly impartial chairman. The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) was a little mixed up in discussing the machinery for appeals to the national board, but we will let that go for the moment.

Something has been said about the freezing of wages. I do not believe that those people who use the phrase believe it themselves. However, since the institution of these boards the total increases granted through their instrumentality have amounted to $222,222,912 a year. That was started on November 15, 1941, and continued up to December 31, 1945, and the number of employees affected was 1,918,892. I should like to know what my hon. friend is saying under his breath. If he will say it aloud I will try to answer it. Of course we had the telescoping of the cost of living bonus into the basic wage, which aggregated $43,682,436, and I believe that of the cases before the different boards 83·5 per cent were granted in full—that is, the applications—9·7 per cent were granted in part, and only 6·8 per cent were denied; which is some indication that these boards have not been as arbitrary as some people would have us believe.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) spoke about steel to-day. Let us look at the record, and I do not say this with any intention of trying to influence the judgment of any board which is sitting on wages in the

steel industry. But I received these figures this afternoon from the national war labour board: Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation, percentage of increase since 1939, 36·7 per cent—that is in wages; Algoma Steel Corporation, Sault Ste. Marie, increase, 54·4 per cent; Steel Company of Canada, Hamilton, 38·7 per cent; average for the three plants, 43·6 per cent.

Mr. COLDWELL: What are the basic hourly wages?

Mr. MITCHELL: They are 59½ cents for the Dominion in Sydney, 64½ cents for Algoma, Sault Ste. Marie—that is the low rate—and 64½ cents for Hamilton, Ontario, the average for the three being 62·8 cents.

Let us take another figure which I think is illuminating. The cost of living index in 1939 was 101·5, and wage rates index, taking the base of 100, was 105·7; 1943, 118·4, that is the cost of living index, and wage rates index 139·5; 1944, cost of living index, 118·5, and wage index, 144·7; and I am informed today that, with the 1945 figures not all in the cost of living index is 119·6, while the wage index is slightly higher than in 1944.

I tell hon. members these things because I know they want to be fair, and I believe that statement goes for all parties in the house. We all want to raise the social conditions of the working people and of the farmers, and we want to raise them as high as possible. I do not believe that any party has a first mortgage on the desire to bring about that condition, but if I might use the language of the street—

Mr. COLDWELL: Better not, now.

Mr. MITCHELL: I will. When I read the declarations of my good friends of the Conservative party, who want the lid lifted off everything so that their friends can make the fortunes—

An hon. MEMBER: No!

Mr. MITCHELL: Their friends have a knowledge of markets and prices, and we know that after the last war it was their friends that made the fortunes. But let me say this to the undying credit of this party, taking this war in comparison with the last war, that we have not had the scandals that we had after the last war, nor have we had the war profiteers. If there are any I should like some member to rise in his place in this House of Commons and point the finger of scorn at this war administration. It may be that some got under the barrier, but if they did I have not yet heard of any.

Mr. FRASER: We cannot find out.

Mr. MITCHELL: Of course you cannot find out because there are not any. My hon. friend who was elected by that crowd says, "We cannot find out."

Mr. FRASER: No, because the War Assets Corporation is a hush-hush proposition.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am not getting mad; my hon. friend need not worry. When it comes to taxation, we may have made our mistakes, but let this be clearly understood. The only people in this country that I know of who make no mistakes are my good friends the Conservatives. But the taxation policy of the government, I submit, has, in the main, been fair. We have been like the Quakers; we have gone where the money could be got. We have gone to the richest people in the country and even to members of the House of Commons and have taken half their salaries in taxation.

An. hon. MEMBER: How about the 85 per cent—

Mr. MITCHELL: If my prairie chicken would just shut up—

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That is nice.

Mr. MITCHELL: I remember the budget of two years ago when my good friend the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) heard the taxation proposals as laid down by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). I felt like saying, "Brother, can you spare a dime?" Well, I believe that any nation which permits enormous riches at the top and poverty at the bottom is in for trouble. I believe the policy of any government in a democracy, if it is to remain a democracy, must be based upon the fairest distribution of the wealth that it owns. I believe this government has done that. I believe it has done it in a sincere way. I rose to say these few things to put the record straight as I see it.

An hon. MEMBER: In a roundabout way.

Mr. MITCHELL: We talk about putting the record straight. This evening one hon. member spoke about another hon. member who has to do with labour relations. He made those remarks without any knowledge of the other side of the picture which has to do with wage relations. I believe these things should be said. When I take my seat I hope it will not be said that I am a friend of the big interests. In administering legislation you cannot have one law for the rich and another one for the poor on the same subject. You have to try to be fair to both sides. I believe this government is endeavouring to do that in a big way.

Mr. McCUAIG: How about the income tax and the $660 exemption?

Mr. MITCHELL: Nobody likes to pay taxes. I detest it myself. When the motion was before the house giving my hon. friend and all the other hon. members $2,000 a year free of income tax he voted for it. I have no objection to that. I believe the only hon. member who did not vote for it was the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis).

Mr. McCUAIG: It was a government motion.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend cannot get from under by saying it was a government motion; it was not a government motion; it was the decision of the House of Commons and of this parliament of Canada. If my hon. friend does not like what the government did, my advice to him is that he return the $2,000 to the treasury.

I believe that it will take the greatest degree of discipline and cooperation to maintain a stable price structure in this country. We all know that wages have gone up; we all know that prices for agricultural products have gone up right across the board. But we shall need the greatest degree of discipline in the months that lie ahead. While we might talk of powerful employers' organizations and powerful labour organizations, the duty of any government in a democracy is, in my judgment, to protect the weak from the strong. We have endeavoured to do that and we shall continue to endeavour to do it. The attitude adopted by my hon. friends directly opposite reminds me of an old song to the effect that we are only chasing rainbows.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL: Wait a moment.

Mr. GRAYDON: He is "forever blowing bubbles". That is what the minister has in mind. The minister is not blowing bubbles; he is just kidding himself; that is all.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend talks about blowing bubbles. He has been doing that for the last twenty years. I just rose to say these simple things that the working people of this country will understand, notwithstanding my good Conservative friends or my hon. friends to the left of them.

Mr. LEWIS MENARY (Wellington North): I should like to say a few words on the increase in the price of farm implements. This increase has come about when there is a pent-up demand for farm implements. I am opposing the increase. Used tractors are being sold in the vicinity of my home town for $1,200. These tractors are three and four years old. Dealers are buying these tractors and reselling them to farmers. Take binders which have been used for some years. They are becoming dilapidated and will have to be replaced. There is a large pent-up market for farm machinery. This increase comes at a time when an increase in food is needed. Farmers are short of labour. Many farms of 200 acres are being worked by a man and his wife. The wife drives the tractor and the man drives the team on the drill and the harrow. They do the chores at night. I know of a case where a man and his wife are working 200 acres of land. They cannot get help; they could not get it last summer and have not been able to get it for two or three summers. They have given a lot to feed the empire in the last few years.

This increase in price will mean that a binder which sold at $325 will now cost around $44 to $50 more. That is quite an increase in the price of a binder. May I give the house an instance of how scarce farm machinery is. Last fall there was sold in my district a sleigh which was twenty-eight years old. It sold for $65. There is really no machinery for sale at all now. It is pretty nearly all worn out. I should like to ask the minister what effect this increase in price will have on machinery already ordered by the farmer and not taken delivery of. The dealer may not have the machine to deliver but he has the order from the farmer. What effect will this increase have on the purchase price?

Mr. ILSLEY: I will find that out.

Mr. MENARY: Returned soldiers are buying farms. It will now be difficult for them to get machinery to operate these farms. They need the machinery and they have not too much money to spend. Every dollar of an increase in the price of machinery will have an effect on these returned soldiers. It will be harder on the returned soldiers than on other farmers, because the returned soldier is just getting started. He needs all the help he can get. He needs the help of the government and of his neighbours and of all people in the district. I just wish to register my opposition and to ask the minister to answer my question.

Mr. D. S. HARKNESS (Calgary East): Without being quite as verbose as some hon. members who have risen to say a word or two in connection with this matter, and without chasing any rainbows like the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), I should like to register my protest against this increase in the price of farm machinery. Ever since I was a small boy in western Canada I can remember that

the farmers of that area looked on the price of farm machinery as a very sore point. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) will bear me out in that. Probably the question which caused more discontent and more anger on the part of farmesr in western Canada than anything else was the excessive price of farm machinery. I can think of nothing at the present time which would cause more anger and a greater loss of morale and more discontent on the part of the farmers of western Canada than an increase in the price of farm machinery without a corresponding increase in the price of farm products. In my opinion a policy of that kind is the surest way to cause a decrease in the production of agricultural products. If the government had racked their brains from now until Christmas they could not have found a policy which would cause more discontent and, as a result, bring about a greater loss of production on the part of the farmers of western Canada than the very policy that has been announced. I am by no means convinced that a price increase of 12½ per cent on farm machinery is necessary to bring about an increase in the production of that machinery. If such an increase is necessary for that purpose, well and good. But in the name of all that is reasonable let the government couple that increase in the price of farm machinery with an increase in prices of farm products. If they do not do so, I personally am absolutely certain they will get a decrease in agricultural production.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I think it is well that the house has had an opportunity to discuss this most important question. I must say, however, that I was disappointed in the hon. gentleman who brought this matter to the attention of the house. After having made a motion that parliament should be adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, and having been given the opportunity, the hon. gentleman did not discuss it for very long. I presume he was inspired to raise the question by the same reasons which inspire me to speak now; he feels he has an obligation to agriculture, and perhaps particularly to his constituents. I hope it was not a soft feeling in his heart for the manufacturers concerned that influenced him to repress his noble rage.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is hardly fair. Play ball, now.

Mr. IRVINE: Well, I just made a goal. What I meant was that I believe a matter of such importance, raised by the hon. gentleman who occupies the most prominent position to your left in this house, Mr. Speaker, should have been gone into more thoroughly. The whole situation should have been laid bare, and all the facts available should have been brought to the attention of the government and of the house.

An hon. MEMBER: What have you said so far?

Mr. IRVINE: I hope to say something before I am through, if my hon. friend will give me an opportunity; and if I say anything out of the way I am sure he will take the opportunity to chastise me in the proper parliamentary fashion. I hope my hon. friends to my right do not take what I said as an insult, for I had no intention of even questioning the honour of the hon. gentleman to whom I referred.

I wish to say a word now about what was just said by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) before I go on with what I have to say for myself. The minister repeated the old saying that we cannot have our cake and eat it too, which is such an obvious truth that comment is hardly necessary. But I would point out to the hon. gentleman that in this instance the farmers are neither getting the cake nor have they eaten it. I presume the minister's idea was that it is not possible, on the one hand, to raise wages without, on the other hand, raising prices. I do not think that necessarily follows; it all depends upon the relation wages had to prices in the first instance. But assuming his statement to be true, then I take the objection that this is exactly what the government is doing. It has allowed an increase in prices without a corresponding increase in wages and without a corresponding increase in the income of farmers.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is not correct at all. I do not want to interrupt, but that is so far from being correct that I must interrupt.

Mr. IRVINE: If that is not correct I should like to be corrected.

Mr. ILSLEY: I will correct you; certainly.

Mr. IRVINE: But the minister is going to correct me when I have no opportunity to point out the weakness of his correction.

Mr. ILSLEY: There will be no weakness in it.

Mr. IRVINE: I do not presume that the right hon. gentleman is any more infallible in that regard than the rest of us, and it is just possible that I may find a hole in his reasoning as he supposes there is in mine.

I believe, sir, in the government having some control over the national economy and, when the occasion arises, having control over

prices. Particularly do I hold that view in a time of crisis. In fact, not so long ago I voted for the extension of such powers to be exercised by the present government. Nor do I think, as was suggested by an hon. member in this debate, that such procedure necessarily means the establishment of a bureaucracy because, as I understand this situation, no board in Canada has absolute authority to do anything, but the minister and the government must accept responsibility for the statement which was made to-day by the minister. That responsibility rests with this government and with this parliament. The same hon. gentleman said that the increase proposed was negotiated by the wartime prices and trade board, and he branded that body as a bureaucracy. It may be a bureaucracy, but I would rather submit to the findings of that board than to the bureaucracy of monopoly capital which, without any board, would be raising prices without any question and without this parliament even having a chance to discuss the matter. It would be very interesting for this house to know whether the trades board gave the advice to the government in this matter or whether the government gave the advice to the trades board. I do not believe the board initiated this increase in prices, and when the minister speaks I hope he will prove my point by taking full responsibility for the statement he made, as I believe he will.

Nevertheless I was amazed at the statement itself, indicating an increase of 12½ per cent in the price of farm machinery, and that this was done without those directly affected being given an opportunity to be heard, either by the board or by the government, or by both. It means, of course, an increase in the production costs of the farmers, without, as has been pointed out by nearly all the speakers preceding me, a corresponding increase in farmers' incomes. Similar increases have already been granted to other companies, without any corresponding increase in the wages of those employed in the plants privileged to raise their prices. So that I desire to protest against this increase. I protest against the principle; I protest against the method by which it was put into effect; I protest against the result it will bring, both to farmers and wage-earners.

For the past few years, during war time we have had what I might call stabilized prices. I suggest that it is unwise to alter any price in a stabilized system unless there is a complete revision touching all industries and all wage scales affected. It is not possible to alter the price of one commodity without adversely affecting all other industries and all other individuals. To do so, therefore, means that we are entering the vicious circle of inflation.

For instance, we had first of all an increase in the price of steel. It follows naturally that industries requiring steel in their production will seek to have an increase in their prices. Then it will follow that working people will ask for corresponding increases in wages; farmers will ask for corresponding increases in their income. When that is done the steel companies will ask for a greater increase to offset the increased costs brought about through increased wages and increased farm incomes, thereby effecting a complete circle. So that the dog of inflation will chase its own tail around the circle of our national economy, but never get a chance to catch it.

If there is to be any alteration in prices, then it should begin with workers and farmers, because they are at the lower end of the system. Their incomes are now and in the past have been relatively much less than those of the manufacturing fraternity. Manufacturers had much the best of it during the war. They made greater profits in that time, in spite of the profits tax, than they did in peace time. They vastly increased their reserves; they increased their capital assets and they decreased their corporation debts. In fact, profits in the war-time period took the form of increased assets and increased reserves. Still they are not satisfied.

In the second place, I am opposed to this increase because of the method by which it has been achieved. It has already been pointed out that there was no real inquiry. If there was, then it was all one-sided. I believe the minister indicated that the evidence warranted the action taken. But the evidence is not all in; it was one-sided. The evidence of agriculture and that of the workers was not there. I believe one hon. member emphasized the fact that when an increase in the tariff was to be made, the tariff board gave notice of an application. Then those who were interested were permitted to appear and to say why such increase should not be effected. In this instance, however, there was no such inquiry. Therefore I am opposed to a method which fails to give an opportunity to the industries directly affected to bring their position to the attention of the board, to point out how they would be affected by the proposed change.

Then I am opposed to the results. One hon. member has said he was out for results, and cared nothing about methods. Well, this is a result. But I submit that anyone who is out for a result cannot afford to ignore the only method by which a desired result can be

obtained. I am opposed to this result. The minister may say I am wrong in this, but I still await a refutation of what I say, namely that a 12½ per cent increase in the price of farm machinery will certainly not reduce farmers' costs of production. If the minister can show how that is possible, I shall be greatly in his debt. Not only will it not reduce the cost of farm production, but I insist that if there is an increase in the price of farm machinery it must of necessity increase the cost of farm production.

As an hon. member to my right pointed out a few minutes ago, all our returned soldiers who intend to go farming must buy all their machinery. They have none. For that machinery they must pay the extra 12½ per cent. Without doubt, those seem to be the facts in the case.

For some time there has been what I would call a systematic campaign put on by big business to influence the government, if possible—and probably the board—and to prepare the public mind for acquiescence in a desired rise in prices. They have carried on this campaign to the extent of discouraging, as far as possible, the continuation of price controls by the administration. In this connection, let me mention some of the headlines which have appeared in the *Financial Post*, and then I would ask hon. members to draw their own conclusions as to what would follow from them. One says this, "Say growing goods famine is caused by price ceiling"—not caused by a shortage of material; not caused by a shortage of labour, but caused by the price ceiling.

Another heading states: "Output of essential goods slow as ceiling 'bonus' luxuries".

And another: "See black market booming if price controls maintained".

Those are headlines which suggest the campaign of industry and of big business to remove from the government all controls whatsoever.

I conclude by asking the minister what the facts are. He has said that the evidence was sufficient to justify the action taken, which was announced this afternoon. But, as I have said, only half of that evidence was heard. What are the facts? Will the minister put on record the actual financial position of the companies which have been permitted to raise their prices? Industries claiming the right to raise prices should be able to make public the facts showing the financial position warranting the increases demanded. If the minister can show such facts I am sure the house will receive his statement with a great deal more grace than it can accept the position as it now stands.

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with those who have already spoken in protest against the 12½ per cent increase in the cost of farm machinery.

The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) said that he would like to see the statement or figures of the machine companies showing their present position. I agree with him, and I should like to see alongside those figures the income of our farmers from 1929 to 1939 and on up to the present time. I am sure that if the incomes of these two groups were to be compared we would find that it is the farmer that needs subsidizing and not the machine companies. It is my view that the government should not allow, should not even think of making this gift to the machine companies at the expense of the farmers, but if the minister still desires to make a gift to the machine companies he should look for another source of revenue from which to do so. It has been pointed out on many occasions by members of this group as well as by other groups in the house that the farmers of this country have been worse off than any other group of our citizens.

Surely after what our farmers had gone through during the depression years we should give them an opportunity now to get on their feet. During the past six years of war the farmers had to struggle along with a shortage of labour; they had to repair their old machinery, and now they are all in the market for new machinery. This is the time apparently when a number of the gentlemen in the farm machine business got together and thought that now is a good time to clean up on the farmers, to skin them alive. If members of this house representing agricultural constituencies do not stop this price increase they will have failed the farmers of this nation. If this is the type of new order that was promised to our agriculturists during the war, who can tell what will happen to them five years from now? I protest as strongly as I can against any increase in the cost of farm machinery I feel that this is the time to be demanding a reduction in the price of farm machinery—not an increase.

I also wish to join with other hon. members in protesting against the method of arriving at this decision. I am going to be frank and say that this is the backdoor method. Why did the government not bring in a measure, place it openly before the representatives of the people in the House of Commons and let the people's representatives

debate it? Then it could have been sent to a committee of the house, where witnesses could have been called so that we could have ascertained exactly what the situation was and in the light of the facts adduced arrive at the proper decision. As it is, we are permitting a board to make a decision of this importance, to decide an issue which affects about thirty per cent of our total population. It is about time that we learned that the farmers of this nation are not going to keep on taking it on the chin as they have had to do in the past. It is about time they were consulted. But I understand that the minister consulted no farm organizations, nor did he consult the members of parliament. Not a single farm organization was consulted, although this is a measure that directly affects agriculture. It seems to me that this is not the proper way of handling this problem.

As the leader of this group, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), has pointed out, should conditions warrant an increase in farm machinery it would then be up to the government to find ways and means of subsidizing the increased costs. Surely the farmer should not be expected to bear the whole burden.

Agriculture in this country, as we all know, is a basic industry. If agriculture prospers, Canada prospers. Should agriculture suffer, Canada will suffer. I for one would never like to see agriculture go back to the position in which it found itself between 1929 and 1939.

There has been a campaign carried on in the press and I have heard a number of speakers over the radio stating that Canada should get as many young Canadians as possible to go into agriculture. It is a back-to-the-land campaign. But if the government begins by increasing the price of farm machinery by 12½ per cent it will simply be turning the boys away from the farms. If the government wants to deplete our rural population, this is the best way to do so. It would be a healthy sign if more of our young men were interested in agriculture. But when you put agriculture in the position where farmers have to pay more for their implements, and levy additional costs, you cannot blame the young men for going into the cities.

One further thought. If the government intends to discredit private enterprise, this is the best way of doing so; and if the government continues to pursue this course it will do just that, discredit private enterprise.

For the past number of years our farmers have fed approximately 16,000,000 people. That is no small achievement, and surely this price increase is no small issue to be lightly brushed aside or decided by a board.

[Mr. Hlynka.]

We should review farm income over the past fifteen or twenty years and at the same time review the earnings of the machine companies, so that we can arrive at a satisfactory comparison whether it is the machine companies or the farmers that need to be subsidized. Let us not forget that the farmers have carried on their farming operations during the war with old machinery, and that they are now all in the market to buy new farm implements. This decision of the board is a blow at agriculture which will bring no credit to this government. I am not so much concerned about who is going to clean up on this price increase. I want to see agriculture in Canada placed on a sound basis so that our farmers will get their share of the national income and so that their children will be able to attend schools and live like human beings, instead of being driven from place to place by the mortgage companies. If our farmers have to buy the machinery they need at increased prices and have to go into debt, then when prices of agricultural products fall it will be only another few years before the mortgage and trust companies will again be racing after our farmers up and down the country trying to collect.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that if the representatives of western Canada and the representatives of central Canada and of eastern Canada as well permit this increase to go through they will be failing their constituents; they will be failing our basic industry, and failing our nation at a time when the world is demanding greater production than ever before. At a time, when millions of human beings are starving in Europe, this is the action which the government takes without even giving it much thought.

Mr. T. B. BARRETT (Norfolk): I wish to put myself on record, as a farmer representing an agricultural constituency, in endorsing what has already been said by so many hon. members disapproving these increases in prices of farm machinery. I am absolutely sure that the minister is convinced that this increase is justified in relation to the increased cost to the manufacturers; but in relation to the cost of farm products, farm machinery has been altogether too high for the last twenty-five years. Just because farmers have bought machinery is no indication that the price has not been too high in relation to the prices which they have been receiving for their products, and it is becoming increasingly evident now, since the war, that farm prices are far too low. This is evidenced by the decreased production in certain lines, and by the number of idle farms which anyone can see in driving through the

country. Farms containing the very best of agricultural land are lying idle, for the simple reason that farmers cannot afford to work them. This is particularly evident in my own constituency. In one part of my riding the farmers are engaged in tobacco growing, and because of the regional character of this crop and certain circumstances under which tobacco growers work, they have been making money. Nobody denies that. You can go through the tobacco area and you will find no idle farms; in fact the price of farm land in that part of the country has risen over 100 per cent in the last few years. But in the other part of my constituency, not so much in the dairying districts as in the general mixed farming areas, you will find farm after farm lying idle, simply because the farmers are not making money and they simply will not bother to work the land, and cannot get anybody to take over the farms. All through the country farmers are experiencing great difficulty in getting sufficient help to work their farms; and this, in spite of the fact that there is unemployment in all our towns and cities. Plenty of young men who are experienced and quite able to farm refuse to go on the farms because of the reduced remuneration they will receive. If they are fortunate enough to obtain jobs in town they will get far bigger wages, work far less hours and have a much easier time than if they work on the farms. If this added burden of increased prices of machinery is put on the farmers, I am sure it will result in a further decrease of production instead of the increase which is so much desired.

Mr. J. L. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): After listening to the discussion here to-day I should like to offer to the house for their approval my own solution of the question. I believe it would add a great deal to the speed with which we get through this debate and take care of our whole price structure in this instance, if I introduced the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley).

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): I understand from what the minister has said that the increase in the price of farm machinery, announced to-day, means in increase of 12½ per cent in the price of farm machinery made in Canada. I hope that the minister in his statement to the house will make it clear how the dealers in selling these articles are to distinguish between machinery which is imported and machinery which is actually manufactured in Canada. A good deal of farm machinery, such as binders and combines, is imported from the United States, but binders and combines are made in Canada as well. Is there to be a distinction of price between one and the other? I hope the minister will make that point clear when he speaks. Furthermore, to what extent is farm machinery to be deemed to be manufactured within Canada? Does the minister mean, manufactured wholly in this country, because a great deal of machinery manufactured in this country has component parts manufactured in the United States, the material being brought over and assembled in Canada? I believe that practically no tractors are manufactured in this country. Am I right, then, in assuming that this does not include farm tractors?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is right.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: There will not be an increase in the price of farm tractors?

Mr. ILSLEY: Not as a result of this.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: We are opposed to granting this increase in the price of farm machinery. The fact that it adds to the cost of production to the farmer upsets a great deal of the faith which the Canadian people have had in the government's policy of price control to prevent inflation. The minister, or the cabinet, or whoever advised this step have taken the wrong course, because they set ceilings on prices of farm products when the old prices on machinery were in operation, and now that the cost of production is increased to the farmer, the same ceilings remain on farm products. In all fairness to those concerned in the big business of raising food when the world needs it as it does to-day, this should be accompanied by an announcement on the part of the government that they are permitting an increase in the selling price of farm produce. This measure takes all the security out of agriculture, and without security people will not go into agriculture.

Further, I think the announcement was ill-timed from the point of view of the thousands of young men whom this government is trying to entice back on the land as they return from the war. Hundreds of thousands of young men wishing to take up agriculture as their life pursuit will say, "What security is there in this? What is the use of my undertaking a twenty or a ten-year agreement to pay back borrowed money if overnight it is to be announced that machinery prices will go up 12½ per cent? To-morrow the price may go up another 15 per cent." They will begin to ask, "Where do we fit into this thing?"

The farmer is commencing to wake up to the fact that what has been wrong with him in the past is that, whenever he went to town to buy anything—and in these days he must buy in order to operate—those who had commodities for sale always told him exactly what he must pay; he had to pay it or he went without; because he had to have it he had to pay what was charged, and he accepted the idea that those who were selling should name the price. It is a funny thing, however, that when the farmer took his produce into town to sell it, instead of being able to say what price he should get, he usually had to go around and say, "Please, mister, what price will you pay me?" Until you put a floor under farm prices there can be no security, and there ought to be a guarantee against such increase of production cost as this, or some guarantee of the actual cost of farm machinery, so that the farmer will know over a period of years what his costs will be in this line. What assurance has he that in another three months the price will not again be increased with the government's consent?

The greatest harm which will be done is the loss of faith on the part of the people who are doing the work, and, after all, the people who toil are the people who produce the wealth from the land. Without the production of the men and women in the factory, without the production of the men, women and children on the farms we cannot have any wealth in this country; that is, any real wealth—the food and clothing and the shelter that man requires.

The other circumstance that makes the situation particularly serious is that the greatest need of the world to-day is food. This government has so stated. It is recognized by all, and UNRRA and the united nations organization are emphasizing it. But this policy goes to the very root of production, which is falling off badly. I have here the figures for creamery butter and cheese production. If we take 1946, in January, creamery butter fell off 15·6 per cent and cheese, 27·8 per cent; in February, 1946, there was a drop of 18·3 per cent in creamery butter and 26·5 per cent in cheese. This is in comparison with the same months of 1945, and that has confallen off 19·6 per cent as compared with last year, and cheese, 35·5 per cent.

In these provinces we have the hay and the necessary materials, but the people are not producing. What is the trouble? There are a good many causes. It is time the government realized that the production of farm commodities is not an eight hour day job. If you are raising cattle or milking cows your job starts early in the morning. A good many people are in the barns working at five o'clock in the morning and they work until eight o'clock at night. And it is not a five-day week that they put in, but a seven-day week, 365 days in the year, without any holidays and often without any pay. The government tells us that we are to have another cut in butter rations when we should be producing more than ever before. There are more men to go into production. The boys are returning from overseas. But they are not going on the farms. Why? We find the answer in just such legislation as this.

I wish to criticize the government also on its farm machinery policy in this regard, that they do not put any ceiling on the sale of secondhand machinery by agents. Recently in my own city some ten thousand farmers came from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta to the city of Yorkton because an enterprising agent there had advertised that he had some sixty-nine reconditioned tractors for sale, and according to the press reports the bids ranged from $200 to $1,000 over and above prices of new tractors. So serious is the need for machinery. Without the labour, men must have the necessary machinery to save them toil, and the machinery companies cannot provide what is required. The farmers need these things, and to permit a 12½ per cent increase is bad enough, but to compel the farmers to get their machinery at 100 per cent increase is something that should not be tolerated. Ceilings are put on secondhand cars; why not on this machinery?

This is the last straw on the camel's back. Many things have been gradually added to the farmers' burden since the end of the war, one thing after another. There is the difficulty in getting labour and the increase in the wages the farmer has to pay. His returns are so small, and he has to pay income tax. I am glad the Minister of National Revenue is in his place. I have seen farmers go out of production in the west overnight in recent months when they found out the manner in which their income tax is to be collected.

A farmer I know came to me in December and said, "Is this what you call justice in this country? I operated this farm in 1942 and by the government regulations I was not permitted to sell my grain because there were quotas on it. My cash operations for 1942, owing to the fact that I could not sell my products, was $150 of a loss and my bins were full of grain. The year 1943 came along and the quotas were lifted slightly so that I sold part of the 1942 crop and part of the

1943 crop. I had to build more bins to keep the stuff, and I was not allowed to sell it in view of government regulations. The result was that once again my bins were full. The year 1944 came along; we had a big crop and the government told us to sell grain and stock and cattle because this was necessary to feed the armies." Well, the farmers went and sold stuff. These people have never known what it was to pay income tax because so many years of their lives have been spent in making losses. They would make $130 cash income for a year's work.

The farmers do not understand the intricacies and the complicated forms of income tax, and as to knowing what an accrual basis is, well, they do not know anything about it. One day this farmer whose case I am stating was ordered to appear and report on his income tax. When he told them what had happened in 1942, they said, "We are not interested in 1942; what about 1943?" They also inquired about 1944. He had kept his records and on the sale of 1942, 1943 and 1944 wheat his income had come up to $3,800 that year. He was taxed on the sale of parts of his crop for 1942, 1943 and 1944, all in one year, and he was charged income tax of about $400.

I do not know what the members of this house would say if they were paying income tax on three years' income in one year. There would be rebellion. I do not know what the big machinery companies would say if you took all their profits for three years, lumped them into one year, and charged excess profits tax on three years' earnings in that one year. But that farmer had toiled long hours, had gone out early in the morning and milked his cows and fed his hogs, raised chickens, sold eggs and worked long hours overtime without pay. When he and other farmers like him thought they were doing something for the welfare of the country they found themselves having to pay income tax in the way I have described.

This man did not raise any hogs last year and is raising none this year. He is not bothering to milk cows except for his own use. The farmers are not producing butter. Why? The results of their overtime work are taken away from them. They may come up to the $1,200 with war prices as they have been if they happen to strike a good year. This man wrote to the income tax office and said, "I understand I can do this on the accrual basis". The only reply he got was a statement to this effect, "We hope you will make arrangements for settlement of the $400 because interest is running at the rate of eight per cent."

The government does not need to have me tell them all this. They can read the report handed to them recently by the Canadian federation of agriculture with regard to income tax. Among the recommendations regarding farm income tax I suggest that the government implement what appears there and that something more be done as is suggested in paragraph 1, which reads:

> That the income of the farmer for income tax purposes be assessed on the basis of average over a period of at least four years. We submit that a moving average plan might be adopted which would assist the taxpayer in meeting payments in years of loss or low returns. We were encouraged by the statement of the finance minister in his budget statement of October 12 last year, that he was prepared "to give the most sympathetic consideration to the inclusion of a provision of this sort in a revised income tax law."

An hon. MEMBER: When?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The question is asked, "When?" I hope he starts operating it very soon. These are the things that break a man down. I continue with the recommendations:

> 3. That the exemption for single persons be raised to $1,000, and that for married persons to $2,000.
>
> 4. That more adequate allowance be made for the labour of farmers' wives, sons and daughters in connection with production on the farm.
>
> 7. That payment of arrears of interest and principal on the home farm, due before 1940, be allowed as deductions for income tax purposes.

These are the things that have taken away everything that these farmers have earned, and they are unable to carry on any longer. The hearts are gone out of these people. The young people see it and they do not want to go on the farm.

Until agriculture is put on a firm basis where there is security against the kind of thing that happened in the announcement that was made in the house to-day we shall find the agricultural producers of this country stopping. They are going to quit on us. I would not be surprised if that was what is behind the drop in production we have in Canada to-day. Instead of discouraging production in the country, now is the time we ought to be going on with the same effort which this cabinet did so ably during the war in so far as food production was concerned. We should be in war production to-day in agriculture. We need every encouragement that can be given to increase production. The farmers ask for bread and they are given a stone.

We have supported price controls. We believe in them when they are properly used for proper purposes; but if this type of thing is to be used to promote monopolies of any

kind to take the last drop of sweat and work from people who are already overworked, then we are going to oppose it with everything we possess. Monopolies have no right to come in here and get concessions such as these without the cards being placed on the table and the reports and financial statements of all these companies and their actual cost of production placed before parliament. They should be brought before us and proved before this house. I would advise the minister to give sympathetic reconsideration to this demand for an increase until it has been proved to the people of Canada that it is essential, and until the farmers themselves have been given something to offset this terrific increase in their cost of production, without which offset they cannot carry on.

Mr. L. E. CARDIFF (Huron North): I rise to-night to take part in this debate for three reasons. The first is that I am a farmer and believe I should voice my opinion. The second is that I should like to speak for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) because I feel that he would be embarrassed if he spoke for himself.

Mr. GARDINER: The hon. member is not able to speak for me; I shall speak for myself.

Mr. CARDIFF: The third reason is that I do not agree with the announcement that there should be an increase in the price of farm machinery; not that I do not think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) can justify his position by quoting figures to show that it is necessary to raise the price of farm machinery. I believe that he can. All through the years the price of farm machinery has been increased so substantially that it is not necessary now to increase it again. Before we can pay more for farm machinery it will be necessary to raise the price of farm produce an equal amount. The price of farm produce has been far too low for far too long. During the war years farmers generally carried on because we were at war. No one in this country will contend that they did not do a good job. A census taken in our community in the county of Huron showed that during those years the average age of farmers was fifty-six years. That will give the house some idea of the age of some of the farmers who were trying to farm. Many men seventy years of age and over were trying to run a 100 acre farm. These men carried on all through the war years because we were at war, not because they were able to do it. They now find their health impaired and they cannot carry on any longer. They have tried to get help but, because farming is not attractive, they could not get help. One has only to look at the number of returned men who have applied for farms to undertake farming to understand. It is true we have had some make application, but they do not amount to a large percentage of the boys who came back and who want to start farming. Many of these boys saved a couple of thousand dollars. They would rather put it into a wartime house costing $6.000 and depend on their monthly pay check to pay the remainder, than put it in a farm. I should like to suggest that the boys who are putting all their savings in wartime housing and are depending on industry to pay the remainder will, in seventy-five per cent of the cases, lose every dollar they have. These boys could take the money they have saved and go to the country, and while prices are not as good as some think they should be, they would at least save that portion of the money they tried to save during the war years.

Labour is demanding more money; the machinery companies are demanding more money and many other people are demanding more money. I should like to know what good money will be if we reach the stage where we cannot buy food. Take the devastated countries of Europe where they are starving. Money is not of any value when you cannot buy anything to eat with it. That is what we shall be faced with here. In almost every farming community in Canada we find house after house and farm after farm vacant. There are at least two or three in every mile and a quarter. Why? Simply because farming is not attractive enough to bring people to the farms. Many farms were made vacant during the first years of the war. People left these farms to go into industry, munition plants and the like. These farms are still vacant. The government should know where these men are. If they are still in industry they should be driven back to the farms to operate them, and the jobs they are occupying should be made available to the returned men.

Farmers in this country have always been the last to get consideration from any legislation, and the first to be penalized. That condition cannot prevail longer. It is the duty of every farm member in this House of Commons to voice his protest against this rise in the price of farm machinery. Every member representing a farming community should voice his protest. If that is done I am not afraid that this increase will be allowed to stand.

Mr. F. W. TOWNLEY-SMITH (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my voice to the protest against the proposed

increase in prices of farm machinery. The farmers have always believed they were being overcharged for their machinery, and I can well imagine the dismay and consternation that will be felt when particularly the western farmers hear of this price increase. I represent an agricultural district, a constituency said to be the largest in the dominion, and I know exactly how these people feel when they come to discuss machinery prices.

The point has been made that an increase in prices of machinery will bring about an increase in the production of the machines. I doubt very much whether that is so. I made application some time ago for some farm machinery, and I have in my possession letters from the manufacturers stating that they are unable to supply what I require. One of these machines is a drill, and my information is that there will not be any drills in the west until June. Well, one can imagine how useful a drill will be in June! If, because of this increase, should it go through, drills are available before that time, it will simply confirm the suspicion in my mind that the whole thing was prearranged and, on the part of somebody, probably the machinery companies, some form of hold-up. I do not believe that point was well taken; as a matter of fact I do not believe it will increase the production of machines.

While we are talking about drills, I should like to make this point. We are told that there has been an increase of $5 a ton in the price of steel. This drill, with certain equipment that I desired on it, was going to cost me in the neighbourhood of $500; it is a big drill. An increase of 12½ per cent would mean something like $62. The drill itself weighs about 1,600 pounds, representing about $4 extra in the cost of the steel, whereas the additional price I shall have to pay will be be some $62. So that I suggest there is really no justification for an argument of that kind.

It is most unfortunate that almost every time agriculture comes under discussion some form of unpleasantness or unhappiness for the farmers seems to result. When I came here last September one of the first things we talked about in which I was peculiarly interested was the Hudson Bay railway. The improvement of the railroad and the use of the port of Churchill were to be of great advantage to the western farmers, but we completely failed to gain our point. Nothing was done; nothing has been done about the railway or the port. Soon after that, we had an announcement about the price of wheat which, instead of being allowed to follow the world price, was fixed for the time being at $1.55 a bushel. I wonder if hon. members appreciate just what this price of $1.55 means to me, for instance. They may think I get $1.55 for every bushel of wheat. That is not so. I get as an initial price $1.25, f.o.b. Fort William. At my elevator where I deliver wheat that means to me, if it is No. 1, the best wheat that can be grown, $1.05 a bushel, not $1.55. We hope to get $1.55 eventually, less the charges, but at the present time what I get at my shipping point is $1.05. Then, shortly after that, meat rationing was ordained, and immediately the price of hogs on the western market slumped $1.25 a hundred, or roughly $2 a pig. After that, coming into this year, the price of gasoline went up two cents, and now we have a suggested increase in farm machinery prices of 12½ per cent.

You have already heard, Mr. Speaker, what is happening in the production of butter and the production of hogs. I wonder exactly what the government is trying to do. Butter production is down twenty per cent. Last year the production of hogs was down forty-three per cent, and in my opinion, this year it will be down another twenty-five per cent as far as my province of Saskatchewan is concerned. Yet the need for hogs is very great. The farmers are feeling such irritation, aggravation, disappointment and frustration that they are just about ready to let things go. I wonder if we could warn the government as to what is taking place on those western farms, that the situation is serious and should be carefully considered. In my opinion, a step like this, increasing prices of machinery, is entirely wrong. Last year I tried to make the point that those nations which could grow commodities of quality most economically would get the market; in other words, that those countries which could keep down their production costs would eventually get the world markets. All these things I have been mentioning, the failure to make use of the Hudson Bay line, the price of wheat, the price of machines and so on, mean an increase in production costs and greater difficulty in getting and keeping the markets of the world.

All these matters should be taken into consideration and given careful thought. I hope the minister will reconsider this matter of increasing prices of machinery, because it is an important point. When you are dabbling with an industry that grows products to the value of $2,146 million, which are the figures for agriculture for the last year as to which we have available data, it is big business which requires careful handling, for that is a great deal of money. On behalf of my constituency I protest against this increase in

prices of machinery. It is a most untimely move and an unwise step under any circumstances.

Mr. W. G. CASE (Grey North): I should like to make my position known with respect to the matter now being presented to this house. I have not had an opportunity to examine the figures which were presented by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) this afternoon, but I have some reason to believe that the increase he has intimated may be justified.

My position is that I am opposed to the increase unless some corresponding offset can be arrived at to protect the farmers who must purchase machinery. The situation is indeed serious. My constituency is about two-thirds rural, and recently I have been receiving letters from many prominent farmers there. Some of them are men between fifty and sixty years of age who toiled very hard during the war. They feel discouraged; they are unable to employ labour. As a matter of fact, the Owen Sound *Daily Sun-Times,* one of the outstanding newspapers in Canada, reports that we are 4,000 farm hands short in Grey and Bruce counties—and these are large agricultural producing counties. The farmers are unable to obtain help. The story they told me is that they are discouraged to a point where they are inclined not to endeavour to produce those articles so necessary to meet the demands of a starving world, and particularly of Europe.

Therefore I have risen at this time simply to make my position clear on this one point. If this increase of 12½ per cent can be justified—and possibly it can—then I say it is a challenge to the government to indicate to the farmer that he is no longer the forgotten man. In other words, the farmer feels he has had a shabby deal. I shall not labour the point, but shall leave it to the judgment of those who are familiar with the set-up, and the consideration which has been given.

I say, however, that it is a challenge to the government to arrange the 12½ per cent increase by subsidy, so that all the citizens of Canada will carry the burden, not one class alone to whom we look for our livelihood, our food and our living. It should be spread over all the taxpayers, or there should be a corresponding increase or offset in the price of farm produce to provide for the increased cost of the implements of production.

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, while I am anxious to go home for the Easter recess, I would not dare do so without offering my protest while this matter is before the house. I suggest that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), who represents a large agricultural community, might take advantage of the Easter recess to visit some of his constituents, so as to get their reaction. Rightly or wrongly, the farmers of Canada will not accept his statement that the agricultural implements industry cannot operate longer without this type of increase. Investigations carried on in Ottawa and Saskatchewan a few years ago into the whole farm implements industry gave us some information we cannot easily forget.

This afternoon the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Bentley) referred to a report presented by the Saskatchewan government. At page 9 of that report we find a break-down of the factors which enter into the cost of a binder for which a farmer in Regina paid $281. The raw materials cost $71.06; labour, $22.62; freight, $26.08, making a total of $119.76 for materials, labour and freight. The overhead or burden was placed at $33.93; experimental work, $2.55, and commission, $45.50.

There is another break-down respecting the price of a cream separator. This separator was manufactured in Sweden by the De Laval Company, which organization apparently has a plant at Peterborough, Ontario, in the constituency of the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser). The price laid down in Peterborough was $17.65. By the time the separator reached Winnipeg the price was $44.58, or an increase of $25.63. This represents a profit of 135 per cent. But my real reason for taking part in the debate was to protest against the yielding by the Minister of Finance to the pressure to put the skids under the wartime prices and trade board.

I have been following very closely the pressures in the United States which have been prompted by reactionary forces there to get rid of all controls. In the issue of *PM* for Tuesday, March 12, I find that the landlords have been spending fabulous sums to try to get all restrictions removed. One of their representatives suggests that it was bad business to have controls which were making it impossible for landlords to get the sort of rents they might have. Apparently they were prepared to build apartments which would rent for $2,000 a month and upward. When the question was asked as to who would use these apartments the calm reply was that the people who made money during the war were anxious to move into new quarters. Then they were asked what would happen to the old quarters,

and the reply was that they would be quite good enough for the veterans who were having trouble to get settled.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member is talking about the United States, not Canada?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not know of anyone who is paying that much here.

Mr. NICHOLSON: If the minister had been listening he would have heard what I said.

Mr. COLDWELL: It was the $2,000 that got the minister's attention.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Here the national association of manufacturers has something to say. It would seem that these things all come out in the open in the United States. Apparently lobbying goes on behind the doors here, and I think it would be well to get these things out in the open. The national association of manufacturers are anxious that they should get away from all these controls. The issue of March 19 of *PM* states that Robert Ross Wason, president of the national association of manufacturers, said:

> We want people to be free of this control. The benefits (of freer prices) will come to 140 million people, not to just 15,000 manufacturers.

Then a representative in congress said:

> If the private enterprise system is to be saved those connected with it will have to fight and fight to the death.

Then *PM* goes on to explain that if these controls are to be removed in the United States, the ceiling price on five pounds of sugar, now standing at thirty-five cents, would go up to $1.34; a pound of bacon with a present ceiling of forty-one cents would rise to fifty-eight cents; a dozen eggs at the present price of fifty cents would rise to ninety-two cents; Portland cement at seventy-nine cents would increase to $1.42; and a gallon of gasoline from twenty cents to thirty-four cents. Then a man's suit valued at $25 would sell for $75, and an apartment with a present rental of $40 would rent for $60.

The workers are, of course, very much exercised for fear these powerful interests in the United States will have their day, that controls will be abolished, and that only those with large amounts of money will be able to buy.

Philip Murray put in a strong plea for the continuation of controls. According to some of the figures they supplied, 1,743 of the largest industrial firms in the United States have profits 217·7 per cent higher than during the period 1936-39. He argued that it would be disastrous if these firms, which now see a real harvest around the corner, are to have their way and short supplies should be bid up to the ceiling.

The Minister of Finance earned the respect of the citizens of this country for his industry and integrity in maintaining the wartime prices and trade board ceilings during the war. But I wish to warn him that he will be forgotten just as quickly if he yields at this stage. The very short supply of food in Great Britain and the importance of maintaining some sort of control now makes it urgent that the Minister of Finance should see to it, just as emphatically as he did during war time, when pressure groups came saying that they were in favour of these controls, but that their particular industries were the exception and required special consideration.

First came the increase in the price of steel. I believe the steel workers had a reasonable request, namely that before any increase should be granted in the price of steel, the people concerned—the industry, government and the workers—should be taken into conference so as to discuss the merits of the case. If some increase was to be granted, there should have been an understanding as to what would happen to wages.

In this most recent transaction we have a third group which is vitally interested, namely the farmers. The industrial workers who are manufacturing farm implements are also greatly concerned. Surely it is a misfortune that an increase of 12½ per cent can be made without first taking into account the reaction of farmers, or of workers in the plants, or of the public. It is most unfortunate that this decision was taken in that particular way.

I want to plead as eloquently as I can with the minister to continue to deserve the confidence and respect of the great majority of the Canadian people who realize that the danger from inflation is as great now as it was during the war. It is unnecessary for me to remind the house that it was after the last war that inflation was felt with such devastating effects in Europe, and it is quite conceivable that we might suffer the effects of inflation in Canada if this sort of pressure is able to get an increase of 12½ per cent in the price of farm implements. At a time when the farmers all across Canada, rightly or wrongly, feel that they have never, to use the words of hon. gentlemen to my right, had a square deal from any party in Canada, with that feeling so prevalent it is a great pity that this increase should be announced without the government taking the people's representatives into their confidence.

Mr. D. J. McCUAIG (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I am firmly opposed to this increase in the price of farm machinery. I am at a loss to understand how the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) can justify this increase to the machine companies, particularly in the face of the financial statements of two of our Canadian farm implement companies. I have here the *Financial Post,* which shows the net profit of the Massey-Harris company. The net profit in 1937 was $1,043,728; 1938, $1,065,639: in 1944 and 1945, after deducting all war taxes, the net profit was, in 1944, $1,413,396, and in 1945, $1,800,000.

Take the Cockshutt Plow company. Its net profit in 1937 was $183,091; in 1944, after all war taxes had been deducted, it had a net profit of $399,244. That was not too bad a war effort. The stock market quotations of the stock of these two companies also show something. The stock of the Massey-Harris company in 1939 was quoted in the daily press at from $3.25 to $3.50. According to the Ottawa *Evening Citizen,* the closing price of that stock to-day was $29.

The stock of the Cockshutt Plow company in 1939 was quoted at $3.50, and to-day, according to the *Evening Citizen,* it was quoted at $19. That does not look so bad.

Only recently the price of gasoline which the farmer uses in his tractor was increased by two cents a gallon.

Again in to-night's *Citizen* I notice that the net income of the Imperial Oil company, after all deductions, was $16,616,583 for 1945. That was not so dusty a war effort.

Let us compare that with the financial position of the farmer. The situation of our farmers from 1937 to 1940 was a crime. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) had a little joke about the $2,000 free of income tax for members. But what I am concerned about is the young boy who is starting up on the farm and has an exemption of only $660. I should like to see it raised to $1,200, and the exemption of the married man and his wife raised from $1,250 up to at least $2,400.

I have heard it stated in the house that eighty-five per cent of the people of Canada work for an income of $1,500 or less. They do all the manual work, all the serving, and they are the salt of the earth, the backbone of the country. I also see in the press that the finance minister collects half of the total income tax from this eigthy-five per cent.

I feel sure that Canada will be on the way out under this kind of national economy. Where lies the strength of the nation? In good homes, in health and in all these things that make for a prosperous countryside. How is the boy who is just starting up going to get anywhere with an income tax exemption of only $660, or the man who is trying to build a home? How can the boys who are coming back buy a farm and pay for farm implements at these increased prices? How are they ever going to get started? Using the simple logic of a simple farmer, I would say that this Canada of ours is on the way out and that it will not take long to get there if you impoverish rural Canada, the source of all supplies. This is a matter of the greatest importance, and I should like to see the government give it its most serious consideration.

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the time has perhaps come when I should answer some of the statements that have been made in the numerous speeches to-day. I do not hope to be able to deal with all the numerous speeches, but I wish to clear up some misconceptions that are in the minds of hon. members and to answer some questions that have been asked.

One aspect of the discussion that is gratifying is the support that now comes from most members of the house for the principle of price control. At least it seems to be popular. We started a general price ceiling in 1941 and at the same time instituted a system of wage stabilization. We had an uphill fight to have the principle of over-all price control accepted by the Canadian people, either by agriculture or by labour. As the years went on, perhaps the wisdom of our policy became more apparent, and when recently it became obvious that if we were to avoid a complete break-down of price control and wage stabilization there must be some yielding in some places, we discovered that when and to the extent that we yielded at all we met with tremendous protest. I have tried on several occasions to explain to this house that it is utterly impossible to maintain indefinitely rigid price control. To begin with, we have to get out of this field constitutionally some time; we have not the power to stay in this field indefinitely, and there must be a certain amount of decontrol. This was explained on numerous occasions.

As I understood the position taken by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) this afternoon, he said that if this authorization of a raising of the price ceiling on agricultural implements was necessary, it was in the wrong order, that other ceilings should be raised first, the ceilings on agricultural products, or on wages, or on both: I think he mentioned both wages and prices of agricultural products. Other speakers said that we had put the cart before the horse. I want to point out that we have not put the cart before the

horse. Both with regard to wages and with regard to farm prices there have been repeated and extensive upward adjustments from 1941 down to the present time.

First, with regard to wages, one of the reasons why there has to be an upward adjustment of the ceiling on farm implements at the present time is the increase in wages in the farm implement industry. I said in my statement this afternoon that wages in this industry had increased by 28½ per cent. I was asked by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) whether it is true that in the agricultural implement industry in Toronto wages had been reduced and some of the men had been laid off. I made inquiries between six and eight o'clock, and I find that the western plant of the Massey-Harris company, which was engaged on war production, has been closed, and that the war workers were given the option of transferring their activities to the agricultural implement plant, where the wages may have been lower than in the war plant, but that there has been no reduction whatever in agricultural implement wages. As a matter of fact, the increase in wages paid by the Massey-Harris company, according to information which I have obtained, is as follows: 1939, 51½ cents an hour; 1941, 59·7 cents an hour; 1945, 79·4 cents an hour; 1946, about 80 cents an hour is the average present wage rate of the employees of that company. This indicates a wage increase of approximately 33⅓ per cent. With regard to wages generally in Canada—and I say this on the point that the government has put the cart before the horse, and in rebuttal of the accusation that the government meets the wishes of big business, or business generally, before it meets the demands of labour and agriculture—I wish to point out that, according to the Department of Labour figures, the average hourly wage rates in all industries in 1944 were forty-four per cent above the average of 1935-39 and eighteen per cent above 1941. I say that because some hon. members have gone rather far in stating that I as Minister of Finance am particularly amenable to the appeals of business, or big business, rather than those of other classes in the community. That is not so, nor is it true of the wartime prices and trade board. The whole record and history of the wartime prices and trade board shows that it is consumer-minded. There is not anybody in Canada who knows anything about the record of the wartime prices and trade board and has followed it through the years who can deny that it is consumer-minded. So much so, that it has been denounced at times by agriculture; it has been denounced at times by labour; it has been accused of being obsessed with the idea that we must have low wages and low prices in this country. I do not think the wartime prices and trade board has gone too far, but it has been accused of going too far along those lines, and certainly nobody can deny that the first and paramount interest of the wartime prices and trade board is the interest of the consumer, which in this case is the farmer consumer.

We have to leave these matters to somebody. The government cannot conduct the exhaustive investigations which are necessary to bring to light every detail in these investigations. The body which has been set up to consider what prices are proper under the circumstances is the wartime prices and trade board. I have faith in that board because I have worked with it over the last five or six years, and there is one thing I know they will not do; I know they will not authorize a price increase unless that price increase is absolutely necessary. The reason that a price increase was authorized in this case was because of the great cost increases.

I said a few minutes ago that there had been repeated upward adjustments in prices of agricultural products. I must, I think, place on record some of the increases which have taken place in prices of agricultural products since 1941, merely by way of reply to the charge that we do not meet other groups but meet the claims of business. I am not saying for one minute that the increases were excessive. I am not saying for one minute that price increases over the level of the fall of 1941 were not desirable, because the price level before the war was low, and while it rose somewhat between 1939 and the fall of 1941 it did not rise as high as it should have. But since 1941—and these are figures given by the bureau of statistics—average prices of farm products, including subsidies, in 1945 as compared with average prices for 1941 showed the following increases: wheat, 67 per cent, or, if an estimated participation of fifteen cents be included, 87 per cent; oats 65 per cent, barley 62 per cent, hogs 51 per cent. The recent adjustments in hog prices would increase this to 70 per cent. Cattle, 40 per cent; fluid milk, 28 per cent; butter, 29 per cent; with the recent price increase, 40 per cent; cheese, 53 per cent; eggs, 28 per cent; potatoes, 135 per cent; all farm prices, 48 per cent, farm machinery, three per cent.

Mr. McCUAIG: Will the minister allow me a question?

Mr. ILSLEY: I am afraid—

Mr. McCUAIG: I was going to say, with the ridiculous price of farm products in 1941—

Mr. ILSLEY: Please do not interrupt me. I have listened to a lot of speeches to-day and I have not a very long time in which to speak. I am appealing to the house to give this matter fair judgment. I can understand that members from rural constituencies, about to go back to their ridings, wish to place themselves on record as trying to keep down prices of implements which their constituents have to buy. Do not think that the government is insensible to considerations of that kind. I myself represent a rural constituency, and the government would not permit this price increase to take place, at the instance of the wartime prices and trade board, or anybody else, if they did not consider that it was a necessary price increase for the reasons I gave this afternoon. To continue: farm machinery, three per cent; with the recent increase, nine per cent. Taking the period from October, 1941, the basic period of price ceiling, to February, 1946, farm prices have advanced 14 per cent; farm machinery prices have advanced three per cent. The present price increase in farm machinery, which applies to domestically manufactured items only, will mean an increase in all farm machinery prices of about nine per cent, since the price ceiling came into effect, as compared with an advance of 44 per cent in farm product prices.

Listening to the speeches this afternoon and evening, one would think that we had removed the price ceiling from farm machinery and were retaining it on farm products. I should like hon. members to bear this in mind, that far from removing control over prices of farm machinery we are maintaining a most severe and rigid control, so much so that we have protests from the implement companies, who say that this increase is entirely inadequate. I will read two or three of them. Here is one from the Cockshutt Plow company. This is a wire I received to-day:

The recent increase of 12½ per cent in the retail prices of farm implements is completely inadequate to cover increases in material labour and over-all costs since ceiling prices were set. While necessity for controls is appreciated such controls should be fair and equitable. Implement manufacturers should not be forced to accept staggering increases in costs without being allowed to adjust selling prices proportionately. Otherwise the industry will find itself in straitened circumstances and will be unable to carry on necessary production. The increase required by our company to provide sound operation is over 25 per cent as outlined in our submission to the wartime prices and trade board. The increase authorized by them is insufficient and will place our company in an unsound and unsatisfactory position unless augmented by a subsidy. We therefore respectfully request the matter of increases in prices of farm implements be given further consideration. Our company is in no position to manufacture implements on a losing basis.

Cockshutt Plow Company.

I quote another communication from a small company in Orillia:

Minister of Finance, Ottawa, Ontario.

Otaco Limited manufactures the lighter agricultural implements, wagons and sleighs. Before the war costs had eliminated any reasonable margin of profit in our products. Our costs have increased including the latest authorized increases on steel malleables and pigiron to an average of forty per cent on our class of farm implements and fifty per cent on wagons. All these increases are results of government authorization. While we appreciate the help given the twelve and one-half per cent does not cover our increased costs and unless we have sufficient relief to do that we will obviously have to withdraw from the farm implement field. This we will regret because of the approximately four hundred families that depend on us for their livelihood.

Otaco Limited.

The next communication is addressed to myself:

Reference recent ruling farm implement prices. Decision taken wartime prices and trade board most disappointing having in mind we submitted conclusive evidence cost advances justifying our request substantially greater percentage increase. I appreciate your difficulty and recognize that if inflationary tendencies are to be controlled that all must be prepared to make sacrifices. Inescapable fact is however that cumulative cost advances since basic period and impending increases in material and labour costs make further increases selling prices imperative if our company is to continue to operate on sound basis. Recent 12½ per cent adjustment can only be regarded therefore as temporary measure of relief.

James S. Duncan.

That is the kind of thing we get from the implement companies. We are not prepared to have regard to these representations because the wartime prices and trade board have spent a long time in the investigation of the claims of the implement companies that they must have increases in the prices of their implements ranging from 20 per cent to 25 and 30 per cent. The wartime prices and trade board have satisfied themselves that 12½ per cent will be sufficient to enable the companies to carry on; but they are also satisfied that, whatever the profit position may have been during the war on their war business, there is now such a drop in their profits that those profits for the ensuing year are sure to be less than standard profits; that is to say, less than the average profits of the period 1936-1939.

Those who are running the implement companies are much like other people. I have

spent a good many years in this house and have heard big interests attacked; I have heard wealth attacked, and so on. Perhaps I have indulged a little bit in the attack myself. The members of this house think it is perfectly natural for a workman not to work overtime if all his earnings are taken in income tax. They think it is perfectly natural for the farmer not to strain himself to produce if he can get nothing out of his additional production. Human beings are pretty much the same everywhere; they want to be assured that they will get something in return for what they do. They will not do business unless they make a little something out of it. The implement companies are like other people in that regard. Members here have said "Why do you not put this before the house? Why do you not let us decide?" I am satisfied that if the members of the house had executive responsibility, if they had the responsibility of deciding, of saying yes or no as to whether a factory should go on or stop, they would say, "Well, we hate to have to defend an increase in prices before our constituents but we must have the machinery." That is what they would say, and that is what the government has to say, although it is far easier to make good fellows of ourselves with the farmers of Canada than it is with a few implement companies who are politically negligible, as everybody in this house knows. We are doing this because we think it is in the interests of the farmers of Canada. We could take another course. We could follow the course which the Progressive Conservative party came near advocating recently, if not completely advocating, to let the controls go and let things find their level. That was tried at the end of the last war. I wish to tell the house what happened to farm implement prices at the end of the last war. I have the records here and I shall give them in a moment. Taking 1914 as the index of 100, in 1915 the price had decreased 5 per cent; in 1916, it was 4 per cent below 1914. In 1917 it was up 11 per cent; in 1918 it was up 44 per cent; in 1919, 54 per cent; in 1920, 64 per cent; in 1921, 96 per cent. That is what happened to farm implement prices during and at the end of the last war.

Mr. McCUAIG: How much did they go down from that price?

Mr. ILSLEY: In 1921 they were 96 per cent above; in 1922 they came down to 61 per cent above 1914. I have not the figures beyond that. I do not know whether they came down below that or went up again or not. Prices were lower at that time than they are to-day. If I remember correctly, and if the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) were here, he would know, steel workers were getting 16 and 18 cents an hour in the 'teens. Workers in the implement industries were getting 22 cents an hour as against 80 cents an hour to-day. In regard to wages they were working twelve hours a day in the steel mills in Nova Scotia and getting 16 and 18 cents an hour. I am speaking from memory, but I think I am right.

Mr. HARKNESS: Farmers were getting $3 for wheat.

Mr. ILSLEY: No, they never got $3 for wheat. That is the situation we would have in this country if we had no controls. There has been no control that has been more rigid, and few controls that have been as rigid, as the farm machinery control. When we were adjusting farm prices upward in 1942 we were keeping farm machinery prices down. When we were adjusting farm prices upwards in 1943 we were getting farm machinery prices down. When we were adjusting farm prices upwards in 1944 we were getting farm machinery prices down, and putting them down below what they were at the time.

An hon. MEMBER: At that time—

Mr. ILSLEY: I listened to twenty-five speeches to-day and I did not interrupt very much. In 1944 we pressed them down below the ceiling at the time we took the duty off. In 1945 we kept them where they were. In 1946 with the rise in the steel price, with these rises in wages, with these rises in overhead costs and so on, we think the time has come for us to be fair, and to get production we think the time has come that we have to allow this moderate increase of 12½ per cent, which over the whole field of agricultural implements amounts to only nine per cent, because about half of the agricultural implements are imported.

In the debate to-day it was pointed out that selling costs were less than they were years ago. I made inquiries about that and I was informed the fact that the selling costs are down was taken into account in fixing the figure of 12½ per cent. I was asked whether the increase in the price ceiling applies to inventories. The answer is that it does for one reason, namely, that when you raise a ceiling it is administratively impossible to select certain machines and say this machine came on the floor before the ceiling was raised, and this machine came on the floor after the ceiling was raised, and put a tag on one machine at one price and on another machine at another price. The important fact in reference to inventories is that there are practically no inventories. The machines

are snapped up. The demand is so great that they melt; they go right out into the hands of the public.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is the minister sure that they have not been held for this price rise?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not think they have been held.

Mr. COLDWELL: I heard that.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is one objection to the suggestion that sounded reasonable to-day, and is reasonable in principle, that before you change any ceiling you ought to have a public hearing. The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) put that forward very strongly. If we were to have changes in the ceilings taking place all the time—they have been taking place all the time over the last two or three years, and they are taking place more rapidly recently—it would be utterly impossible from the administrative point of view to have public hearings on all these price changes. If we selected some of the more important ones—I was thinking about this as I listened to the hon. member for Vancouver East for whom I need hardly say I have much respect—I do not know where we would stop. Each person who was heard would say: "Well, I am entitled to a public hearing on this matter." It would have to be advertised and so on. But it seems to me there is this big difference between a price hearing and a wage hearing. In the case of a wage hearing the wage increase, if it is eventually granted, may be dated back to the time of the application and very often is. The price increase cannot. If you had a hearing that lasted as long as some of the wage hearings have lasted, and if you had a price hearing on this matter that lasted several months you could not, of course, date the price back. Therefore, if you had a situation where the producer of the article really needed the increase in order to operate you could not do anything effective for him at all. The suggestion that there should be public hearings is impracticable. We have to have faith in the wartime prices and trade board. Their record and their outlook have been such that, however much people desiring higher prices may dislike them—and they have taken a great deal of abuse all through the years from people who desire higher prices—those who desire low prices, prices as low as can be maintained, can trust them.

These were some of the questions that were brought up this afternoon. One other question was asked by the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Menary), namely, what happened in the case of an article which was purchased before the effective date of the increase in the price ceiling? I made inquiries and attempted to get the information in that regard. The increase came into effect on April 13. If a man has a contract for delivery the ordinary law of contract applies; but if a sale takes place on or after the 13th day of April the vendor may sell at the new price.

There is one point which perhaps I ought to make clear. After listening to a number of the speeches this afternoon, one would have thought the government was raising these prices. The order of the wartime prices and trade board does not raise the prices; it merely authorizes an increase in prices, raises the ceiling on the prices. The circumstances at the present time are such that the producers can take advantage of that. We removed the duty from agricultural implements; we removed the war exchange tax and so on from agricultural implements, so that no advantage whatever can be taken of the tariff. We get the advantage of the competitive United States market, to the extent that it is an advantage, and I presume it is of some. The tone of some of the speeches was that we were just going in and saying, "You have to pay these increased prices." We are just removing the control of the prices to that extent, raising the ceilings to the extent of 12½ per cent.

I have a great deal more material here, Mr. Speaker, but I do not know that there is very much more I could usefully add.

Mr. PROBE: Might I ask the minister a question which would fit into this discussion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ILSLEY: Very well.

Mr. PROBE: Would the minister inform the house whether or not he is taking steps to see that we are now going to get machinery on the Canadian market, so that these large inventories I see listed here will not be allowed to trickle out of Canada at the same time? What precautions are we taking to keep our Canadian inventories at home, as well as building them up in the United States?

Mr. ILSLEY: I shall have to find out just exactly what some other agency of government is doing about that. I think a certain proportion is allocated for export in order to hold our export markets, so that we shall not lose our foothold in those markets. That is a matter which, as I understand it, and I think I am correct, is arranged between the wartime prices and trade board and those agencies of government which are interested in export.

I am reminded that some question has been raised as to whether the wartime prices and

trade board advised the government in this matter, or specifically whether they advised me, because I am the responsible minister; or whether the government told the wartime prices and trade board to raise this ceiling by 12½ per cent. I might as well tell the house how these things are done. No implement company has approached me at all. Personally I have not seen any representative of any implement company, nor have they communicated with me except by protesting to-day at what has been done in regard to these increases. However, they have made their representations to the wartime prices and trade board over quite a period of time. Those representations have been analyzed and gone into, with the result the house knows. The wartime prices and trade board advised me last week they were convinced that this was absolutely necessary and should not be further delayed. They then made the announcement themselves. I did not know what time they were going to make the announcement, but I understand it was on the radio on Friday evening and in the newspapers on Saturday morning; but I consented to the increase and take the responsibility for it.

Mr. J. M. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making one or two brief observations and a suggestion. The suggestion is not wholly new; it is very similar to the one made by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) and the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge). The reason I do that is this. It seems to me that it is important not only to do what is believed to be the right thing but to make people believe it is the right thing. If anything were needed to support the statement made this afternoon by my leader that this matter was not carried out as well as it might have been, it is the debate we have had, when we have seen what, to a new member like myself at any rate, seems an unprecedented spate of protest against what the government is doing.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has made a statement to which we have all listened with respect. Personally I would not presume to disagree with it because I do not know enough about the facts. On the other hand, we have had a great many people here who do disagree with it, and so I come to this. I agree with what has been said that it is in the highest degree unfortunate that a decision of this kind has to be arrived at by methods fair-minded men have to-day described as in camera, secretly, and so on. I fully realize the force of the minister's statement that we cannot have a debate in parliament on every decision that has to be made, but nonetheless I suggest that there are certain basic principles underlying the de-controls which must come within the next few months. So that I submit for the consideration of the minister and the government whether it would not be possible to have some body, I do not know whether it should be the agriculture committee, the banking and commerce committee or a combination of the two if you wish, which would ask to appear before it people who are supposed to have competent opinions on these important questions, which I recognize as very difficult, and to ask also representatives of labour, of the farmers, of the manufacturers and of all the other people interested. The minister may say, "Oh, well, you would just have a kind of debate which would lead to nothing." I am not suggesting that this body could proceed to decide on this and this and this de-control in Gatling-gun fashion, but I suggest that at the present time there is a great deal of misapprehension in the public mind, and that if we are to have merely one announcement after another that this and this and this has been de-controlled, it is not the best way of trying to get across to the public mind what, it seems to me, it is so enormously important that we should get into the public mind.

The thing that has distressed me to-day and harrassed my mind beyond words is the statement we have heard in this house as to farms abandoned, as to people unwilling to leave the cities to go to work on the farms. I heard a figure as to the percentage of men who had come from farms and were now unwilling to go back to them, which was so high I simply could not credit it; nevertheless there is the problem. It seems to me one of enormous importance, and therefore with great respect, not with any desire to complicate this difficult question but because I believe at the present time it is not being really met, I offer this suggestion. I believe the debate we have had to-day shows that the problem is not being met, when once there is this widespread measure of protest. I realize that the protests come from farming constituencies. I represent one myself, though it will be observed that I have not made a protest. Nevertheless I feel there are basic principles here which might well be discussed in open forum, so that the citizens of Canada might have a better understanding than they now have of the problems and the basic principles which are to be followed in dealing with the matter.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it was suggested

a few minutes ago that it might be necessary for one of the members of the opposition to speak for the Minister of Agriculture. I think it is pretty well understood, however, that I usually speak for myself.

There are one or two reasons why it would be necessary for me to say something in a debate of this kind. The first is that I do not think that in the ten years I have been here I have allowed a debate on a question involving an increase in the price of farm implements to go by without my saying something. If I were to do so on this occasion it might be misunderstood.

In addition to that, like many other hon. members I intend to go to my constituency during the Easter recess, and I am certain again that if I did not express myself upon this question I might be misunderstood there —and I have seldom allowed myself to be misunderstood in my own constituency.

Another reason for my rising is that one or two of the suggestions made require a little analysis. We have talked a great deal this afternoon and this evening about a 12½ per cent increase in the price of farm implements. I think I am as much opposed as anyone in Canada—and every farmer is opposed—to an increase in the price of farm implements, believing as I do and as most farmers do, as has been stated a number of times this afternoon, that farm implement prices, if anything, have always been a little too high. So that one has to have proven to him the fact that they are as low as they ought to be, in order to be entirely satisfied.

But on this occasion perhaps too great emphasis has been given to the increase of 12½ per cent, and more particularly by my hon. friends directly opposite, in view of the statement I have heard them make on many previous occasions. Each time that I have been attempting to prove that we should have lower prices for farm implements, I have always been told that it does not involve more than from three to six per cent of the farmer's cost of production. I think the report that was read this afternoon on so many occasions bears that out—and probably accepts the higher figure of six per cent. If that is true, what we have been talking about this afternoon is three-quarters of one per cent of the farmer's cost of production, when we speak of a 12½ per cent increase. I wish to make that statement only in order to have the record straight in so far as what we actually do is concerned.

If there were no other considerations I would think that even three-quarters of one per cent of an increase in farm costs of production at the present time would be a most important matter, and that it should be justified on some ground or another. I consider the statement made a few minutes ago by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) was a very fair statement of the relationship between farmers and the implement industry, and a very fair statement in respect of what has happened since 1941 to the farmers as compared with what has happened to the farm implement companies.

But I wish to emphasize a little more—and he emphasized it—the fact that these increases, so far as the farmers are concerned, began at a very low level, and did advance eventually to a fairly high level. Considered, of course, in terms of percentages, that can be represented in very high figures.

There is another argument which is being used in the country, but which was not used in the house this afternoon. I wish to refer to it because it has been used in the country, and more particularly in some of the financial papers. The suggestion has been made that farmers are very well off. I do not find any more common statement. Indeed I find it quite often in the corridors of this building—the statement to the effect that farmers are well off. Because of that statement being made, we have been arriving at conclusions which are not justified by the facts.

One of the most apparent reasons for making the statement is contained in a table which has been issued, indicating the extent to which farmers have paid off their indebtedness for farm machinery, and on mortgages. I was just reading this evening one statement which indicated that thirty mortgage companies in Canada—and some hon. members opposite know very well the records of some of them—had had the indebtedness of farmers reduced by $102 million. That is, early in the war the indebtedness of those farmers was $168 million, while at the end of the war or last year, it was down to $66 million.

I should just like to make an analysis of what that means. It certainly does not mean that the farmer has $100 million more in cash. It does mean that farmers have worked hard for long days during the years of this war to produce products which have been sold at reasonable prices under arrangements made through the wartime prices and trade board. They have worked long hours and long days, and by doing so have accumulated $100 million which has been paid into the treasuries of thirty loan companies in Canada.

That is a partial job well done. They still owe $66 million. Any man or any group of

men which still owes any debt, particularly a group owing $66 million to thirty mortgage companies, is not yet well off. That statement ought to be emphasized. Until that other $66 million is paid off, the farmers who owe that money are not well off. Every farmer in this country, or every farmer who farms in this country, knows that a farmer has only one ambition, if he is ever going to be well off, and that is to have his farm clear of debt. His second ambition is to have his farm implements clear of debt.

If any farmer in this country with an average, family-sized farm, has his farm clear of debt, and his implements and stock clear of debt, then I venture to say on the floor of this house that there is not any nicer way of living than living on the farm. But if the farmer is loaded down with debt, even to the extent of a few thousand dollars, it is hard for him to make a living on the farm, with people chasing after him from morning to night to get him to pay his debts. That farmer will not have a very comfortable time on the farm, nor will he enjoy working there.

So that, I think, while he has taken off $102 million from a debt of $168 million owed to some thirty mortgage companies—and owing a great deal more in some other directions—that we should pay attention to that fact, when considering his present position, rather than pay attention only to the fact that he has paid off that amount of debt.

There is one other point I wish to make, and it is this: As the Minister of Finance pointed out, we have made recently some increases in farm prices. There has been an increase in the price of butter of four cents which, after all, is an increase of ten per cent. It is not three-quarters of one per cent, and it might be fair to compare it with the 12½ per cent increase to implement companies. But to the farmers who produce butter it is an increase of ten per cent. In both cases it is an increase on top of the price at which he was probably at least getting by prior to getting that increase. So that I am sure it is acknowledged in the country as a very helpful increase; at least it is as much as the organized farmers asked for.

The other increase which was made was the six per cent increase on hogs. Many of us are going home to our constituencies during the Easter recess, and many of those constituencies are agricultural. I am speaking as a member of the government because there are only two of us on this side from Saskatchewan and I think any message we have to give out should go to that province, namely, that the prices board cannot make all its adjustments at once unless it is prepared to agree that the position taken by the official opposition is the correct one, that we should make all our decisions at once to close the whole thing up. If that were the case, then, of course, you could make all your adjustments at once. But barring that, there is only one other way, and that is to do it partly, one at a time; then work along with the job until finally you have it completed. I am confident whether other members of the house are or not, and I am going to exercise any ability that I have to spread that confidence, that the adjustments which have been made will be followed up by more adjustments. I am also satisfied and confident that when those adjustments are all made, a good job will have been done and that our farming population can at least during the next few years proceed to pay off the remainder of the debt. When they have that debt paid off I hope we shall be able to say that the farmer is well off. Because for Canada to be well off, the farmer must be well off. When he is well off, others are well off in common with him. Then we shall be able to go back to our constituencies, wherever they may be, and say that we have taken some part in doing a job that will be of some assistance to this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is customary, Mr. Speaker, where a motion has been made such as that moved by my hon. friend, that he ask to withdraw his motion in order to close the proceedings.

Mr. BRACKEN: What is the alternative? We do not want to vote the government out of power. The purpose of the motion has been achieved. A good discussion has been had; protests have been made, and the minister has made his answer. That is a good thing for Canada. The difficulty was, Mr. Speaker, that prior to this time decisions were made outside this house, and then the minister would come in and explain them under conditions where there could not be any debate. That is what I protested chiefly against to-day. Our protests have now been made and the minister has made his answer, and better than he ever did before in any statement he has made. I think the purpose of the motion has been achieved and, as is customary under such conditions, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

It being seven minutes after eleven o'clock, the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, April 16, 1946

The house met at three o'clock.

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING

CANADIAN NATIONAL (WEST INDIES) STEAMSHIPS LIMITED—REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORT TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): I desire to lay on the table the annual report of Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Limited for the calendar year 1945, in English and French. Copies of this report are being distributed to hon. members this afternoon.

By leave of the house I wish to move:

That the annual report for 1945 of the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Limited, tabled this day, be referred to the sessional committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government.

Motion agreed to.

FOODS AND DRUGS

PROVISION FOR LABELLING IN FRENCH AS WELL AS IN ENGLISH

Mr. L. PHILIPPE PICARD (Bellechasse) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 55, to amend certain acts in respect to the labelling and marking of foods and drugs.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. PICARD: Mr. Speaker, at the moment the Food and Drugs Act provides, under section 3, subsection (b) of chapter 3 of the statutes of 1939, that the department shall have the right to make regulations concerning the labelling and packaging of foods and drugs. The aim of that section as it stands is to prevent the public or the purchaser, according to the text of the subsection, from being "deceived or misled" as to the character, strength, quality or quantity of the article, and so on. Under the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act there is a subsection providing that whenever there is any drug marketed there shall be printed on the wrapper or label the following words:

It is unlawful to administer this preparation to a child under two years of age as it contains (insert name of drug) and is dangerous to its life.

The object of the present bill is to provide, for people who understand only the French language, the same protection as is provided for those who speak English, under the Food and Drugs Act and under the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, by providing that the labelling shall be printed both in English and in French.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Mr. POULIOT: Jan de Kuyper gin should be described as poison.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

RADIO BROADCASTING

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER ANNUAL REPORT AND REVIEW POLICIES OF CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue) moved:

That a select committee, the members thereof to be later named, be appointed on radio broadcasting to consider the annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and to review the policies and aims of the corporation and its regulations, revenues, expenditures and development, with power to examine and inquire into the matters and things herein referred to and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, and to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I wish to ask the mover of this resolution a question. This committee has been appointed periodically for many years, in fact since the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has been in existence, and it seems to me that its meetings have been held to too great an extent in camera. Moreover, the reports presented to the house are never considered by the house. When the committee was appointed last year it was supposed to report on the question whether the $2.50 fee should be abolished, having regard to changed conditions. I would like to find out from the minister whether, when the present committee is appointed, it will meet in Ottawa, whether its proceedings will be open to the public, and whether its reports will be presented for consideration by the house, and presented in time to allow of such consideration.

Mr. McCANN: The committee is being set up at this time for the purpose of expediting the business of parliament, and we invite the cooperation of members of the opposition and of other parties in naming members who will constitute the committee in order that its work may begin immediately after the recess. In answer to the hon. member for Broadview, may I assure him that the sittings of the committee are not held in camera. They are open to the public, and the reports submitted are brought down in sufficient time to be acted upon by parliament if parliament so desires. It is within the province of any member of parliament to move that a report be concurred in, with a view to having discussion. The recommendations and reports of the committee for 1942, 1943 and 1944 have

in the main been acted upon, and the government has put into operation as a matter of policy almost all the recommendations which these committees throughout the several years have submitted to parliament.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): I do not rise to speak against the motion, because I am in favour of it. I simply wish to point out that the motion is for a select committee, and of course a motion is necessary if the committee is to be set up. But the select committee is to deal only with the annual report, and not "annual reports," in the plural. I am at a loss to know why the committee should be set up to deal with just one report. I presume that is not particularly what is in the minister's mind. What I wish to emphasize is my belief—and I shall present to you, Mr. Speaker, and your committee who are now revising the rules and regulations of the house, a submission in this regard—that a committee of this kind should be a standing committee in order that it may meet every year to consider not only a particular matter but other subjects which should be brought before it. In fact, I believe that all government institutions should come under review of this parliament annually and not merely when something may have arisen to necessitate a special sitting of a committee. I emphasize this at the present time. At a later date I shall discuss matters affecting radio.

Mr. McCANN: It is not the intention of the government to have the committee confine its investigation to one single report. All the policies, the financial operations and the obligations of the organization may be reviewed by the committee when it sits, as has been the practice in former years in respect of the policies and operations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

EASTER ADJOURNMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That when the house adjourns on Wednesday, April 17, it stand adjourned until Monday, April 29, 1946, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

He said: Mr. Speaker, since the motion to have the Easter adjournment until Wednesday of next week was carried I have received representations from all sides of the house indicating that the majority of the members would prefer to have the longer rather than the shorter vacation. The adjournment to Wednesday of next week would give only two and a half working days in the house next week. If the adjournment were fixed until the following Monday it would allow hon. members a longer recess of four and a half days. I am putting forward this motion in the belief that the longer recess would better suit the membership of the house. With respect to this longer recess, the government intends to follow the same course it has followed in previous years when there has been a lengthy recess, and allow hon. members their actual travelling expenses. As to the method of transportation, hon. members are free to choose what will best accommodate them.

Mr. BRACKEN: We are agreeable to the passage of the motion.

Motion agreed to.

[*Later:*]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say I received a note from the leader of the Social Credit group asking me to clarify the last part of the statement I made as to the members being free to choose their method of travel at the Easter recess. My hon. friend asked if that means by plane. It will be for hon. members to decide; they are free so to travel if they wish.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

GREAT LAKES SEAMEN—HOURS OF WORK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): A matter of some urgency has just come to my attention about which I would like to make an inquiry of the government. I am told that there are seamen employed on vessels operated by the Department of Transport and other owners who are working as long as eighty-four hours a week on the great lakes. What steps if any is the government taking to rectify this matter and thereby avoid a threatened seamen's strike?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I wish to thank the leader of the opposition for giving me notice of this question. In so far as it refers to the operation of vessels controlled by the Department of Transport I think I should leave it to my colleague, the Minister of Transport, to reply.

With respect to the privately owned and controlled companies operating vessels on the great lakes and the dispute with the seamen, my department has been endeavouring to get the parties into collective bargaining negotiations in accordance with the provisions of P.C. 1003. A preliminary conference was arranged for April 8 in Toronto, but the representatives of the Canadian seamen's union did not attend, claiming that it was their under-

standing that the conference was to be held in Toronto in the office of the Department of Labour, and that an officer of the department was to attend. This was not the understanding of myself or the officers of my department.

At the present time the agreements between certain operators and the union call for a twelve hour day except for firemen, but when the last collective agreement was signed the question of hours of work per day was left open to further negotiations. For the present these negotiations have not yielded any result, and it is the view of the department that the conciliation processes of our legislation should be invoked by the union or the companies. We are informed by the representatives of the companies concerned that a meeting of all operators of great lakes vessels is to be held in Toronto on April 24, and following that the operators will have a concrete proposal to submit to the union executive. It is our hope that the parties will then enter into negotiations looking toward a settlement of the dispute.

Mr. BRACKEN: I did not send a copy of this question to the Minister of Transport. I wonder whether he could add anything to what the Minister of Labour has said.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): Yes. I was advised by the Minister of Labour when we were coming down to the house that the hon. member intended to ask this question. I can say that so far as the Department of Transport is concerned we believe we have the equivalent of an eight hour day on the ships operated by the department, although it is true we do not pay overtime. There are seasons in the year when it is occasionally necessary to send out lighthouse supplies, and where it is deemed advisable for the crew to work more than eight hours. When that is done the men get time off as soon as they reach their home port. In fact there are seasons in the year when officers of these ships are on call. They have to go out at night and do certain work. There are seasons of the year when because of the weather it is impossible to move. When it is impossible to move and the men work only two or three hours, they are paid for eight hours. When they work over eight hours, they get, as I said a moment ago, time off at the home port. Therefore we consider that in effect we have the equivalent of an eight-hour day.

Mr. MacINNIS: May I ask the minister a supplementary question? When they work only two or three hours a day in bad weather, are they on duty for the rest of the time, and on call?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes, they are on duty for the rest of the time.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE

REFERENCE TO MINISTER'S ADDRESS IN CORNWALL —MILITARY TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. A. KIDD (Kingston City): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister clarify the statement with regard to the Royal Military College, Kingston, which he released to the press in Cornwall yesterday?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): I did not release any statement to the press. I was making a speech in Cornwall yesterday, but I do not suppose the house would care to have me repeat it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ABBOTT: Briefly, what I said with respect to the Royal Military College was this, that contrary to rumours, the military college would not be closed, but the question now under consideration was whether or not the character of the course, the syllabus and so on, would be that conducted before the war or a different one, and that that question had not yet been decided.

Mr. PEARKES: Mr. Speaker, a question arising out of the previous question: Will the Minister of National Defence say whether the Royal Military College will be open for courses this year for young men without previous military training?

Mr. ABBOTT: The answer is, it will not.

PEACE CONFERENCE

INQUIRY AS TO PROBABLE DATE—CONFERENCE ON COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the house rises to-morrow for a lengthy Easter recess, will the Prime Minister be good enough to give the members such information as he has with respect to the probable date of the peace conference in Paris, and when he plans to meet the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom for a conference on commonwealth affairs?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I wish I were able to inform my hon. friend as to the date of the Paris conference. As hon. members know, it was hoped that the conference might open on May 1; but I think I am correct in saying it is hardly probable that it will open for some weeks after that date.

As the house is aware, I have accepted the invitation of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to meet in conference with him and others on matters of mutual interest. I hope that that meeting may be arranged so that the time of it will be approximate to that of the meeting of the Paris conference, possibly a week or two before the conference opens in Paris, but up to the present I have not received exact information.

TIMBER

BRITISH COLUMBIA PRODUCTION—PRAIRIE REQUIREMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. O. PROBE (Regina City): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Reconstruction or his appropriate colleague. I sent a notice of this question to the minister. Will the Minister of Reconstruction please inform the house whether the 35 per cent of the British Columbia timber production being retained in Canada is being offered by the coast mills locally only, thereby denying the prairie trade a fair share of the British Columbia timber output? What provision has been made by the department—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. This is what may be called a lengthy question and it should be put on the order paper.

Mr. PROBE: I did not understand your ruling, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said this question is a lengthy one and should be put on the order paper.

Mr. PROBE: Mr. Speaker, I must suggest that this is an urgent question. The reply need not be longer than any other.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked the hon. member to put his question on the order paper.

IGOR GOUZENKO

REFERENCE TO PRESS REPORT AS TO STATEMENT FROM RUSSIAN EMBASSY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Cariboo): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in his capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the statement appearing in the press, alleged to have come from the Russian embassy, that Mr. Igor Gouzenko had stolen money from the Russian embassy, I should like to ask if the Secretary of State for External Affairs received any communication with regard thereto prior to the establishment of the royal commission?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I assume the statement in the press to which my hon. friend refers is that which was issued by the Russian embassy some days ago. I may say to my hon. friend that a similar statement was received in the Department for External Affairs a day or two after Mr. Gouzenko had left the embassy.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

PART 3—FARMERS AND RESIDENTS OF TOWNS AND VILLAGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance, notice of which I sent him the other day. Will he please indicate to the house the arrangements which have been made to enable farmers and residents of towns and villages to take advantage of part 3 of the National Housing Act?

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I inadvertently left the answer to that question in my office, and I shall have to give it later. Will to-morrow be all right?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Before the Easter adjournment.

CANADIAN FORCES

ALLEGATIONS AS TO TREATMENT OF CANADIAN SOLDIERS AT HEDLEY DOWNS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): May I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence, notice of which I sent him. I would have put the question on the order paper were it not for the fact that there is some degree of urgency in view of the house rising to-morrow. Has the minister received a communication signed by Mr. N. M. Lee Rolfe, president, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Halifax, relating to serious allegations regarding the treatment of Canadian soldiers at Hedley Downs Detention Barracks, England? If so, is an investigation being undertaken, and will the minister make a complete statement to the house?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): Yes, I did receive the letter referred to. I have ordered an investigation but I have not yet received a report. When I do I shall make the statement asked for.

ELIGIBILITY OF FORMER R.C.A.F. AIRCREW FOR FLEET AIR ARM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. W. SKEY (Trinity): I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Defence, arising out of newspaper reports of new rates of pay in the armed forces, and shortages that are reported in the Royal Canadian Navy. Will the Royal Canadian Navy consider accepting former R.C.A.F. aircrew for entry into the new fleet air arm? I have particular reference to air force pilots, navigators, gunners and wireless operators already trained in naval cooperation.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT: (Minister of National Defence): It is very difficult to answer that question offhand. I was given no notice of it. I am sure that they would consider any applicant whose physical category, education and previous training qualify him for entry in the naval forces.

LOAN TO UNITED KINGDOM

APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL AGREEMENT SIGNED MARCH 6, 1946

The house resumed, from Friday, April 12, consideration in committee of bill No. 28, respecting the financial agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom signed on the 6th day of March, 1946—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford) in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I have done my best to summarize the speech made the other day by the Minister of Finance. I give him credit for his hard-working spirit, but when I read his speech I understood nothing from it, and it took me about two days to try to put his argument in order so as to understand something of it. I shall have to quote part of it before asking the minister a few questions which he may answer later. I have sent him a copy of his speech so that he may correct me if I happen to make an error.

In the first place the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance declared on April 1, 1946, that since September, 1939, Canada had made to the United Kingdom only one loan, of $700,000,000, under the War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act, 1942. The interest rate is nil. The loan is being repaid by proceeds of sales or redemptions of British-owned Canadian securities. It has since been reduced by repayment to $538,000,000 odd.

[Mr. Abbott.]

In the second place temporary loans have been made under the Export Credits Insurance Act to eight countries. The interest rate varied from two per cent to 3·5 per cent, and the time of repayment also varied from 1950 in the case of Russia to 1977 in the case of China. The total commitments are $644,500,000. They include $30,000,000 for Norway and $65,000,000 for the Netherlands East Indies.

This information is not satisfactory. It is too broad, and I hope that the minister will be kind enough to supply information about the first loans that were made to those countries and also in respect to the further loans. In regard to Norway, for instance, I remember that one of the members from Toronto said that he was satisfied with the progress of the Falconbridge Nickel mines in Norway during the war. I have now the company's report to the shareholders, and when I showed it in the house some of my colleagues were surprised. I will tell hon. members where it comes from. It comes from a boy in the navy who has some stock in the company. He was dumbfounded to see that this Canadian concern was boasting of making a huge profit by dealing with Germany in German-occupied territory.

With regard to the Netherlands East Indies it is important to know if it has been supplied only with money, or with some ammunition and arms. With whom did the Canadian government deal, since there was no recognized government over there?

In the third place temporary advances have also been made to fifteen allied countries under section 3 of the War Expenditure and Demobilization Appropriation Act and previous war appropriation acts.

The Minister of Finance said at page 766 of *Hansard* that the British authorities have estimated that the deficit will be $3,300 million Canadian for 1946, and $2,220 million Canadian for the two years 1947 and 1948; that the deficit in 1948 should be small, and a balance should be achieved by 1950. This is what the British refer to as getting back to equilibrium, the minister said.

I would ask one question of the minister at that point: What about the Canadian equilibrium? If we are so much interested in the equilibrium of the United Kingdom, we should have some information about the equilibrium of Canada.

Again the minister said, at page 766:

> The figures I have given apply to Britain's total position and not her position vis-a-vis Canada alone.

He said at page 765:

The losses incurred in shipping during the war have reduced, at least temporarily, the income from her merchant marine . . . British overseas earnings in respect of insurance and financing services, which also helped to pay for imports—

—have been interfered with by the war. Lloyd's, for instance, a powerful insurance society has never been taxed. I suggested to the minister that he tax them, but it was not done. I do not see how there can be a greater competitor dealing with the Canadian people, but it is not being taxed because it is a society instead of a company. Again the minister said, at page 766:

Britain is confronted with a very serious deficit in her international accounts which she is trying to keep down by the utmost economy in her purchases and expenditures abroad and by the utmost efforts in promoting her exports.

Nothing is said about reducing taxation in the United Kingdom. That is an example for Canada. I quote the minister again:

This deficit, however, must—

The word "must" is used; it must be done.

—must be financed by borrowing in one form or another.

Another question: From whom will Canada borrow to finance her own deficit? Will it be from the United Kingdom later on? I quote the minister again where he says that the British deficit for 1946, 1947 and 1948 will be $5,500,000,000 Canadian. Then he says, at page 789:

The United States loan will provide her with the equivalent of 4,120,000,000 Canadian dollars for future purchases.

Canada will provide her with $1,250,000,000 Canadian which would bring the total up to $5,375,000,000. The remainder, says the minister, $1,250,000,000 Canadian—

—the United Kingdom will need to find elsewhere—

He uses the word "elsewhere".

—together with such amounts as are required to discharge existing indebtedness, which, of course, is not included in the estimate of her deficit on current account.

What is the total amount of that deficit on current account, if it is different from the one reported by the minister? And does "elsewhere" mean all the other dominions and the other countries of the empire?

The minister referred to "a credit of this magnitude". He admits that it is considerable. Then, to quote him again, at page 765, he says with regard to Britain—

—that her need for credits is huge in comparison with the other countries with which we have dealt.

And again, the same page:

There are special factors in the case of the United Kingdom . . . that necessitate and justify—

These are strong words.

—different terms from those we have offered as a matter of policy in other cases.

And again:

During the five years from 1946 to 1950, the United Kingdom will be going through a period of transition and reconstruction, both in its domestic and in its international economic affairs.

What will be our own period of transition and reconstruction in our international economic affairs? How will we do it? But the minister is concerned only with what will happen in England in the future. Nothing is said about Canada. He has his eyes there, and made the speech that Joe Chamberlain would have made at the beginning of the century.

I quote again, page 765:

It is necessary for Britain to do much more than to regain the pre-war levels, however, if she is to pay her way internationally. She has had to sacrifice many of the overseas investments she had made.

The income she previously had therefrom must be replaced by increased exports to help her pay for imports.

I quote again, where the minister states, page 766, that after 1948—

—she will be financing her deficit in Canada from other sources, for example, by selling us gold or other foreign exchange that we require.

We shall be paid after 1948 only if Great Britain has the gold, or other securities. Why are they not given to us in payment now? Why should we wait until 1948? I quote further, from the same page:

The case of the United Kingdom is unique.

There the situation is—

—a special one requiring terms and conditions in a financial agreement that are quite different from those in our other loans. "In the financial agreement of December 6, 1945, the British agree to their removal within one year from the effective date of that agreement."

Then, what about our British preference in trade? That is another question. I quote the minister again—page 764:

If we are to be successful in our public finance, we cannot afford to be hesitant and half-hearted in promoting the foreign trade which is the basis of our prosperity.

Foreign trade is not our trade with Great Britain. Our trade with Great Britain is our external trade. The minister will not use the word "foreign" as applying to Great Britain. I remember an incident in the days of Lord Dundonald, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier used

the word "foreign" when referring to Great Britain. It was considered a scandal at that time. The minister is a good imperialist, and I do not know how he could use the word "foreign" when describing our trade with Great Britain. Therefore our foreign trade shall be our trade with nations other than the United Kingdom. He said further, page 766:

We expect that the excess of what Britain pays to Canada for supplies and services during 1946 over what she receives from us currently for supplies and services will amount—

And it is not "would",

—will amount to approximately $600 million.

The minister knows what our trade will be with Great Britain this year. He knows that it will be $600 million. And he knows more than that; he knows the amount of our trade with Great Britain next year, although as yet no arrangements are definitely made. He states:

Next year, that is in 1947, the amount of this deficit with Canada will—

And again he uses the word "will".

—be reduced both because of lower expenditures of Britain here—

"Lower expenditures of Britain here" means that Great Britain will import less from us next year than she may this year. There is no other possible construction. I cannot understand why the minister has not bluntly used the word "imports" instead of the word "expenditures". Then, secondly—

—and because British exports to Canada will be at higher levels.

The situation as pictured by the minister is that next year Great Britain will buy less from us and sell more to us. That is what he said, in very blunt language. The reason I have worked so hard on this speech is that I want to understand the matter, and I hope the page references in *Hansard* will be shown, so that hon. members will be able to follow it, just as the minister has that opportunity now.

Then—and here it is—

The total may be expected to amount to about $400 or $500 million.

That is next year, in 1947. How can the minister prophesy the amount of our trade in such a definite way for next year? And again:

From that figure, the deficit may decline gradually in subsequent years to some more or less permanent, normal figure which it is difficult to forecast at this time.

And I quote again—page 764:

We must receive payment for our exports—

[Mr. Pouliot.]

The minister said that, and it is perfectly true and sound.

We must be able to use the proceeds of our exports to the United Kingdom and the continent of Europe in paying our own bills and debts in the United States, and in making purchases wherever we can best obtain the goods we need.

He is sure that we will get money from this loan and that we will use that money to pay our debt. That is what he says.

There is a question I want to ask the minister now. What payments did the United Kingdom make to Canada since December, 1940? I will tell the minister afterwards why I have mentioned that date specifically. What payments, if any, did she make? Then the minister went on—page 767:

These reasons for regarding the United Kingdom position as a special one requiring special treatment are much more important in relation to Canada even than they are to the United States. They are more important for two reasons:

—and here are the two reasons he gives, and I recall them to the minds of hon. members so that there may be no difficulty about them:

First, because we are so much more vitally interested in the future of international trade as a whole than the United States.

Well, this is incredible. I cannot conceive of the minister, with his intelligence, making a statement of that kind. And—

Second, because such a large proportion of our trade takes place with the United Kingdom and other countries in the sterling area, and we are most concerned to continue this trade and to continue to be able to receive payment for our exports to Britain and other sterling area countries in a form that we can use for expenditures elsewhere.

There we are, with a zollverein of countries in the sterling area, the old German plan of the duchies making arrangements together, circumscribing the sphere of our trade. This I object to. I object to it very strongly. And when the minister said that the United Kingdom was our most important customer and took the figures for 1938, he did not cite the figures for 1939, the year the war started. In 1939 the percentage of our trade was 46.6 with the British empire, including 35.5 with the United Kingdom, and our foreign trade was 53.4, including 41.1 with the United States—which shows that we were doing more trade with foreign nations than imperial business. I again quote the minister, page 767:

The nature of her imports was such that she constituted the chief market for countries such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina and Denmark, as well as many smaller countries, all of which were greatly dependent upon exports for their prosperity and their general welfare.

Well, we understand that for small countries, for two of the other dominions, for Argentina, where there are British investments, and for Denmark, the United Kingdom is the chief market, and naturally they go there to sell their products, but they do not deal much with the other countries of the world. Are we to follow their example?

British policies will influence and largely determine the policies of many other countries, including particularly the countries now in the sterling area and probably the countries of western Europe.

What about Canada? Canada is out of the picture. The minister described an international world in which Canada would have very little room, and he is more concerned for the United Kingdom and for the small countries in the sterling area, and even for Indonesia, than he seems to be for Canada.

Britain cannot afford to choose a liberal trade policy—

A liberal trade policy!

—unless she gets loans from the United States and Canada on liberal terms . . . The more desirable policy from our point of view is the type reflected in the Bretton Woods agreements and the proposals for expansion of world trade and employment put forward by the United States government. This type of trade and exchange policy involves a minimum of restrictions on trade, tariff reductions, the elimination of discriminatory import quotas and exchange practices,—

I want hon. members to follow this very closely.

—and the freedom of each country to use any currency that it has obtained through trade with another country in carrying on trade with any third country. This type of policy would make possible not only a high level of trade but freedom in the direction of trade.

Again, what about the British preference? I draw the attention of hon. members to the whole of pages 767 to 770 to make the comparison, and they may read the distinction which the minister makes between liberal trade and the other kind of trade. I cannot understand it. That is perhaps a defect of my intelligence, but he has been splitting hairs to make the distinction. I refer hon. members to *Hansard*. I cannot analyse it, it is beyond me. Now, the minister again, page 768:

The British are now worse off to the extent of about 20 billion Canadian dollars than they were when the war commenced.

So that if the loans are approved—

—she will end up with her international position worsened by the equivalent of over twenty-five billion Canadian dollars as compared with her position in 1939.

Some hon. members who had spoken and who were reared in England say that we want to improve the condition of England, but the minister himself has said that the financial situation of the United Kingdom will be worsened to twenty-five billion dollars if the United States loan and the Canadian loan are granted to them. Is that an argument to induce those who love the United Kingdom to vote for this proposal? I quote from page 768:

We must realize that Britain is no longer a wealthy country in international terms. She has sacrificed her international financial strength in meeting the costs of the war. Before the war Britain had substantial overseas assets that yielded her, on balance, an income of approximately a billion dollars a year.

We have come to the conclusion—

Says the minister.

—that the British government will be able to meet the terms of this agreement over the next fifty-five years.

Well, there will be water under the mill before we reach that date. Another question in passing is, what is the detail of the settlement of the war claims, which may be discussed, and which should be discussed? We have no information. The government says "We found it all right and we accepted it." What was it? What were the claims of Canada? What were the claims of the United Kingdom? We know nothing about it; and this is why I have insisted on having an expose instead of a mere plea for the ratification of the loan. The minister continues, at page 769:

In fact, as I have already indicated, the British deficit of Canadian dollars will likely be such that the total amount of this credit will be drawn before the end of 1948.

That is most important. The piece of legislation which we are studying now is not the last one, because before we start to receive interest, if any, in 1950 all the money which will be lent to Great Britain by Canada and by the United States will have been spent.

The British representatives made it clear to us that they expected that Britain would need to finance additional purchases in Canada from other cash resources.

This is matter for thought.

She cannot afford to pay interest in this period without making additional credits necessary.

Is anyone who is considered solvent not able to pay at least the interest, if not the capital? What about the gradual and orderly repatriation of Canadian securities owned in the United Kingdom?

Now as to the British commonwealth air training plan, listen to this—page 771:

It was found that the United Kingdom's share of the cost exceeded what she had contributed and paid by $200 million. Similarly, when the details for the second plan, ending at March 31, 1945, were worked out, it was found that the United Kingdom had paid or contributed an amount that fell short of her share of the costs by $225 million.

Instead of saying that the United Kingdom had failed to pay this, we are told that she had "paid or contributed an amount that fell short of her share . . . by $225 million." How well said!

In agreeing to cancel this amount owing by Britain in respect of air training, the government has been motivated by a number of strong reasons . . . We came to the conclusion after much consideration—

Mark you, sir,—"after much consideration".

—that repayment of this $425 million was beyond the United Kingdom's capacity to pay within any reasonable period.

How then can we expect any repayment of the billion and a quarter if the United Kingdom could not pay an indebtedness of $425 million, or about one-third of that amount, representing her debt in connection with the commonwealth air training plan? Again, what about the British preference in trade? What is the detail of the settlement of the war claim? The minister said at page 769:

In fact, as I have already indicated, the British deficit of Canadian dollars will likely be such that the total amount of this credit will be drawn before the end of 1948.

And it goes on like that. Well, sir, there is one thing that is forgotten in all this. It is that, though nations may unite to wage war, as soon as the war is over they become competitors in trade. That is an elementary truth that is known to all and we cannot consider any country our ally in trade. A country is a separate unit and must consider the interests of its inhabitants, and the idea of being under the yoke of the United Kingdom, in the matter of trade, is no better than the idea of being under the yoke of the United States. It is dangerous to consider these matters from a sentimental point of view.

The other night there were two or three members who made jokes at the expense of members of parliament who are not favourable to this measure. That is an old trick. It is not the first time it has been played. It is an effort to impress members, to frighten them and prevent them from expressing their opinions in this country, which is called a democracy. I remember when I was discussing some matters during the war there was a little arrangement of the kind and two Liberal members, one from eastern Ontario and the other from western Ontario, started telling me

[Mr. Pouliot.]

that I was taking up too much of the time of the house. That was my own business, and it was for my colleagues to decide whether they would listen to what I said or to disregard it. However, I was in no mood to take a calling down from any of those gentlemen and I told them to look at the bull moose over there, a little statue in front of the ladies gallery, and the bull buffalo over here, another statue. I told them to look well at those two statues, to fill their eyes with the bull moose and the bull buffalo, because they would never see them after the election. Well, I was right. One of them lost the convention and the other was defeated at the polls.

At the same time there was one member banging his desk, making a terrific noise in order to impress me, in order to show that I was wrong. He ran again and lost his deposit, thank God. Sometimes, some members have family links with the old country and they say, "We have relatives over there". That is true. But why do they not bring those relatives to Canada? Canada is the country of the future, but Canada will not be the country of the future if we pass this legislation and other measures of the same kind.

I warn my colleagues. Some of them have expressed themselves in favour of the loan. That is their business and I respect their views, but I tell them that every time Canadians ask for something which is denied by the government, every time they fill in their income tax returns, every time something goes wrong, from their own point of view, they will say it is because of this loan that has been voted to Great Britain. They will say it is because of this gift.

A country as poor as this cannot enter into that kind of finance. It is impossible. Think of it, sir. According to the figures of the British experts, at the present time the increase in indebtedness in Great Britain as a result of the war is twenty billions. If our national debt is at the present time sixteen billion dollars, only four billions less than Britain's debt in connection with the last war, how can we expect to lend money—lend, not give? We know very well that when the time comes for the settlement of the loan the Minister of Finance will reason with the government of Great Britain, as he has done with regard to the British commonwealth air training plan, and the Englishmen will only have to come here and say, "We cannot afford to pay" and that will settle the question.

All right. Very good. The Canadian taxpayer will pay for it. That is absurd, and I am sorry to say that to a Liberal government.

How much I would enjoy saying it to a government leading another party in the house. It is a shame to me to have to say that to my party, but I want to try to bring them to their senses, just as we throw a glass of cold water into the face of a fainting man.

But that is not all. There is more to it. There is something that the minister has not told us. How much have we given to Great Britain since the beginning of the war? Our debt now is sixteen billions. Our debt before the war was two and a half billions. That means that our war debt is thirteen and a half billion dollars. If we have not given to Great Britain ten billion dollars already we have not given a cent. We must know what has been done.

Do you know, sir, there are two different periods with regard to war finance? The first one was from September, 1939, to December, 1940, and the second was from December, 1940, until the present time, and perhaps until ten years from now if we go on like this. In the first place, the United Kingdom, for what she was buying from Canada, was sending gold. The business was dealt with normally, but since December, 1940—and the Canadian taxpayers will know about it—all that we have got from Great Britain has ben turned over to the United States to pay the United Kingdom debt. It was said by the minister—and I have it here on record just as I have recorded his speech of April 11—every time that we received something from England it took its way to the United States to pay for her. Nothing was left here. Then the other day I had a question on the order paper about the fulfilment of the United Kingdom obligation with regard to the commonwealth air training plan. The question stood on the order paper for a long time, and then it was passed as an order for return and I have not got it yet. Why did I not get it? It was because it was showing precisely the fact that the United Kingdom had not fulfilled her obligation, that Great Britain had not fulfilled her obligation to Canada during the war.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not propose to follow the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), who has just spoken. I suppose the minister will reply to the series of questions that he has propounded. In all probability some of the things I shall say will have some bearing on the speech that has just been made. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that when the resolution was before the house the other afternoon most of us understood that on that occasion the speeches would be short, and probably at this stage we would be discussing the matter more fully. Consequently I am taking this opportunity of saying some of the things I might have said and did not say the other afternoon.

A great deal of the opposition to the loan in this house and in the country is based upon the idea that we are doing something for Great Britain that we are not prepared to do for other people, and that this is an indication that Canada is still in somewhat of a colonial stage of development. In my opinion and in the opinion of my colleagues, that view is erroneous. As a matter of fact I believe we can discuss this proposition from the point of view of cold economics and cool logic and show that what we are actually doing is something which is beneficial for our own country and for the world. The fact is that the recovery of Europe and, particularly as far as we are concerned, of the United Kingdom as a great trading area is essential to our own recovery, and indeed to the progress and peace of the world in the days to come.

As an exporter of foodstuffs and other raw materials, Canada has a selfish interest in the welfare of the people of the rest of the world, and in particular perhaps in the welfare of the people of the United Kingdom. If we had no political associations with the British commonwealth, our economic interests would compel us to consider this proposal favourably.

Those of us who know the history of this continent know that historically an important factor in the development of North America has been its relationship to the economy and the economic policies of the United Kingdom. Once upon a time the ability to develop this continent was largely dependent upon the export from the United Kingdom to this continent of all kinds of machines and of other materials. That was particularly true in the United States at the beginning of the last century, and toward the end of that century it was true of our own country.

The proposed loan by the United States to Great Britain is not a sign of the colonial association of the United States with Great Britain, but rather a recognition of the fact that the recovery of Europe and of the United Kingdom means, to a very large degree, the economic progress and prosperity of our great neighbour to the south. It is from that point of view rather than from the point of view, which perhaps some of us share, of gratitude for what the British people did in withstanding the fascist and nazi aggression that we should discuss this proposal.

The United States realizes, as members who are supporting this loan do, that year in and year out the United Kingdom has been, as is sometimes said, the world's best customer. The prosperity of the world, and particularly of Canada which relies upon British purchases of our products to enable us to pay for goods we import, not only from Great Britain but from other countries of the world, depends upon her ability to remain the world's best customer. Somehow then she must be enabled to regain an ability to pay for the things that she must buy.

In former days, as has so often been said in the house, and as the Minister of Finance so well said the other afternoon, Great Britain was able to pay for the supplies she needed from abroad, very largely because of her overseas investments—investments, of course, by her nationals; and she received interest in the form of goods, and goods in the repayment of the capital that she had formerly left in these countries. But in the common struggle—and I use the words "common struggle" because it was a common struggle—against Hitlerism she was compelled to sell a substantial part of these securities, not only in order to get food but also to get the necessary supplies of munitions of war to enable her to put up the resistance against the aggressor. She delivered us from a greater evil than we perhaps apprehended at the beginning of the war. Therefore at the present time the position is that Europe, and again particularly Great Britain, must expand her exports in order to pay for the goods that she needs to import. In other words, with her overseas investments depleted she must export in order to get the supplies she needs. Various economists have estimated that the United Kingdom will need to export in the next few years from fifty to seventy-five per cent more than she exported before the war. In addition to this there must be a reconversion of her industries. She must rebuild her destroyed factories and machines; she must replace her obsolete machinery and at the same time provide food, clothing and shelter for her people. Therefore the bald fact is that if she is to regain her standards of living and continue to act not only as our best customer, but as the world's best customer, she must obtain goods either as gifts or on a deferred payment plan. In other words, somebody must give or make loans. We find that the United States, recognizing this, is proposing a large loan to Great Britain at the present time, and we are proposing the loan which is now before us.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

In my opinion this agreement negotiated between the two governments is not an agreement negotiated from the point of view of giving an advantage to the United Kingdom but a mutual advantage to both Canada and the United Kingdom. In the main this is, as has already been said, a loan repayable in the future with interest. We wipe out certain other indebtedness, that on account of the air training plan and so on, which I take it is part of our war contribution and a recognition of our good fortune in escaping the devastation and physical destruction of war which Europe underwent. Again I say I approve of that proposal.

There is just one other thing I want to say in connection with another matter which is not settled by this agreement. Early in the war we did make a loan of $700,000,000, as hon. members who were here at that time will remember, to adjust an accumulated sterling balance. That is to be extended and we understand that it will be settled at some future date. May I suggest that that should be considered apart from what we are now discussing and should be settled on a business basis, as was suggested when the loan was originally made, and when the time comes to settle the loan certain securities now held in Britain might be considered in payment thereof. But I do not want to discuss that this afternoon, as I do not wish to introduce a side issue. I believe that the problem at this moment is a much more important one than the settlement of what remains oustanding of the $700,000,000 loan.

What we have to remember is this, that the economic plight in which this great purchaser of goods finds herself to-day is bound to be reflected in our own economy in the future unless something is done to rehabilitate Great Britain as a great customer. If we fail, and other countries fail, to render the aid that is necessary at this time—we are discussing mainly a loan to Great Britain, although this applies to other European countries and indeed other countries of the world as well—we shall ultimately suffer ourselves because we have not assisted in rehabilitating the world. It is often forgotten when we speak of a loan of this kind that we are not discussing money. We think in terms of money, but here we are not discussing money but goods, the ability of Canada to produce goods, the ability of Canada to ship these goods, and if we fail in this we shall find our own trade in a state of stagnation. I want to emphasize that our welfare depends upon our ability to sell our goods in the markets of the world and therefore upon the ability of the world to consume the goods that we produce. What is true of

Canada is true of the world, of course. Canada cannot be prosperous apart from a prosperous world. In a depressed world, in other words, Canada is depressed too.

Now let us look at what this trade between our countries means. In 1938 four nations took 49·8 per cent, roughly 50 per cent, of the total world exports. That is to say, of all the goods placed on the markets of the world, four nations took practically 50 per cent and Britain, with only two per cent of the world's population, took 21 per cent of the exports available on the markets of the world. Germany took 10·9 per cent; the United States, with her great population, took only 10·9 per cent, and France took 7 per cent. It is clear I think to all of us that Germany will not recover her position in the world economy for some time to come. The United States with her rich resources and with the war developments in the production of synthetic materials, such as rubber, to take the place of imported raw materials, will in all probability find it very difficult, and particularly so because of the pressure groups within her own country, to take very much more than her present 10·9 per cent, but unless she does the world is headed for disaster. I think much depends on the ability of the United States to accept from the world a larger share of the exports available on the markets of the world.

There are two nations which remain, Britain and France, and the rehabilitation of both these countries as great purchasers on the world markets is of paramount interest to Canada and to the world. I am very glad indeed to be able to support substantial loans to both these countries in order to enable them to regain the position that they must take once more in the markets of the world.

As has already been said, in the last year of peace, 1938—the hon. member for Temiscouata quoted 1939, when the figure was slightly less, but I am taking 1938 because it was the last year of peace before the war—forty per cent of our total exports went to the United Kingdom, or in round figures, $69,000,000 worth out of total exports of $172,000,000. Is that about right? I think it is. I looked up the figures, and those are the figures I found. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the prosperity of our purchasers is inextricably linked with the recovery not only of Europe but of Canada's own best customer, the United Kingdom. This loan therefore becomes to us a matter of economic interest rather than a matter of sentiment. I know that there is a disposition in some quarters of this house to consider that those who are supporting this loan are supporting it because of a sentimental attachment to Great Britain or from some colonialism or imperialism. But I would point out that considering it purely from the point of view of Canada's selfish economic interest, what we are doing is a good thing for Canada, and it is because it is a good thing for Canada that I am warmly in support of it.

Let us bear in mind that during the war years there has been a very significant change in the exports that we have been making to Great Britain. In addition to being, as we were before the war, a principal supplier of cereals to Great Britain, we became during the war a principal supplier of meat and meat products to Britain. Coming as I do from western Canada I must say that our farmers are very anxious indeed to maintain the market we have built up for our pork and other meat and meat products in Britain, and they are anxious also, of course, to retain our market for cereals such as wheat, flour, and so on.

Again, if I may speak of the capacity of the United Kingdom to absorb meat products, the United Kingdom has always been a large purchaser of meats on the markets of the world, and the greatest purchaser of dairy products. Each year before the war—again I am taking the official figures—the United Kingdom purchased 81 per cent of the total amount of pork and pork products entering the markets of the world. Similarly she took 80 per cent of the beef and 78 per cent of the butter sold on the markets of the world. The United Kingdom before the war was a large importer of foods and raw materials, and she must remain so if the world is to prosper. It is true that during the war she has expanded to some extent her production of wheat and other cereal products. Anyone who knows the British isles knows perfectly well that that has been done very largely under the pressure of war, and that much of the production has been on land which otherwise would not have been cultivated because of its marginal quality.

As an exporter, then, of many of these raw materials and foods we are vitally concerned in anything we can do to assist in the restoration of her economy and in tiding her over a very difficult four or five years which now lie ahead.

I say, then, that if for no other reason than that of our own self-interest we should give support to this bill. What I have endeavoured to say up to now is this, that the prosperity of the world depends upon the ability of the

world to exchange goods and that is in reality what we are trying to arrange, so far as we are concerned.

Nations do not pay in currency, they pay in goods. In the old days, of course, deficits of usable goods were often made up by exports or imports of gold. As world trade expanded, and because of developments in recent years, the amount of gold became too little and became inefficient as a medium. Very properly, I think, it has been discarded.

The Bretton Woods agreement, which we discussed last December, the stabilization fund, and the international bank, which were parts of it—these were steps in the direction of providing the world with the necessary credits and currency in order to encourage trade between nations and to develop the more backward areas of the world. That is why we of this party supported the Bretton Woods agreement, recognizing as we did that, like all compromises in this far from perfect world, the Bretton Woods agreements were not by any means perfect.

There are still those, of course, who believe that we can get along as a self-sufficient nation. I do not share that view. Our policy must be one of an exchange of products. Obviously we do not produce all that we require to maintain our economy. We must import. And if we are to import goods in exchange for goods we send out, then they should be used to give our people a progressively higher standard of living than we have known in the past. But, again, that should be discussed on another occasion.

Some people say there is an alternative, and that while Canada cannot live alone the British commonwealth of nations could. I do not believe that, either. If one looks at the goods produced within the commonwealth he will find that the commonwealth is by no means a self-sufficient unit, even if we could get agreement among the component parts and tried to live that way. Our prosperity, I believe, and the prosperity of every unit of the British commonwealth of nations, does not depend upon the relations within the commonwealth, but rather upon the state of the world itself. In other words it is not a commonwealth problem; it is an international problem.

The loan then, in my view, is one contribution of Canada to international action. And to that extent, as I have already said, is an indication of enlightened self-interest on our part. The United Kingdom is our best customer. She is the world's best customer. If we contribute to her rehabilitation as a great consumer for goods, as well as a great exporter of goods, then we make our contribution to the rehabilitation of world economy and to a more prosperous world. But it is not, I repeat, a matter of sentiment. It is a matter of cold economics.

Last week I said, in discussing commonwealth relations, that the Ottawa agreements were restrictive in their effect. I believe they were. True, perhaps they were defensible, in a way, because of the Hawley-Smoot tariff of the United States, which about that time was put into effect. Nevertheless they contributed to the building up of self-sufficient nations in the world; and from that point of view were a detriment to our own country and the world. They increased barriers, rather than helped to remove them. It seems to me an attempt is now being made in the world, through the Bretton Woods agreement, the food and agricultural organization, the social and economic council of the united nations, the American loan and this loan, to break that vicious circle which constricted the world before the outbreak of the last war. Will these attempts be successful? I do not know that they will be; I hope they will be. Indeed, I believe they will be. They are worth trying.

But certainly, as part of the great world, and depending upon world commerce to the extent we depend upon it, our prosperity depends upon the success of the economic experiments now being made in the world. I know there is one other consideration one cannot forget, and that is that if we fail now, and the world enters again upon a period of cut-throat competition—if we force the United Kingdom into cut-throat competition, so that she must buy again in those places where she can drive down the prices to the lowest level, then we shall be the sufferers, indeed. And since this agreement looks toward some measure of stabilization, some intelligent economic policies in the world, I believe it is indeed worthy of our support.

Speaking in Toronto on January 10 Mr. Morrison said this, indicating what the policy was, if they have a chance to follow it:

> To eliminate fluctuation in international prices so that producers can safely plan future production and to reduce unnecessary distribution costs. We believe that the maintenance of a sound nutrition policy will give the great advantage of stability to overseas producers and will also help to earn a long-term market for our exports.

In other words, the advantages are mutual.

I have discussed this matter this afternoon purely from the point of view of Canada's economic advantages, but I would not have anyone think that I am thinking only in

terms of economic advantages. None can have a deeper appreciation of the sacrifices made by the people of the United Kingdom during the war than those of us who had the privilege of visiting there during that time. I was over there, as were you, Mr. Chairman and the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman) who is in his seat this afternoon, and with the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) whom I also see. That was in the autumn of 1941. We saw the devastation wrought by German bombing. We witnessed the steadfastness and courage of a great people in a great crisis. German troops were at the gates of Moscow. The United States was still a neutral country. The outlook was dark indeed. But the British people were determined that no matter what came, they would resist the German aggressor. One could only admire the courage with which they withstood those dark days in the autumn of 1941. With some other of my colleagues, one of whom was the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis), who is in his seat at the moment, I witnessed the flying bombs in the autumn of 1944. Again the devastation; again the courage of the people who withstood those onslaughts of the German aggressor.

Out of the meagre resources she had at hand, during this winter Britain has contributed to the relief of starvation and disease on the continent of Europe. These people have shown a remarkable degree of courage, in trying to do something for themselves and for others in distress. They have accepted the austerity programme with a courage which is the marvel of the world. While I am not speaking from a party standpoint now, merely as an indication of what the British people are thinking let me point out that despite the fact that the Labour government of Great Britain has had to institute even a greater degree of austerity since it was elected in July of last year, by-elections and, more recently, municipal elections, have endorsed that austerity programme at the polls.

So I say that to-day we have an opportunity, even if we put aside all the considerations which I have named in the last few moments, to contribute not only to the welfare of the United Kingdom—because that must not be our first consideration—but also to the welfare of Europe, of the world, and of Canada as a nation. In other words, in my opinion this is an opportunity for us to play our part in the international sphere in order to bring about a greater measure of understanding and of world prosperity.

Mr. QUELCH: I wish to make at this time a few comments and to ask the minister a few questions.

We are supporting this measure on moral grounds. We are not supporting it because we think it is a good thing for Canada, except in so far as it helps to maintain good relations with other nations. We feel that we owe a certain obligation, an obligation which we should meet; on the other hand, we look upon it as a sacrifice, but a sacrifice which should be made. We intend to support the measure because we feel that the situation which exists in the United Kingdom at the present time, which makes this loan necessary, is very largely owing to the fact that the United Kingdom fought the earliest, that she fought the longest, and in many ways I think it may be said that she fought the hardest, of any of the united nations; and she fought not merely for her own benefit but for the benefit of all peace-loving nations throughout the world.

I know it has been argued that we have made a number of contributions to the United Kingdom during the war. But we did not make those contributions in order to raise the standard of living of the people of that country; we made them in order to expand their war effort against the enemy for our own protection and for the protection of all the united nations which were fighting against the enemy. It might very well be argued that, had the United Kingdom thrown up the sponge after Dunkirk, there would not be a free France to-day, and it is quite doubtful whether or not we would be sitting here to-day as the parliament of a free people. Therefore we feel that there is every justification for making this contribution at this time.

It is well to remember that in the United Kingdom over three and a half million homes were destroyed, and that country's shipping tonnage was reduced from 41½ million to 19½ million, and that her foreign investments were practically wiped out. Her whole industrial plant was converted to war purposes; her standard of living was reduced to the bare necessities of life, and as a consequence there will be a long, hard road of reconversion before the United Kingdom will be in a position to meet her obligations.

During the war the united nations to a very large extent pooled their resources for common use against the enemy. Every nation was expected to make its maximum contribution and to reduce its own standard of living to the bare necessities of life. I do not think anyone can argue for one moment that the United Kingdom did not go as far as or farther than any of the other united nations. It is just as well to remember that the cost of war does not cease with the end of hos-

tilities. Heavy expenditures related to the war will continue for many months after the war. Those expenditures will continue until the repatriation and demobilization of troops has been completed and until the reconversion of industry has taken place to the extent that will make it possible for the nations to rebuild their factories and to produce the goods needed to bring in the imports which they require. Therefore, I think, many nations were somewhat shocked at the indecent haste with which the United States of America cancelled their lease-lend help to the United Kingdom, and made further help dependent upon Great Britain becoming a signatory to the Bretton Woods agreement. I do not think it was to the credit of Canada that we joined with the United States in that squeeze play, and I think it is to the credit of Australia, of New Zealand and of Russia that they had not signed that agreement by the end of the year.

So that on moral grounds we are supporting this motion.

However, when the Minister of Finance asks for our support on the ground that we benefit by the trade resulting from this loan I do not think his argument is so soundly based. What does making this loan at this time really mean? It means that we are going to have to make available to the United Kingdom goods which are at the present time, and will be for a number of years, in short supply. Whether or not we make this loan to Britain, there will be no difficulty in getting rid of any surplus goods we may have at that time, because they are actually in short supply throughout the world. What it will mean is that we shall take the repayment of this loan in goods at a time when they will be no longer in short supply, because we do not begin to take repayments until 1951 and we shall continue to accept repayments for the next fifty years; I do not suppose there will be any shortage of goods in this country during that time. Therefore we are making goods available at a time when they are short and accepting payment at a time when there will be surpluses. To that extent, I think, it is unquestionably a sacrifice on our part: but, as I say, it is a sacrifice we should be willing to make.

What is happening as a result of these large loans which we are making abroad? In Canada to-day there are many projects which people are asking to have carried out, but which we cannot attend to because we have not the necessary goods available, and these goods are not available because we are fulfilling certain obligations which we have abroad. To-day there is a great demand for the expansion of social services such as pensions for the aged and the disabled, and many other social reforms, These also are being denied because we are having to make goods available to other nations where they are in short supply to-day, and we cannot satisfy the demand for the expansion of social services in this country until we are able greatly to expand production to take care of these demands. Therefore I say that this loan does represent a sacrifice.

The minister emphasized the fact that this loan was not merely to help the United Kingdom, but to help Canada expand her trade; and the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario gave it the support of his party on this ground. Although he made it quite clear that he would also support it on moral grounds, he based his argument entirely on the economic good of Canada. The minister pointed out that the United Kingdom must do more than merely regain her pre-war levels of exports. He pointed out that they must expand that by a considerable amount beyond pre-war levels in order to pay their debts. I noticed in the speech made by the president of the board of trade of the United Kingdom that it was estimated that they would have to expand their exports by fifty per cent over pre-war levels. Some speakers put it as high as seventy-five per cent. In other words, the United Kingdom will have to maintain a very large favourable balance of trade, and we in accepting payment will have to maintain an unfavourable balance of trade when the time of repayment takes place, in order to accept payment.

I realize that the minister will put forward another argument, which I shall deal with very shortly. I should like to ask the minister: Will Canada be prepared to import more from the United Kingdom than she sells to the United Kingdom? Also, will the United States of America be prepared also to be paid likewise?

Mr. ILSLEY: What is the second one?

Mr. QUELCH: Will the United States of America also be prepared to maintain an unfavourable balance of trade with the United Kingdom in order to make it possible for the United Kingdom to pay the United States? Perhaps the minister will wait until I finish and then he can answer my questions all together. I think the minister made it quite clear in his speech that that was not the intention, and I quote from page 764 of *Hansard* of April 11, 1946:

To accomplish this purpose we must be able to use the proceeds of our exports to the United Kingdom and the continent of Europe in paying our own bills and debts in the United States

and in making purchases wherever we can best obtain the goods we need. We have a special interest in being able to use the currency that we receive for our exports, to obtain other currencies that we need for the payments we must make.

If we use the credits accruing to us in the United Kingdom to buy goods in the United States, how will the United Kingdom obtain United States dollars to pay the United States unless the United States is prepared to take it out of goods? I quite realize that under the Bretton Woods agreement currencies are convertible, but if that policy is continued for fifty years the quota of the United Kingdom will quickly be exhausted unless Canada and the United States are prepared to have unfavourable balances of trade with the United Kingdom. Further, the United States will be exporting goods to the United Kingdom and obtaining credits for them. The United Kingdom will not be in position to discriminate against United States imports unless she is prepared to discriminate against all other imports at the same time. The United States will also have credits from the loan that she is making at the present time. In addition, the United States will also have some of our British credits which we will trade to her.

Will the United States be prepared to accept payment in British goods for all those credits? Personally I doubt it very much. If she is not prepared to, if she is not prepared to balance her trade with the United Kingdom, and if we are not prepared to balance our trade with the United Kingdom, then it is bound to be only a question of time before the United Kingdom suffers default. She will exhaust her quota, and if she has not gold to meet her obligations she will have to take a further loan. I should like to ask the minister how long sterling will be convertible into dollars under such a policy. Britain's quota will soon be exhausted and for that reason she will require further loans. If the creditor nations fail to deal squarely with the United Kingdom, it seems to me the United Kingdom will be bound to default.

The minister goes on to say that he thinks the United Kingdom will be able to meet her obligations, and I turn to page 768 of *Hansard* where he states:

> We have also come to the conclusion that the British government will be able to meet the terms of this agreement over the next fifty-five years.

And again:

> They have been determined from the outset, and indeed they made this determination clear to us as early as 1944, that they would not incur debts which they could not honestly believe they would be able to discharge.

I do not doubt for one minute that the United Kingdom will desire to meet her obligations. Second, I do not doubt that the United Kingdom will be able to meet her obligations in goods if the creditor nations play the game. But the record of the past causes me great misgivings as to whether or not the creditor nations will be prepared to play the game.

I recall at the last session when Mr. Rasminsky appeared before the banking committee. He admitted quite frankly that on the basis of the record of creditor nations in the past there might be some concern with regard to the success of the Bretton Woods agreement. He stated he believed that there had taken place a change of heart on the part of the creditor nations and he hoped that in the future the creditor nations would be prepared to play the game. Mr. Rasminsky, and also the minister in the debates, emphasized the fact that the difficulties that we were referring to would, in his opinion, be a matter to be taken care of under trade agreements rather than under the Bretton Woods agreement.

I have here a copy of the proposals for the expansion of world trade which have been communicated to the United States. I understand that these are to be the basis for discussion when the conference meets. I turn to page 15, where the question of unbalance of trade is dealt with as follows:

> 2. Restrictions to safeguard the balance of payments. Members confronted with an adverse balance of payments should be entitled to impose quantitative import restrictions as an aid to the restoration of equilibrium in the balance of payments. This provision should be operative under conditions and procedures to be agreed upon. These conditions and procedures

Then we go down to (d), which reads:

> (d) should provide for the full application of nondiscrimination in the use of such restrictions after the transitional period.

For example, take a nation that is suffering an unbalance of trade. Suppose the United Kingdom was able to maintain a balance of trade with the majority of the nations but had a serious unbalance of trade with the United States because the United States was not prepared to play the game, was not prepared to take Britain's exports in exchange for her own. Surely, in circumstances such as those, the United Kingdom would be absolutely justified in discriminating against imports from the United States in order to balance her own trade. Yet, according to this agreement, which is to take care of that very thing, we find that one of the great defences of debtor nations is removed and they are even worse off in that regard than they were before the agreement.

I certainly feel that the Bretton Woods agreement, instead of expanding trade, may very easily have the opposite result unless, as Mr. Rasminsky says, the creditor nations have a change of heart and are prepared to be good creditors in the future instead of the bad creditors they have been in the past. If they are not prepared to accept goods in payment for their exports, what is bound to be the result? The result is bound to be that nations suffering unfavourable balances of trade will consider policies of economic nationalism. The Bretton Woods agreement may very easily bring about an intensification of economic nationalism. Apparently that has already taken place in the United Kingdom, and I wish to quote the Prime Minister of that country in that regard. I should like to quote from the British *Hansard,* page 26, column 25, where a question is asked by Mr. Norman Smith as follows:

> Mr. Norman Smith asked the Prime Minister whether, in view of the difficulties in paying for imports, he will direct scientific research to the substitution of home-produced for imported raw materials used in British factories.
>
> The Prime Minister (Mr. Attlee): The circumstances of war have already obliged us to do our best to substitute home-produced for imported materials within the limitations imposed by our natural resources. The government consider that these efforts should be continued both by the government and by industry, with the full support of scientific research, in such a way as will contribute effectively to the solution of our balance of payment difficulties.

The greater difficulty Britain has in balancing her trade, the more will that policy be intensified. The minister says that we do not need to use the proceeds of this loan only to buy British goods, that we can spend it in the United States. That is certainly going to aggravate the situation, and that is why I am interested in knowing whether that is to be our policy, and whether the minister can intimate whether or not that will be the policy of the United States.

As I was saying, if the creditor nations fail to deal squarely with Great Britain, then Great Britain will be bound to default on this measure. I noticed when the chancellor of the exchequer, Mr. Dalton, praised the Bretton Woods agreement he concluded his remarks with the statement "Thank God there is an exit." That seemed a very funny thing for the chancellor of the exchequer of Great Britain to say when praising the Bretton Woods agreement. I think a person would be naive to suggest that you can sign an agreement in order to get certain benefits and, having got the benefits, you can withdraw. I do not think it will be quite so easy to withdraw. Otherwise, we shall have people signing the agreement, coming in one door and going out the other as it suits them, just running around in circles.

Mr. ILSLEY: Did not the chancellor mean that if the United States loan agreement did not go through the United Kingdom would have to get out of the Bretton Woods agreement?

Mr. QUELCH: He was not referring to trade agreements; he was referring to the Bretton Woods agreement. He was discussing the Bretton Woods agreement at that time and saying that if they came under the agreement and got into difficulty, they could always withdraw, that, thank God, there was an exit.

I am suggesting that if we wait until they reach the point where they have exhausted their quota and are not able to meet their obligations, then they are going to be in a far more difficult situation than they would have been in if they had refused to go into it in the first place and adopted measures within the sterling bloc. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) stated the other day that we should have demanded security from Great Britain. I say to the hon. member that that would be altogether too crude. Public sentiment being what it is, there still being present the fervour of war, the people would not like it if we were to say to the United Kingdom, "We will give you this loan if you give us security, say in the form of some of your colonies or certain islands."

I would point out to the hon. member that that sort of thing is pretty well taken care of in the Bretton Woods agreement, but it is done in a more subtle way. If a nation defaults under the Bretton Woods agreement and cannot meet her obligations and has used up her resources, if she has exhausted her quota and cannot meet her obligations with gold, she will have to get a loan. When a loan is given to that nation security may be taken for the loan. I suggest to the hon. member that that is the time that security will be demanded for the loan. That time would be several years after the war, and probably there would not be quite the same reaction throughout the world that there would be now if a nation demanded security.

Mr. BLACKMORE: It would be ruinous to Great Britain.

Mr. QUELCH: I do not think the hon. member for Temiscouata was worrying very much about whether it would be ruinous to Great Britain.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am afraid he was not.

Mr. QUELCH: Personally I would be opposed to the giving of security. I have criticized some of the things the Minister of Finance said, but I should like to say now that I agree with him 100 per cent when he says that after this war the people of Canada should have a higher standard of living than they had before the war. The standard of living should be higher than they had or ever dreamed of. We have a much greater plant capacity than we had before the war, and we have far more skilled labour. It is merely a question of applying that skilled labour to our resources in order to give the people of this country the highest standard of living they have ever had. In this regard I should like to refer to a statement made by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario, and I quote from page 773 of *Hansard* of April 11, 1946. Speaking on behalf of the Progressive Conservative party and referring to this loan, he said:

> We have become so accustomed to these fabulous and astronomical amounts that we are getting to feel they are just figures in books, and some people tell us that they are just figures in books.

I should like to interject and say that if he had us in mind he was wrong. At no time have the members of this group ever suggested that exports were figures in books. We have always criticized the policy of exporting without taking imports in return, because it means an absolute loss of wealth. We believe that the proper function of trade is the exchange of goods. We are not prepared to support international trade on the basis of making foreign investments in other countries which very often are later repudiated. The net result is that you have made a gift and have lost some of your wealth. To go on with what the hon. member said about the loan:

> Why do we do that? Do we do that just to make ourselves good fellows, because we are generous-hearted? No. Why do we do it? All hon. members know why we do it. I ventured to say last autumn when the exports credits were up that we could not afford not to afford them. I say the same thing about this amount. Why do I say that ? What do I mean when I say it? All hon. members need to do is to look back over the last fifteen years. They do not need to go another step backward to see what foreign trade means in the life of this country. We remember the figures of 1929. Our exports amounted to something like $1,400 million. Then it went down in 1933 to little more than one-third of that amount. I believe it was $534 million.

I think the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario was confusing effects with cause when he made that statement. It is true that our trade was low in that period but prior to that falling off in trade we had a heavy restriction of credit, a deflationary policy was imposed. A statement was made by a former minister of finance, Mr. Cahan, that that restriction was somewhere in the neighbourhood of $900 million between 1929 and 1932. Certainly a deflationary policy was in operation throughout the world. People did not have the money with which to buy goods and therefore imports were not brought into this country. Then the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario went on to deal with the question of conditions in Canada. He apparently did not agree with the Minister of Finance. He had this to say:

> We taxed ourselves to the extent of about two and a half billion dollars, and on top of that we borrowed almost another two and a half billion dollars. In various other ways the minister managed to raise about another $500 million. Altogether we took out of our pockets about $5,500 million. The result was we were all rich. We all had money in our pockets. There is great danger lest we feel somehow or another that these good times with these fabulous amounts can just go on. The truth of the matter is that we are like a man who had an income of $2,500 and then borrowed $2,500 and spent the whole $5,000 in one year and said, "This is grand," and did not bother very much about what is to come afterwards.
>
> The Minister of Finance smiles.

I certainly do not blame the Minister of Finance for smiling because a statement like that would be enough to make a horse laugh, let alone the Minister of Finance. Why do I say that? I say it for this reason. The condition of a man who borrows an amount equal to his income and then spends the whole amount is not in any way analogous to the position of Canada. For that to be analogous to the position of Canada would mean that this country would have had to borrow the amount of its income of $9,000 million and then spend that in addition to its own income of $9,000 million.

Was that the situation? Not only did Canada not borrow externally; I believe she lent a small amount of money to other nations. But note her borrowings were internal. Therefore, after the war, if other nations repay us what they owe us we shall be able to spend our own income plus the income of those other nations which they pay us on account of their borrowings. I know what the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario had in mind. He was thinking that Canada has borrowed large sums of money. But she has not borrowed externally. For the position of Canada to be analogous to the case cited, Canada would have had to borrow from other nations. What is the situation? Canada borrowed in-

ternally, and therefore when those loans are repaid they will be repaid from one individual or one institution to another. The income will still reside in Canada and the income of Canada will be the same. The only case in which it could be argued that the repaying of a debt in Canada after the war might cause a loss of income would be where the payment was made to a banking institution, because money lent from a bank is created, and when you repay that money it is cancelled and that amount of money goes out of existence. But if we repay a debt represented by money that was created in the first instance it can very well be repaid by the creation of money.

The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario must know that during the war we did not finance purely from money obtained from people's pockets. We had a very heavy expansion of credit. I believe the figure for the chartered banks was around four billions lent to the government, and the government borrowed one billion from the Bank of Canada, or five billions in all, in round figures. If we had depended entirely on money obtained from the taxpayers' pockets we would not have had the war effort that we did have.

There is no doubt that after the war, in order to maintain full employment and the full development of the resources of the country, we shall have to continue to have the creation of credit in Canada. The governor of the Bank of Canada has frankly admitted that. I know the Minister of Finance does not like me to quote individuals, or refer to remarks that they have made without giving the exact text. I had better, therefore, give the exact statement which the governor of the Bank of Canada made. He admitted that we shall have to have an expansion of credit in order to maintain the full development of our resources.

In a broadcast on April 4, 1943, in which I participated with the governor of the Bank of Canada, the subject being post-war finance, I asked the governor this question:

I think you have agreed on other occasions, Mr. Towers, that there are three ways in which governments can, raise money—by taxing, by borrowing from the public and by credit expansion.

Mr. Towers: That is true!

Mr. Quelch: During the war, the emphasis has been on the first two because of the government's desire to curtail private consumption and investment. After the war, the need will be to encourage private spending, heavy taxes and public borrowing will be contrary to the public welfare. Will the government finance all desirable public projects by credit expansion when necessary?

Mr. Callaghan: What do you mean by credit expansion?

[Mr. Quelch.]

Mr. Quelch: The creation of money.

Mr. Towers: To me, credit expansion simply means more money. That money may take the form of Bank of Canada notes held by the public or public deposits with chartered banks.

Mr. Quelch: I prefer the Bank of Canada.

Mr. Callaghan: To get back to the question of whether the government will be able to finance desirable public projects.

Mr. Towers: In circumstances such as Mr. Quelch describes, I would say that there would be grounds for government not meeting the entire cost of its programmes by taxing and drawing on public savings. The desire would be to encourage private spending and make government investment more of a residual item. If part of the necessary money had to come from credit expansion—and the projects were sound and in the public interest—then I should say, go ahead.

I am heartily in accord with that statement, and I think it is one which the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario should carefully consider, because we heard him advocate the other day that the government should decide upon how much money they could raise and then cut their expenses to fit that amount. We feel that the government should decide what their programme can be, what the physical possibilities are, in the way of men and materials available in order to execute a certain programme, and then find out how much money will be required for that programme. Then to the extent that the money they obtain from taxation fails to meet that obligation they should be prepared to go ahead with credit expansion in order to take care of their undertakings, exactly as they did during the war.

Another thing I would emphasize to the Minister of Finance is this. The present measure is an extremely inflationary one. In the past we have heard much criticism against the idea of issuing money because this process is inflationary. But let me point out that inflation is not merely the result of an increase in money, because you can have inflation as easily by decreasing the amount of goods available; and when you propose to drain $1,200,000,000 of goods from Canada you are introducing an extremely inflationary measure. Not only that, but we are making loans of hundreds of millions elsewhere and in that way introducing an extremely inflationary policy into this country. I hope, therefore, that in the future we shall not hear any talk of inflation when it is suggested that money should be created in order to develop the resources of the country.

I should like to have an assurance from the Minister of Finance that, later on, when this loan starts to work the other way, when Britain starts to repay the loan and we have

surplus production in this country, he will not then hesitate to have an expansion of money necessary to create effective demand against the production coming into Canada as a result of this and other loans that we may make.

I have one or two other questions which I should like to ask the minister, but in the meantime I wonder if he would answer the questions I have put to him in the course of my remarks.

Mr. ILSLEY: Would the hon. member be good enough to repeat those questions?

Mr. QUELCH: Will Canada be prepared to accept goods from the United Kingdom in repayment of loans? How will the United Kingdom maintain convertibility of the pound if Canada and the United States do not provide the United Kingdom with dollars by purchasing British goods to the extent of the British credit?

Mr. ILSLEY: As the hon. gentleman pointed out, I indicated in my speech that we did not intend that there shall be in the forseeable future an adverse balance of trade, adverse to Canada as between Canada and the United Kingdom; but it is not necessary that there should be adverse balance of payments as between Canada and the United Kingdom in order to enable the United Kingdom to repay the loan. It is the essence of multilateral trade—

Mr. QUELCH: But how will she pay? She will have to obtain dollars from the fund and she can do so only up to a certain quota. If she exceeds the quota, what will she do? The only way in which she can replenish her supply of dollars will be to sell goods to Canada.

Mr. ILSLEY: She can pay for Canadian goods by exports to other countries as well as to Canada. Under a multilateral trading system and convertible currencies—

Mr. QUELCH: She has to maintain a favourable balance of trade.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, that is true. If Great Britain gets into a heavily indebted position, and she is now, she must expect to expand exports and have a favourable balance of trade, and the creditor countries, as the hon. gentleman has said, must recognize their obligations to take imports on a large scale.

Mr. QUELCH: Yes. Well, when she obtains funds from other sources she can exchange them for United States and Canadian dollars; but if the United States and Canada are not accepting goods from other nations in payment the fund will be short of United States dollars and the United States will have to make loans. That means a further increase of debt. There should be some way whereby nations can liquidate debts without being forced into further debt to do so.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not follow the hon. gentleman at all. Suppose the creditor countries accept goods from other nations—not necessarily Canada accepting goods from Great Britain in great quantities—if countries like Canada and the Unted States, specifically the United States, which is really a creditor country, accept goods from other countries so as to make United States dollars available to the world, and the United Kingdom has a favourable balance of trade with other countries, the United Kingdom thereby acquires the necessary United States dollars to meet its interest payments to the United States, and the same may apply to Canada. The only point of difference that I can see is that the hon. gentleman seems is be tying it down to one country dealing with another.

Mr. QUELCH: After all, the only way for the countries to obtain United States and Canadian dollars is to have a sufficient quantity in the fund to enable them to replenish their supply of United States or Canadian dollars. If the United States is to continue to maintain a favourable balance of trade, United States dollars are bound to become scarce in that event, and the United Kingdom will not be able to obtain them. When that currency becomes scarce that nation can apply for a loan.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. QUELCH: Does the minister really feel that the policy of Canada and the United States in the future is to be as Mr. Razminsky pointed out, one that shows a change of heart? Is the minister prepared to recommend a policy of real trade? Are we to accept goods in payment for goods, or are we more interested in exchanging our goods for foreign securities?

Mr. ILSLEY: I cannot answer for other nations; but certainly the United States has been following a very much different policy in recent years, not so much a different policy, as expressing different views, liberal trade views, in recent years, as compared with a number of years ago. That is set out in the speech that Lord Keynes made in the House of Lords. I have not it here but he expressed it very well.

Mr. QUELCH: Let us take Canada alone. Will the minister say that the future policy of Canada would be one of trying to balance

trade rather than one of maintaining a favourable balance of trade? I realize we have to maintain a favourable balance of payments for a while in order to meet certain foreign obligations. Will the policy be one of a balanced trade rather than one of maintaining a favourable balance?

Mr. ILSLEY: We have repeatedly said that we must look forward to a policy of increased imports. Of course Canada is still a debtor country. It is not a creditor country yet even if we count these loans. The important fact that puts Canada in that position is the heavy United States investments in Canada, the large amount that our citizens owe United States citizens.

Mr. QUELCH: Does the minister contemplate that Canada will be a creditor nation? On page 8 of the white paper entitled "Employment and Income" I find the following:

In the interest of Canadian and world prosperity and of peaceful collaboration among nations, the government endorses these plans and hopes that parliament will in due course approve the draft agreements. In reaching this view, the government is mindful of the possibility that Canada might, as a member of both institutions, occupy the position of a "creditor" nation.

The minister emphasized the fact last session when he discussed the Bretton Woods agreement that many obstacles which we were bringing up would be corrected by the trade agreements. What is his view regarding that matter? Does he think that when a nation has an unfavourable balance of trade it should have the right to discriminate against imports from nations that refuse to buy from it? The only alternative under the agreement is for it to impose that discrimination against all imports, not just against one nation. Surely it should have the right to discriminate against the nation that is not playing fair with it, rather than have to discriminate against all nations.

Mr. ILSLEY: The scarce currency provision of the Bretton Woods agreement permits such discrimination, if I remember correctly.

Mr. QUELCH: Under this agreement they cannot do it.

Mr. ILSLEY: What agreement is that?

Mr. QUELCH: Proposals for expansion of world trade and employment to be submitted to the international conference. I understand that this is to be the basis of discussion, and on page 15 it states:

Restrictions to safeguard the balance of payments. Members confronted with an adverse balance of payments should be entitled to impose quantitative import restrictions as an aid to the restoration of equilibrium in the balance of payments. This provision should be operative under conditions and procedures to be agreed upon.

These conditions and procedures are as follows:

(d) should provide for the full application of non-discrimination in the use of such restrictions after the transitional period.

It can only discriminate against imports so long as they discriminate against imports of all nations. They must not discriminate against imports of any one single nation.

Mr. ILSLEY: I think that must be read with the provisions of the Bretton Woods agreement. As a matter of fact it is pointed out to me that it expressly must be read with the provisions of the agreement. On the next page of the document from which the hon. gentleman read appears this statement:

Scarce currencies and currencies of territories having a common quota in the monetary fund. Members should not be precluded by this section from applying quantitative restrictions—

Mr. QUELCH: Quantitative. That means imports of all nations.

Mr. ILSLEY: I continue:

—(a) in pursuance of action which they may take under article VII of the international monetary fund agreement, relating to scarce currencies, or (b) in a manner designed to maintain the par value of the currencies of territories having a common quota in the monetary fund, in accordance with article XX, section 4 (g) of that agreement.

Mr. QUELCH: Quantitative restrictions? My contention is that it should read as discrimination against any one nation where that one nation is the nation that refuses to balance trade with another nation. There is a difference. If nations have an unbalance of trade, then they can discriminate against imports coming into the country, but they cannot discriminate or place restrictions against the imports of any one nation, even though it is only one nation that is not playing the game. We believe they should be allowed to place restrictions against the imports of that nation, and that nation alone, but they are not allowed to.

Mr. ILSLEY: They are, in accordance with the scarce currency provision of the Bretton Woods agreement. The language is so clear I do not see how my hon. friend can persist in the position he is taking. This is the language:

Members should not be precluded by this section from applying quantitative restrictions (a) in pursuance of action which they may take under article VII of the international monetary fund agreement, relating to scarce currencies.

Nothing could be clearer than that. The next thing is to look at the Bretton Woods agreement and consult the scarce currency provision. But my recollection is that discrimination is permitted against the country whose currency becomes scarce.

Mr. QUELCH: But the nation has to wait until the situation has developed before it is allowed to try to protect itself against that situation. Why should it have to wait until that situation has developed? Surely it should be allowed to protect itself against that.

Mr. ILSLEY: There has to be some little provision against wholesale and promiscuous discrimination, and that is what the Bretton Woods agreement provides.

Mr. QUELCH: There should be some way for a debtor nation to have a little control on the actions of a creditor nation. I do not see why a creditor nation should be allowed to have it all its own way. Could the minister tell us now when the conference on international trade that we heard so much about when the Bretton Woods conference was discussed will be held? Could the minister give us any idea how many delegates there will be from Canada, who they will be and whether the agreement will be presented to parliament before it is ratified?

Mr. ILSLEY: I cannot answer these questions. I do not know when it will be held, or who the delegates will be. It is expected that the final conference will be held within the next twelve months, perhaps much sooner than that, as I said in my speech.

Mr. COLDWELL: The minister mentioned liberal trade policies. I presume "liberal" is spelled with a small "l"?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. CHURCH: I wish only to endorse the principle of the bill. The minister gave a very fine and detailed description of the aims and objects of this particular agreement. We are now dealing with the short title. I support the bill because I understood the other evening that the resolution was to be adopted. I hope that this bill will be passed by six o'clock. The main point which appeals to the opposition, although I cannot speak for the opposition, is that this bill is giving aid to the mother country. The hon. member for Temiscouata the other night took occasion to tell the opposition a few things, but he forgot that the opposition has adopted the principle of this loan to the mother country.

I have always had a great deal of sympathy with the Minister of Finance for his sincerity of purpose and his ability for hard work, but I think the finest remark he made was that this loan is not charity but an investment with our best customer with whom we want to trade. In the years to come I think it will redound to the credit of the present Minister of Finance and those associated with him in making this agreement. I cannot go so far with him in what he said about other matters in connection with this bill, about the Bretton Woods agreement, for instance, and the Anglo-American loan. The minister said he hoped that these three together would lead to a better world and all that kind of thing, and that a body would be set up by the United States to deal with international trade balances. I have never been a believer in these new worlds to come after the war and all their blueprints. They were to come also after the last war.

So far as this loan to the United Kingdom is concerned, she is our best customer. She has never defaulted. She has invested, not millions, but billions of dollars in this country before we were able to take care of ourselves. Therefore, apart altogether from any sentimental feeling, this loan is good business. Look at the amount of money which Great Britain invested in public works in this country in days gone by, on the Rideau canal, for instance, right here running past the Chateau Laurier. That is only one of the large public works in which Britain invested millions of dollars in this country. In the same way, after the war between the north and the south in the United States, Great Britain invested millions in the eastern and central states to help them build their state and municipal institutions, their public works, and their railway systems. Consequently this loan is in no sense charity but a good business investment because we are dealing with a country that always meets its obligations.

Something has been said by one of our speakers on this side about Lord Keynes, who was called the greatest economist of our time. He started this Bretton Woods scheme; it was an idea of his, and the Minister of Finance and others here and in London and Washington have told us that this loan is interlocked with Bretton Woods and the Anglo-American loan. But Lord Keynes' idea was not carried out in the final act of Bretton Woods. It was an amendment to his idea. Lord Keynes will not be called a great economist twenty-five years from now, because I remember reading a book that he wrote when I first entered parliament in which he expressed views directly the opposite of those he expressed on the Bretton Woods agreement, the success of which is very doubtful, tied up as it is with

the abolition or curtailment of preferences and other impossible conditions. I look on the United States loan to Britain as one of the most unfortuiate things in the history of international finance. It will lead to untold disputes between the United States and Britain and it imposes the harshest terms that I ever heard of. It is worse than the treatment in terms that Germany got after the last war, treatment which she properly deserved.

I should have liked to see the government go further and get all the dominions, Canada, New Zealand and Australia, to shoulder this Anglo-American total loan together. One of the great mistakes that we made in the war was to surrender too much of our political, financial, economic and military power to Washington. That is where we made a great mistake.

But this particular loan dealt with in bill No. 28 stands on its own feet as a good business investment for Canada to make, and will make for employment in Canada. There are, as the Minister of Finance said, other matters interlocked with it. I want to say this of the Bretton Woods agreement and the Anglo-American loan, that they mean the end of preferential trade within the empire. I know one of our hon. members said that nature has placed us on the North American continent, but that is what they said between the two wars. We would hear people asking why we should depend upon Great Britain, upon London and Glasgow for defence, and they wanted to reduce the estimates for defence and have us depend on Washington; but I say that Britain and the dominions are an economic unit and if we developed preferential trade between the empire we should be far superior to Russia and the United States as an economic power. Let us start this brave new world we are talking about by building a strong economic unit within the empire itself. We know from past experience what preferential trade means. It increased Britain's trade with Canada by 42 per cent and Canada's trade with Britain by 44 per cent, and as well increased international trade by leaps and bounds. We have had in the past this new internationalism in the favoured nation treaties with many foreign countries, but we find that over 84 per cent of all our business was done with the mother country and the United States and only 16 per cent with foreign countries. We have tried this international racket and these dreams of a new world to come before. I have no confidence in it; I do not believe in it. We should stick together within the empire as an economic unit. If we do not hang together we shall hang separately, for none of our dominions

[Mr. Church.]

are able to "go it" alone, and Britain without the dominions will be only a second-class power.

There are many things to consider about the Bretton Woods agreement. It is not a scheme of governments but a scheme of economists. I do not believe that it will do what we are told it will. Under it, economic sanctions, if any of us fail, can be applied against Britain and the other dominions; do not forget that. It is only a half-baked international currency scheme which will lead to trouble between Britain and the United States. It is only a half-baked international currency bill, which can never work.

We want full employment, as far as possible. We want cheap money and stable prices. But we shall never get them under the Bretton Woods, Anglo-American loan. I stand by the Ottawa agreements and empire trade first, but they should be brought up to date, so as to meet changed conditions. United with the other dominions we are strong; divided we shall fall. We are not strong enough for any of us to go alone.

I believe the present government, and those which have preceded it, men who held office in the days of Laurier and Fielding, deserve great credit for their pioneering in the matter of preferential trade, and for giving us the six-cent preference on wheat—which was afterwards revoked in 1938 by the United States treaty. But they were the pioneers.

Do not throw it all to the wolves for the sake of a so-called new thing, this dream of a new world, called internationalism. As I have said, the final word of the Bretton Woods agreement is not found in this plan. The final act has been changed, from first to last. They would have Great Britain throw away the only real assets she has, namely her purchasing power in her own home market. She will have to trade that way, and without these two loans will have to regulate and control her export trade and imports. Through the development of consolidation within the empire, Great Britain can build up an economic unit, pledge full employment, and raise the standard of living. All that will be killed by the Bretton Woods agreement. It brings us back to the laissez-faire doctrine of the twenties and the thirties, to the status quo of 1929 and 1939. I want an economic system which, in the circumstances of 1944, 1945 and 1946 or 1960 can help mankind toward a goal of increasing production. The Bretton Woods scheme and the Anglo-American loan will hand over world economic power, and with it world domination, because of the $28 billion of gold in the world, $23 billion are held by the United States.

Great Britain cannot recover unless she is permitted to assume her place in the trade of the world. This trade is not exclusive. The Bretton Woods agreement and the United States loan do not constitute an exchange of goods and services for an exchange of goods and services. It has to be paid back some time, with interest. The United States loan is an exchange of gools and services for what? It is for debt, or for gold. I believe the conditions of the Anglo-American loan are very harsh and a surrender to the money-lenders who do not consider the money was spent to save their shores from invasion for over two years.

If anyone believes the United States will have lower tariffs, then just let him read the recent records of the senate and house of representatives in Washington. There will always be tariffs, so long as there are countries. There will always be nations, and patriotism is the cement that holds nations together. For us to blind our eyes to all this, and go roaming around the world looking for brave new worlds and international agreements is something beyond belief.

In conclusion. let me refer to the speech made this afternoon by an hon. member who spoke first, and who is not at the moment in his seat. He is a fluent, most informative and interesting speaker. But he has forgotten some of the figures, which are set out in a table issued from Washington which shows the principal international credits or loans, either extended or awaiting approval to France by Canada and the United States. This publication is by the National City Bank of New York, April issue, dealing with the subjects of economic conditions, governmental finance and United States securities. At page 44 there is a review of what was done at Savannah recently regarding Bretton Woods. They found that they will have to mark time, and do something. This is what is stated.

> There is general approval of the apparent trend toward postponing starting the monetary fund until some time after the international bank begins operations. This is what many people have advocated all along, for successful operation of the fund is possible only in a reasonably stable world.

I refer now to the table which shows the credits given or to be sanctioned. The amount extended to Great Britain by the United States is $650 million, while that extended by Canada is given as $1,136 million. The credit extended to France by the United States is $895 million, and by Canada, $220 million. The other figures are given for other countries.

In this connection may I point out to hon. members from the province of Quebec what was said by the new Prime Minister of France, Felix Gouin, who is a socialist. This is what he said when taking over from General de Gaulle:

> France has always reacted with the marvellous power which belongs to her and which is made up of moderation, reason and profound political wisdom.

Everybody hopes that under the loan the minister has made available to France—and it will reflect to his credit in years to come, in the minds of the French-speaking people of Quebec—France will soon thus be able to rebuild accordingly. She is in great need of financial assistance at the present time. Her civil and war expenses are much greater than they should be, and will have to be reduced. However, it is our hope that she will get past this critical time. Canada's loan will help greatly. Everything she needs will be made available to her from the people of this country, under the loan announced by the Minister of Finance. I believe the minister deserves the thanks of the country for this transaction, although I would qualify my remarks by making the references I did to the Bretton Woods agreement and the Anglo-American agreement, and the cause and effect of it. I do this because I am a real believer in the future policy of Great Britain and her dominions for imperial preference as an economic unit along the lines I have suggested. Under an empire system we would have preferential trade; the Ottawa agreements could be brought up to date, to meet changed conditions.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Acadia asked me a question about the chances of the United States and Canada pursuing a liberal trade policy in the future. I said I thought Lord Keynes, in a speech delivered in the House of Lords, had made reference to the prospects of such a policy being followed in the United States. I now have excerpts from that speech which I believe are worthy of a place on the record.

This is what he is reported to have said at page 791 of the debates of the House of Lords for December 18, 1945:

> Questions have been raised—and rightly and reasonably raised—about the willingness of the United States to receive repayment hereafter. This is a large subject to which I have given a great deal of thought, but I shall not have time to develop it fully to-day. I am not, as a result, quite so worried as most people. Indeed, if in the next five or ten years the dollar turns out to be a scarce currency, seldom will so many people have been right. It is a very technical matter, very emphatically within their past experience, but not so easily the subject of future prediction. I am afraid I must content myself with a few headlines. First, it is not a question of our having to pay the United States by direct

exports; we could never do that. Our exports are not, and are not likely to be as large as our direct imports from the United States. The object of the multilateral system is to enable us to pay the United States by exporting to any part of the world and it is partly for that very reason that the Americans have felt the multilaterial system was the only sound basis for any arrangement of this kind. Secondly, all the most responsible people in the United States, and particularly in the state department and in the treasury, have entirely departed from the high tariff, export subsidy conception of things, and will do their utmost with, they beileve, the support of public opinion in the opposite direction. That is why this intternational trade convention presents us with such a tremendous opportunity. For the first time in modern history the United States is going to exert its full, powerful influence in the direction of reduction of tariffs, not only of itself but by all others.

Thirdly, this is a problem of which to-day every economist and publicist in the United States is acutely conscious. Books on economics are scarcely written about anything else. They would regard it as their fault and not ours if they fail to solve it. They would acquit us of blame—quite different from the atmosphere of ten or twenty years ago. They will consider it their business to find a way out. Fourthly, if the problem does arise, it will be a problem, for reasons I have just mentioned, of the United States vis-a-vis the rest of the world and not us in particular. It will be the problem of the United States and the whole commercial and financial arrangement of every other country. Fifthly,—and perhaps this is the consideration which is least prominent in peoples' minds—the United States is rapidly becoming a high-living and a high-cost country. Their wages are two and a half times ours. These are the historic, classical methods by which in the long run international equilibrium will be restored.

With regard to the questions put to me by the hon. member for Temiscouata, perhaps I should give them a little more thought and answer them at eight o'clock. I could start on them now, perhaps, but I would like to discuss them. Perhaps I shall have to ask him to repeat some of the questions, as I have not notes of all; but following the notes I have here, perhaps I can deal with them.

There is one point I wish to make clear, which I tried to make clear the other day. I referred to Great Britain getting back into a state of equilibrium, and the hon. member said, "What about Canada getting back into equilibrium?" The point I wanted to make was that when I was talking about deficits and about equilibrium I was not talking about an internal situation at all. When I said the United Kingdom went back, or that the United Kingdom's financial position deteriorated by $20,000 million in Canadian funds up to the time of these loans, I was not talking about the internal debt of the United Kingdom, how much the internal debt was or how much it had increased. The internal debt of the United Kingdom is over $100,000 million, so that we are not comparing likes when we compare an external position with the internal position of the Dominion of Canada. What I meant was that as a result of the war, by loss of foreign assets, by loss of liquid reserves and by debts incurred to foreign countries, the United Kingdom had gone back, had worsened its position by an amount equivalent to $20,000 million in Canadian funds.

The Dominion of Canada did not do that at all. As a result of the war the Dominion of Canada slightly bettered its external position. It incurred a large internal debt, but on balance it lessened its external debt. The same applied to the United States of America; I think the same applied to every other one of our allies. The United Kingdom alone among the victorious allies suffered this terrific deterioration in its external position as far as foreign indebtedness, foreign assets, foreign currencies and liquid reserves were concerned. That is why I said in my speech that the case of the United Kingdom is unique, a special case. That was not an expression of sentiment, or something coming from an imperialist. I was saying simply, and almost in the same words, what was said in the United States of America by the national advisory council, consisting of the secretary of the treasury, the under-secretary of state and so on. They recognized the fact, which cannot be escaped, that the United Kingdom case is different from the case of any other country in the world. The United Kingdom occupies a key position. Either we must write it off and say that it is hopeless, that the place is bankrupt and we might as well forget them; or we have to take the other line and do what we reasonably can, within our resources, to get them into a position where they can carry on as they have in the past, as a great trading nation.

Perhaps I am emphasizing the currency end of this a little more than the trade end of it, but the main reason I desire to see this loan go through is that I want sterling once more to be real money, instead of a currency which is not convertible into other currencies. When I was young, and in fact all during the previous war, when we sold goods to Great Britain for sterling that sterling could be converted into United States dollars; not, as during the last war, simply sold by the Canadian exporter to the government of Canada, which could not do anything more with it unless it made some arrangement with the United Kingdom. So that we must get sterling back to the position of convertibility; and the success of these North American loans, the one from the United States and the one from Canada, is necessary if sterling

is to become a stable and convertible currency once more. Unless it is, we cannot carry on ths huge trade that we have carried on with Great Britain and upon which our wheat exporters, our bacon exporters, our cheese exporters, our apple exporters, our metals exporters, and so on, absolutely depend. We shall not be able to carry that on; we shall have to reorient ourselves entirely, change our economy completely, reduce our exports enormously and try to make ourselves over into some kind of self-sufficient nation.

Great Britain can very well take that other line. She has an area there, the sterling area. By living within that area and pursuing very restrictive trade policies, not buying from any country unless that country will buy from it, by making these bilateral trade agreements they can, and in order to live would have to, do these things, being in the position they are in, unless the North American nations show a little imagination and do something to get Great Britain into the position where in future she can carry on the kind of trade policies which are essential to the interests of the Dominion of Canada.

The hon. member for Temiscouata is entirely wrong when he said my eyes were on Great Britain all the time during my speech. I made the speech from the point of view of the Dominion of Canada. I agree with the approach of the leader of the C.C.F. party and the approach of the financial critic of the the opposition. I disagree with the approach of the Social Credit party, because I do not think the Social Credit party is right in the position it takes that this is purely a moral obligation and not a good business proposition. That is based upon a short-run view.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I do not suppose the minister would remember when I spoke, but he may recall that I did not follow that line, so that perhaps he should be a little less sweeping in his denunciation.

Mr. POULIOT: Your case was like that of England; it was unique.

Mr. ILSLEY: I accept the statement of the hon. member for Lethbridge. Perhaps the members of the Social Credit party were speaking individually, each expressing his own opinion. But while quite a bit of what the hon. member for Acadia says is true, namely that this has an inflationary influence, that it is taking goods out of the country at a time when they are in short supply here, and that goods may be coming back at a time when they are not in short supply here, nevertheless these disadvantages are all outweighed by the paramount advantage of getting Great Britain in a position, not during the next two or three years but in the next half century, where the United Kingdom will be a trading nation with a stable, convertible currency, taking large quantities of our goods and sending us back goods and currency that we can use to buy goods from the United States and other countries. Therefore, from that point of view, we regard this loan as highly in the interests of the Dominion of Canada.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

JUDGES ACT

JUDGES NOT TO ACT AS COMMISSIONERS OR ARBITRATORS—TO BE BOUND BY DECISION OF COURT OF FINAL APPEAL

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview) moved the second reading of bill No. 13, to amend the Judges Act.

He said: I do not wish to delay the minister in getting along with the matter which was under discussion before six o'clock, and I shall speak for only four or five minutes. But I wish to commend this bill to the attention of the house. I have suggested through the acting leader of the house that the minister might consider this bill on his estimates, so as to save time to-night.

The time has come when judges should be paid properly, and no doubt that will be looked after. But, as is generally known, some judges have been absent from their duties for one or two years. That is not in the interests of the administration of justice, because the frequency with which the judges are drafted for all kinds of such work impairs the efficient administration of justice and causes congestion in the law courts. As they are largely only fact-finding commissions when appointed, they duplicate the efficient powers and functions of parliament, of the committees thereof, and of the many outside boards of recent innovation in war work. Furthermore, they are a costly adjunct to good parliamentary government; they cause delays, and interfere with parliament's right to immediate solution of social and economic problems or urgency to good government. Thus a system of "judicial commission government" is slowly being built up in Canada.

While they are appointed by federal authority they are also provincial officers. No doubt on some commissions they have

done good work. but I urge on the minister that he should consider this matter in connection with his estimates.

As regards the second section, namely that judges should be bound by the decision of the court of last resort, by the privy council or whatever is the court of final appeal, it reasserts the well known legal doctrine known as *stare decisis,* namely that decided cases which lay down a rule of law are authoritive and should be followed. Decisions of the privy council should be binding on all courts. In all the provinces, Quebec excepted, they have now what they call divorce courts. In my opinion, this jurisdiction in Ontario should be transferred to the county court judges. There were hundreds upon hundreds of cases standing at the York assizes; the list is nearly as long as the clerk's table; I urge that something should be done.

As hon. members know, there is a divided authority between the federal authority and the provinces. The provinces have certain jurisdiction in respect of the solemnization of marriages, an act which is generally performed by the clergy. In one province decisions of the privy council on the marriage law have been upset, and much trouble has been unnecessarily caused thereby. It is true that the spiritual bodies represented respectively in the Lambeth conference and the canon law of the province of Quebec are unfavourable to the principles of divorce. Nevertheless, it is there, and one must admit that the way divorce has been handled throughout the country indicates the need of a change. When all is said and done, it must be remembered that by Roman law marriage was a contract, and a province can pass an act by which such contract can be registered before a mayor, a sheriff, a warden, or a municipal clerk. I do not raise that point in any controversial spirit; no doubt large numbers of people wish to be married by a Christian minister or a minister of some other faith, but I urge that some remedy should be taken along the lines I suggest. If the minister in his estimates will consent to have these two matters discussed at the proper time, I shall be glad to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

CRIMINAL CODE

FATAL ACCIDENTS AND INJURIES FROM HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AND LEVEL CROSSINGS

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview) moved the second reading of bill No. 27, to amend the criminal code (motor cars).

He said: Prior to the last war we used to have a day called "motor accident day". In 1938 there was a long debate in the house on a motion I introduced with reference to road accidents caused by motor cars. Nothing has contributed more to the education of the people than the motor car, and the proper use of cars is to be commended. But, as in the case of every other invention, its use is one thing and its abuse is another. In the city I come from there were ninety-eight persons killed last year and 7,000 or 8,000 badly injured in consequence of reckless driving. A return was brought down in this house on April 3 giving the number of people killed or injured in traffic accidents on highways during the period of the war, accidents from drowning, accidents at level crossings and so on. Many persons have been killed as a result of fires in small houses and in other ways. In Ontario a member of the forces murdered a girl and was convicted after two trials, but the province spent nearly $70,000 in connection with those two trials. Here we have a record showing 9,038 persons killed and 149,000 badly injured, and no one knows who will be the next victim. There have been some miraculous escapes from the consequences of wild driving at excessive speed contrary to law, but such driving goes on all the year round and apparently no one can stop it.

I would urge the government, when the minister's estimates are up for consideration, to have this matter discussed. There is a real danger from the hit-and-run driver. In the city I come from not a few people have been killed and no one has ever found out who committed the crime. One of our most prominent citizens was killed by a motor car near the York club some years ago and the perpetrator of this dastardly deed was never discovered. It is a cowardly sort of murder, ten times worse than any other. I have seen the headless body of an infant in my constituency, and the people have appealed to me and to one or two other members to see if something cannot be done about it.

I am going to move the adjournment of this debate, but before doing so I suggest to the government that, now the war is over, proper steps be taken to check or to put an end in part to this sort of thing. It takes two persons to make an accident. Reckless drivers will go past the secondary schools at speeds of from forty to sixty miles an hour in spite of signs warning them to drive slowly. It is the duty of parliament to step in and do something. In New York they have adopted certain modern provisions which I have embodied in this bill. I am suggesting an amendment, the purpose of which is to define the powers of the jury in cases of manslaughter arising out of the operation of

motor vehicles, and there is also a section providing that the jury shall decide whether a person charged is guilty or not guilty. It is desirable that the functions of the jury should not be curtailed or abolished. The jury are required to take the law as given by the judge; but, owing to the many cases that are withdrawn by order of the judge, trial by jury in those cases is negatived, and there are at present so many loopholes in our law that many persons guilty of gross negligence get off. The increased number of accidents require that the law with regard to reckless driving should be brought up to date to meet changing conditions, while preserving the liberty of the subject, and there should be a stiffening of the penalties as to drunken and hit-and-run drivers.

I move the adjournment of the debate, and I trust that when the minister's estimates come before the house at the proper time this matter will be disccussed.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

LOAN TO UNITED KINGDOM

APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL AGREEMENT SIGNED MARCH 6, 1946

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Ilsley for the second reading of bill No. 28, respecting the financial agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom, signed on the sixth day of March, 1946.

Mr. W. R. THATCHER (Moose Jaw): Before this bill is carried there are a number of comments I wish to make on it. With the first feature, the loan of $1,250,000,000 I am heartily in accord. In the light of Britain's extreme and disproportionate war-time sacrifices, most Canadians are pleased and proud to give her a hand with her heavy reconversion and rehabilitation problems. Sentimentally and for humanitarian reasons, I think the proposal has a great deal of merit, and I am inclined to agree with other members who have suggested that the loan would be good business for Canada. I definitely favour this part of the bill.

With regard to the second feature of the bill, however, which proposes to cancel a debt owed to Canada by Great Britain of $425,000,000, I cannot agree. I think that this is tantamount to an outright gift for such an amount. It may be that I am inexperienced in political matters and therefore do not see the problem in the proper light. I am willing to concede that. I come from British stock and am very proud of the fact; but as a Canadian member of parliament, circumstances being what they are in Canada to-day, I do not see how I can vote for a gift of such magnitude to another country, even though that country is Great Britain.

In the first place, as nearly as I can ascertain, we have already given Great Britain in the past three or four years, directly or indirectly, over three billion dollars. Over and above these gifts we have sold farm produce to Great Britain in many cases under market levels, and we are still doing so. For instance, wheat on the world market is selling at about $2 a bushel, and yet England is buying wheat at $1.55 f.o.b. Fort William, which means in a nutshell that every time a farmer in western Canada sells a bushel of wheat to Great Britain he is making the mother country a gift of from thirty-five to forty-five cents.

I do not think there are many who begrudge these past gifts, but there are a great many Canadians who are beginning to wonder how long we can fit such vast commitments into our post-war budgets. The war is over and Canada herself faces tremendous problems of reconversion and rehabilitation. Everyone of these projects will require large sums of money.

Everyone admires the magnificent war effort of Britain and is glad to give a helping hand; nevertheless I do not see how we can give away such a huge sum as $425,000,000 when so many of our own people are in actual need.

Only last week there was before this house a resolution urging decent old age pensions for elderly Canadians. Hon. members from all political parties on both sides of the house spoke in favour of that resolution; yet it was not passed. I suppose the reason it was not passed was that the government felt that funds were not available for such social services at the present time. A few days before that, there was before the house another resolution which eventually would have resulted in large irrigation projects in western Canada. Despite the fact that these projects are vitally needed, we saw that resolution also talked out, though we heard members from all sides of the house speak in favour of it. I believe it was talked out because the government felt that funds were not available for it at the present time. My home city of Moose Jaw has a population of almost 25,000 people, and we have been short of water for about forty years. During the past winter our water supply was cut off about half of every day. If a housewife wanted to cook in the daytime she had to fill the bathtub with water the night before. Industries were closed down and men laid off because there was no water. Sanitary facilities could not be used. The people in my constituency will think it strange that parliament can give hundreds of millions of dollars to Great Britain, and yet

cannot find a few million dollars to improve living conditions in the cities of Moose Jaw, Regina and Weyburn in southern Saskatchewan. A few million dollars would give them an adequate water supply.

Mr. ILSLEY: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? I assume he would like to answer his friends in Moose Jaw who are worried about this. Would he explain how we can use any part of the $425 million for old age pensions or for any water improvements or for irrigation projects?

Mr. THATCHER: I cannot tell the Minister of Finance how he should run his department, but I do say this: Surely, if we can find so much money to give Great Britain we can find a few million dollars for that purpose. Probably that is not the answer he would like, but I shall be glad to listen to the minister in a few minutes if he will give me several more. To-day there are thousands of returned veterans who are looking for work. Why cannot we find a few projects on which to employ them? I cannot see how this parliament can justify, on the one hand, being so generous with Great Britain, and, on the other, being so niggardly in many respects to our own people.

I have received no mandate from my constituents to vote for a gift which amounts to about $1,750,000 for every constituency in Canada. I cannot refrain from objecting to this measure, and if the bill comes to a vote in its present form I shall vote against it.

Mr. ILSLEY: Let us deal with this matter now, because I see the trend of the speeches that are going to be made by certain members and one of the oppositions against this bill.

Mr. COLDWELL: Just a minute; I do not want the minister to misunderstand. The hon. member for Moose Jaw is speaking entirely for himself in this particular, and I dissociate myself completely from the point of view he expressed.

Mr. POULIOT: That is a mistake.

Mr. ILSLEY: Let us deal with that, because I think the hon. member for Moose Jaw wants to be fair about this. I have not given this aspect much thought in advance because I am surprised that that line of argument should be used. If any writing-off of this $425 million will enable us to balance our budget or reduce taxes or pay off any of our debts here in Canada or spend any money on anything that we needed in Canada there would be some validity in the argument.

The capacity of the United Kingdom to pay is limited for the reasons that I gave in my speeches to the house. We satisfied ourselves that by the time Great Britain repays the $1,250 million, which will take them until 2000 A.D., it is just nonsense to think about trying to ask them for another $425 million some time in the next century. If we are wrong about our appraisal of the capacity of the United Kingdom to pay, the situation is perhaps a little different; that is, we might get goods of some kind from Great Britain. We could not use the goods to pay old age pensions; nevertheless it would add to the wealth of this country.

The United States made a very careful appraisal of this situation, just as Canada did, and having in mind the fact that the United Kingdom has gone back, as I said this afternoon at six o'clock, by over twenty billion Canadian dollars as a result of this war, and having in mind the fact that we cannot see how Great Britain can meet her deficits—I do not mean her deficits at home, not her budget deficits; I mean her international deficits—how can she pay for the goods that she has to have upon which to live and keep herself going and at the same time even pay interest on the $1,250 million for the first five years, or any more than a low rate of interest for the next half century? What is the use of talking about attempting to collect $425 million? I am taking this in a hard-headed way; I am talking about this as if we had to get it if we could, and I think perhaps that is correct. But bear in mind that this $425 million is a war debt. It was the costs of Great Britain's participation in the air training plan. There is nothing there; it does not represent anything; there is nothing represented by this $425 million which enables the United Kingdom to earn a single dollar with which to pay the Dominion of Canada. The reason that we are lending the money to Great Britain as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar says; perhaps we confuse it by talking money rather than goods—the reason we are sending Great Britain $1,250 million worth of goods or thereabouts during the next three or four years is to get Great Britain on her feet so that she will be a solid, enduring, permanent and expanding market for the Dominion of Canada. This whole deal is an investment in the future of Canadian trade. This deal is for the benefit of these very people about whom the hon. member for Moose Jaw is talking. We are not taking money away from them and giving it to Great Britain. We are now giving money to them as a result of this deal that we are entering into by this United Kingdom loan.

I do not like this arguement that if we can give money to people across the sea, surely we can give more money to people at home. That is not the true nature of the transaction at all. So far as the write-off of the $425 million is concerned, it does not affect one way or the other our ability to do anything along the lines mentioned by the hon. member. I put the question to him a little while ago. I said, if we do not put this loan on the statute books how can we use any part of the $425 million to pay for old age pensions or to pay for Moose Jaw improvements or to pay for irrigation projects in Saskatchewan? How can we do it? There is no answer to that question; there is no way in which we can do it.

Mr. BRACKEN: The bill before us is bill No. 28, respecting the financial agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom signed on the 6th day of March, 1946. This bill has had second reading. Presumably the main principle of it has been approved by a large majority of the house. We are now in committee of the whole. At this stage I do not propose to repeat the arguments that have been used by any hon. members who have spoken in the previous stages of the bill. I take it that our job at the moment is to deal with the details of the measure.

I have just two or three things to say. I shall sum up the main items in the bill, and state briefly where we stand on it,—although it has been stated before—and to ask the minister to answer a few practical questions relating to it. It will help us all to understand better the implications and the cost of the measure we are now considering.

Let me say this in passing. I conceive this measure to be one of the most far-seeing this government has introduced in recent years. It is not a measure for to-day or for to-morrow but for the long distant future. I put it in a class with the lend-lease proposals brought forward by the President of the United States a few years ago, without which the war would not have been won by us. So that I commend the government most highly on the bill. At the same time we must realize that to a considerable degree we are by it making a considerable contribution to an ally in the war.

What is the substance of the bill? It is outlined in sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. We are asked to approve the financial agreement entered into some months ago between this country and Britain. To do what? To advance $1,250 million to Britain by way of loan, to bear interest after five years at the rate of two per cent; second, to continue for five years more the interest free provisions of the loan to the United Kingdom made in 1942, which I understand in the beginning amounted to $700 million and now, I believe, stands at about $500 million. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will tell me if that is right.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, about.

Mr. BRACKEN: That is, we have about $500 million still owing on an interest-free loan made in 1942. Under the terms of this agreement no interest is to be paid on this loan for the next five years. At the end of that period discussions may be held to decide what shall be done about it.

Mr. ILSLEY: It may be paid off by that time. It is being paid off.

Mr. BRACKEN: In three years some $200 million has been paid.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: Probably you do not expect much in the way of repayment of that loan when you are making another loan of $1,250 million.

The third provision has to do with the cancellation of the amount owing by the United Kingdom to Canada with respect to the British commonwealth air training plan, totalling $425 million. This is an obligation owing to Canada by Britain which is being written off. Then the government is given power to borrow the amounts of money required for this loan under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.

We support this bill, Mr. Chairman, chiefly for two reasons. The first is that in our judgment it is essential to the preservation of the Canadian economy as we see it to-day. Ours is an export economy; we are more than any other country dependent upon foreign nations for a market for our products. Three out of every eight people in Canada make their living through enterprises directly or indirectly related to the export business. Our best customer has been Britain. To-day, because of sacrifices made during the war, Britain is unable to pay for the goods she requires from us. As the minister said, this is an investment in trade for the future, to try to keep a good customer going until later on, when she can pay for the imports she will take from us. This measure is essential to the preservation of the Canadian economy. If we lose the British market the farmers will lose a market for a large proportion of what we export. If that should happen we would be in the position of having to let possibly one-third of our Canadian farms be abandoned. We have 30,000 farms abandoned now, and if we have another 250,000 aban-

doned, we shall have a job on our hands. If the farmers cannot sell their products they cannot buy the products of industry. Business then becomes demoralized, and we find ourselves with mass unemployment. These things follow one after the other: loss of export markets, demoralization of industry, mass unemployment and a low national income. As the Minister of Justice is reported to have said a few days ago, a low national income means inability to maintain social services at their present standards. These consequences follow one another if we lose a major portion of our export trade. I have said, we support the bill because it is essential to the preservation of the Canadian economy as we know it to-day. It would demoralize our whole economy if the one-third of our people making their living in export industries had to find some other employment in Canada. That is not any sentimental reason for supporting this measure; it is a purely logical, economic reason.

Our second reason for supporting the loan is that it is a necessary prerequisite to the accomplishment of world peace. If we lose our export trade with Britain, Britain will be forced into a sterling bloc, and in this western world we shall have two competing economies, each using the devices of the inter-war period, each sowing the seeds of another war. This is an investment in possible durable peace. These are two important reasons for supporting this measure.

I wish now to ask the minister a number of questions bearing directly on the sections of this bill. What is the understanding or undertaking on the part of Britain that any portion or all of this money will be spent in Canada? My understanding is that there is no commitment, but that it is the expectation that an amount equal to the loan will be spent in this country. I should like the minister to make that point clear, for I am sure he would want the Canadian people to be in no duobt about it.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, I will do that.

Mr. BRACKEN: Second, what are the circumstances under which payment of the interest on the loan may be waived? Under this agreement no interest is payable for five years, after which interest is payable at two per cent per annum. But in certain years the interest may be waived, and the interest so waived will be written off. I think the house and the country would like to know the circumstances under which interest would not be payable to Canada.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Third, what will the annual payments to Canada be if the interest and principal payments are made in full? The reason I ask that is this: We are making a loan of $1,250 million to Great Britain. The United States has made or is contemplating making a loan three times as large. Great Britain will owe on both of them, according to my calculations, $180 million a year. I would like the house and the Canadian people to understand what the obligation is that Great Britain is taking on her shoulders, when taking these two loans. Perhaps the minister has the figure for the United States as well. The interest rate and the terms are exactly the same; only the amounts are different.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is correct.

Mr. BRACKEN: Perhaps the minister could also give us an estimate on this question. What interest rate will be payable by Canada. on the money raised here to be advanced to Great Britain? We are lending it to Great Britain at an interest rate of two per cent. What interest shall we have to pay our own people for the money they lend us to re-lend to Britain? What is the difference in dollars between our interest payment and the payment we will receive from Great Britain? The difference between what interest the government will pay us and the payments we receive from Great Britain would be our contribution under that particular section of the agreement.

Mr. ILSLEY: It will be the taxpayers' contribution—not the country's contribution. It will be the taxpayers' contribution—the contribution of the Canadian taxpayers.

Mr. BRACKEN: And what did I say?

Mr. ILSLEY: The hon. gentleman said "our" contribution.

Mr. BRACKEN: Well, I did not confine it to this party or to that party, or to any particular individuals. I thought I was speaking in this instance for Canada.

Mr. ILSLEY: But there is a difference. There is a way for the country to lend wealth, as distinguished from the taxpayer paying somebody else in the country. When the government borrows money from the taxpayer, the taxpayer pays money and the bondholder gets money. The country has not borrowed on any of the money. Therefore the contribution works out as a contribution of the taxpayer as distinguished from a contribution of the country.

Mr. BRACKEN: Quite frankly I do not see what the minister is driving at. However, this government borrows money from the people at a certain rate of interest?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: Lends it to Great Britain at two per cent interest?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: Then the difference between the rate paid the people and the two per cent received is the contribution of somebody in Canada.

Mr. ILSLEY: The taxpayers.

Mr. BRACKEN: In this particular proposal?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BRACKEN: Well, who else is there to pay it but the taxpayers?

Mr. McCANN: The hon. member is taking it for granted that everybody takes part of the loan.

Mr. BRACKEN: I do not see any point in what the minister has said. However, if there is something in it I have not understood, he might develop it later on.

Mr. ILSLEY: There might not be.

Mr. BRACKEN: The point is that the difference comes from the Canadian people.

The other day the minister gave some reasons why there should be different rates of interest and loans of different lengths to different countries. Perhaps he would deal with that briefly also.

Why did the government cancel the British debt to Canada of $425 million owing as a result of the commonwealth air training plan? I believe I know the answer, but I think the minister should place it on record, because it is related to another item which is continuing. If the government cancels one debt of $425 million, why does it continue the 1942 interest-free debt of $500 million? My reason for asking that is this: The United States in its proposed settlement with Great Britain of its lease-lend operations has written off certain amounts which, I believe, approximate $25,000 million, and has asked Britain for payment of only $640 million. We wrote off one debt of $425 million and maintained another of some $500 million. I would suppose the minister's answer will be that he thought Great Britain could pay part of the total, but could not pay all of it.

Those are some of the questions I wished to ask. Speaking for this party, may I state again we are very glad to be able to give the government our unanimous support on this measure.

Mr. ILSLEY: Perhaps I had better answer these questions now. The first one was: What understanding is there that Great Britain will use the proceeds of this loan for the purpose of purchasing goods in Canada? It is true that it is not provided in this loan that the $1,250 million must be spent in Canada. It was considered that in the case of Great Britain this restriction was neither necessary nor desirable.

It is not necessary because we know that Britain's purchases in Canada, requiring to be financed by some means other than its current receipts from Canada during the period in which they can use this credit, will exceed substantially the amount of credit. If they use the credit for other purchases, they will need to use other funds for purchasing here, funds derived, for example, from selling to Canada gold or foreign exchange that Canada requires.

It is not desirable because in the agreement, through the operation of article V, we require the United Kingdom to provide Canadian dollars to countries in the sterling area and to other countries in return for sterling which these countries acquire from their trade with Britain, in order that these other countries may be able to trade with Canada. If we are imposing this obligation on Britain to provide Canadian dollars to other countries which need them for buying in Canada, then we should make it possible for Britain to use the Canadian dollars we lend her for this purpose.

It should be noted that this will not mean that other countries are getting any special advantage from the credit. but merely that they will be getting the same advantage of convertibility of sterling into Canadian dollars that we wish to obtain by having sterling convertible into United States dollars.

It should also be noted that the credit provided by the United States is not restricted to purchases in the United States and, in fact, it is expected, as Lord Keynes told the House of Lords in England, that only about one-half of the United States credit will be needed to cover Britain's deficit with the United States. We considered that when the United States was prepared to provide Britain with dollars that she can and will transfer to other countries, we should not restrict our credit from being used in this way.

It should be noted that when and if Britain transfers these Canadian dollars we lend her to some other country, the other

country in turn will use them in Canada. Our exchange control would prevent these dollars from being converted into foreign exchange and taken out of Canada in this way.

The fact is that we know from the demand for goods during the next three or four years that Great Britain will require more than the amount of this loan for expenditures in Canada. It is different from the United States, because it is not expected in that instance that Great Britain will need the whole amount of the United States loan. Great Britain will need more than the amount of the Canadian loan.

Mr. GRAYDON: What part of the United States loan do you figure she will need?

Mr. ILSLEY: I think I have it here somewhere. They would not need the whole amount to meet the deficit with the United States. I do not think I can add much to that explanation.

The second question referred to the circumstances under which interest would be waived. The circumstances are set out in article IV of the agreement. They are a little technical and perhaps I had better read that article:

In any year in which the government of the United Kingdom requests the government of Canada to waive the amount of the interest due in the instalment of that year, the government of Canada will grant the waiver if:

(a) The government of the United Kingdom finds that a waiver is necessary in view of the present and prospective conditions of international exchange and the level of its gold and foreign exchange reserves; and

(b) The international monetary fund certifies that the income of the United Kingdom from home-produced exports plus its net income from invisible current transactions in its balance of payments was on the average over the five preceding calendar years less than the average annual amount of United Kingdom imports during 1936-38, fixed at 866 million pounds as such figure may be adjusted for changes in the price level of these imports. If waiver is requested for an interest payment prior to that due in 1955, the average income shall be computed for the calendar years from 1950 through the year preceding that in which the request is made; and

(c) Interest payments due in that year on any credit made available to the government of the United Kingdom to which a similar provision for waiver of interest applies are also waived.

I just want to put in my own language the substance of that article. To begin with, we can waive when the United States waives; the provision is the same as in the United States agreement. We are not obliged to waive unless the United States also waives under the similar provision in their agreement. The simple way to put it is that unless Great Britain's exports, including balances on invisible transactions, are of a sufficient volume and value to pay for her post-war volume of imports, that is to say, imports from 1936 to 1938, we shall consider that Great Britain has not the capacity to pay and we shall waive payment of the interest. That is the simple way to put it and I tried to put it in that way in my speech.

It means that Great Britain's volume of exports must be very considerably greater than before the war. It was stated in the House of Lords' discussion that they must be sixty per cent greater than they were during those years—perhaps it was 1939—during that period before the war. Therefore the United States and this country and Great Britain look forward to an expansion of Great Britain's export trade. There must be a substantial expansion of Great Britain's trade or Great Britain cannot pay for her imports.

How can she pay for her imports? She has a huge population in a small island without many resources. She has lost so many of her investments and her shipping is down, as I said, by about two-thirds. That great volume of investments which she had and which supplied her with large annual payments which she could turn around and use to pay for imports is gone. The result is that Great Britain has to build up a substantial export trade in order to meet the balance of payments. There is just no other way a country —I do not need to go into elementary principles—can pay. A country cannot by taxing its own people get money with which to pay another nation. In some way or another they have to get reserves; they have to get the currency of other countries with which to pay other people.

Mr. BRACKEN: The minister does not need to sell us on that idea; we are already sold on it. I just wanted to know the circumstances under which England might not be required to pay interest.

Mr. ILSLEY: I knew it was not necessary to argue my hon. friend into that idea, but I thought there were some other hon. members in the house who perhaps would be interested in it. I understand there is not a willingness on the part of some to support this measure and therefore I was talking a little for the benefit of those who are opposed to it.

Mr. QUELCH: Will the amount paid by Great Britain on account of sterling balances accumulated to the credit of overseas governments, banks, et cetera, before the date of this agreement be considered as income under article IV? I think I read in the London *Economist* that they apparently would not be considered as income.

Mr. ILSLEY: There is a sentence in the United States agreement which covers that point. It reads:

> Any amount in excess of 43,750,000 pounds released or paid in any year on account of sterling balances accumulated to the credit of overseas governments, monetary authorities and banks before the effective date of this agreement shall be regarded as a capital transaction and therefore shall not be included in the above calculation of the net income from invisible current transactions for that year.

Mr. QUELCH: Does that apply also to Canada?

Mr. ILSLEY: That point was considered very carefully, and it was thought that the provision in the United States agreement completely protected Canada because we do not waive unless the United States waives. That is specifically provided for in our agreement.

The next question was as to the interest rate if there is no waiver. The rate depends upon the rate at which credit is drawn upon. That determines the length of time it is outstanding before 1951. Assuming that credit is drawn in equal quarterly instalments from April 1, 1946, to December 31, 1948, and that no waiver of interest occurs, the effective rate of interest for the whole period would be 1·73 per cent. It is generally considered, I think, that the United States interest rate is 1·62 per cent, although the provisions are exactly the same in the two agreements. The effective rate would depend upon the times when the amount was extended, but the best calculation we can make is that the rate will be 1·73 per cent.

Mr. BRACKEN: That is the rate. The question I asked was the amount Britain would be paying in Canada and approximately the amount Britain would be paying in the United States. I understand the figures are respectively $40 million and $140 million a year, or a total of $180 million.

Mr. ILSLEY: The amount payable to Canada is approximately $40 million a year. The exact figures are $39,778,750. To the United States the amount payable is about $140 million in U.S. currency. The exact amount is $140,021,200.

Mr. BRACKEN: An annual payment by Britain to both of $180 million?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, that is right.

I think there are some other questions I have to answer. The next one was, the average rate of interest on our borrowings, the amount that we expect to be paying our own people. The average rate of interest on our outstanding debt is now 2·7 per cent. On our long-term bonds the yield to-day is only slightly over 2½ per cent. The rate for which the leader of the opposition is asking will depend on the average terms for which we borrow during the next three or four years. If we borrow a good deal of short-term money, or if the average term of our borrowing is, say, not over ten years, the differential between what we pay and what we receive will be very slight.

Mr. BRACKEN: That is, after 1951.

Mr. ILSLEY: No, the average; the average was 1·73 over the whole period from now on, and the difference between what we receive from the United Kingdom, assuming there is no waiver, and what we pay, will be very slight under the conditions I mentioned; that is, if there is a fair amount of short-term borrowing or borrowing for periods of less than ten years.

Mr. BRACKEN: Is that as accurate as the minister would care to be?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not think I can be any more accurate than that.

Mr. BRACKEN: I just want to be completely fair with our own people. This money will cost us more than we shall get for it from Britain, and I think it is due the people that they should know as nearly as possible what that contribution will be.

Mr. DORION: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ILSLEY: I think there are some other questions.

Mr. FRASER: The minister has not answered all the questions.

Mr. DORION: Yes, but the Chairman gave me the floor.

I would not have risen at this stage of the debate had my absence from the house last Friday not given rise to some misunderstanding. I was called to Quebec to appear before the superior court, and that is the reason why I could not be here. However, as I owe my constituents a clear and definite stand on so important a question I should like to say just a few words.

I must state first that if I had been here last Friday I would certainly have voted against the second reading of the bill. Since this measure was announced by the government, even before the beginning of this session, I have endeavoured to find some sound arguments in favour of this bill. Much has been said for and against the bill. I believe that the only true reason for the passing of this measure is found in the speeches delivered by the hon. member for Kootenay-

West and by the hon. member for Macleod. The hon. member for Kootenay-West. as reported at page 847 of *Hansard,* said:

> But I am rising to express support of the bill on the ground that we have a moral obligation to assist those who have suffered in the defence of democracy.

And the hon. member for Macleod said, as reported at page 848:

> The only reason remaining for the loan, as far as I can see, is from the moral aspect.

I believe those statements to be true. I believe that there is much more sentiment than anything else in this transaction, and I say that the government should not have once more tried to side-track the question by endeavouring to show the people that this loan was a good businesslike transaction when everybody knows that it is not so. If it were true that this loan will contribute to maintain our export trade, which is supposed to be vital to our country, one thing which is certain is that this transaction will cost the taxpayers of this country $37,500,000 a year. Furthermore, an arrangement was come to between the Canadian government and the French government which provides for a loan of $242 million with interest at three per cent. I cannot see any reason why the same principle should not apply to the present loan and that interest of at least three per cent should not be charged. We must also keep in mind the fact that the gift of $425 million forms part of our national debt, on which we have to pay three per cent interest, that is to say an amount of $12,750,000 a year. There is also the extension of the loan made in 1942 of $700 million, which, according to figures given by the Minister of Finance, has been reduced to $538 million, which costs us in annual interest $16,140,000. These three figures give a result of $66,390,000 which we are called upon to pay each year to be permitted to sell our products to the United Kingdom.

According to statistics, I understand that nearly one-half of this amount will be paid by those who have an income of less than $2,500 a year. I have in my hand a statement which was given by the government in answer to a question I put on the order paper. The question was, what amount was received by the government during the last five fiscal years from taxes on incomes of $2,500 a year or less; and the answer was—I take the year 1944—$308 million. I have here a handbook entitled "Canada, 1946", and I see at page 190 that the total tax on incomes for the year 1944 was $756 million. Therefore one must conclude that, of this $66,390,000 already mentioned, those who have an income of $2,500 a year or less will pay, as their share of this interest, about $30 million a year. I should like to quote from an article written by Mr. P.. M. Richards in *Saturday Night* of March 23, entitled, "The Cost of the British Loan". This is what he says:

> What it's going to cost us—if we dont produce a good deal more efficiently and abundantly than we ever have before—is a part of our "normal" standard of living. Because Britain is not in a position to pay cash for either goods or loan interest at the present time, Canada will pay about $30,000,000 a year in carrying charges on the loan until 1951 and about $12,000,000 a year thereafter the latter being the estimated difference between the two per cent Britain will then pay and the three per cent the loan is expected to cost Canada.
>
> This we may reasonably regard as being by no means an excessive price for the benefits in prospect—the maintenance of British economic health as well as the British market for our products. But, clearly, it does impose a new burden on us, particularly over the next five years when we ourselves will be feeling the strains of social-economic readjustment. We shall bear this burden, now added to all the other burdens (such as family allowances) we have taken upon ourselves, best if we recognize it for what it is and do not make the error of supposing that the cost of carrying it comes from anywhere but our own pockets.

Those are the reasons why I oppose the bill.

Mr. ILSLEY: I should like to continue to answer the questions asked by the leader of the opposition. He wanted to know why different rates of interest were charged to different countries and on what principle those rates were fixed. Different rates of interest are charged to different countries under the Export Credits Insurance Act because of the different lengths of the various loans. Our policy is to base the rate on the rate payable by the Canadian government on loans for a period equal to the average period of the credit and to add a very slight margin to cover overhead costs of our borrowing. Of course, this British loan, for the reasons already given, is treated as a special case, and the interest rate has been determined on other grounds. But if the hon. gentleman will look at the rates of interest charged to other countries and the average length of loan to other countries, he will find that they are completely consistent and are based on the rate that the Canadian government pays for money it borrows here.

I have already answered the question as to why we thought it desirable to cancel the $425 million debt. The supplementary question was why we made any distinction between the $425 million debt and the balance of the $700 million 1942 loan. It is just a matter of adjustment. The question is how far a country ought to go. The $700 million loan was a

settled matter covered by an agreement back in 1942 and being slowly but steadily liquidated as securities were sold in Canada; and we thought it desirable to allow that transaction to proceed just as it was doing. We did not begin to charge interest because it did not seem sensible to be asking for interest in the next five years when no interest was being charged on the main loan when capacity to pay was so slight. A similar loan was made in the United States which was not disturbed at the time the loan agreement was made. That is, this loan was secured by what was called a negative pledge of securities. The United States loan was secured by a positive pledge of securities, and that loan is being liquidated by disposition of securities there, while this loan is being liquidated by disposition of securities here. As they did not disturb their pre-existing transaction we did not disturb ours.

Mr. HACKETT: The United States loan bore interest?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. HACKETT: Ours did not?

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. BRACKEN: Two related questions and I am through. Can the minister say what the United States government wrote off in its lend-lease advances to Britain in its adjustment with Britain? The figure I have in mind is $25 billion.

Mr. ILSLEY: It would be over $20 billion after reciprocal lend-lease is allowed for. It may be $25 billion, but it would be over $20 billion at any rate.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am glad to have that confirmation from the minister because in this country there is occasionally criticism of the United States for advancing only three and three-quarter billions to Britain at this time and for charging two per cent interest on it. Such criticism does not show a full appreciation of what the United States has so generously done in the past in its contribution through lend-lease. On other question: What undertaking or undestanding, if any, is asked of Britain with respect to future trade as a result of this loan to her at this time?

Mr. ILSLEY: The only provision is found in article V:

> The government of the United Kingdom and the government of Canada agree that in respect of (a) the operation of exchange controls and arrangements, and (b) quantitative import restrictions, each will grant to the residents and products of the other, treatment not less favourable than that provided for in any instrument of agreement with the government of any other country signed prior to the date of this agreement.

That brings into our agreement the undertakings given to the United States in their agreement, and if it would be of any interest I could put them on the record.

Mr. BRACKEN: All I was interested in was this, whether as a result of this loan to Britain Canada will be placed in any more favourable position with respect to future trade with Britain than we otherwise would have been.

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, yes, very much so, definitely. On can hardly talk about the Canadian loan apart from the United States loan, but I dealt with that in the speech I made. I put it as concisely as I could in the speech in which I introduced the resolution. The United States gets certain important stipulations. The most important is this provision for the convertibility of sterling within about a year or fifteen months, and non-discrimination in exchange arrangements and non-discrimination in quotas. These are the most important provisions. It may be said that we would have got these provisions whether we had entered into this loan or not, but we got certain others as a result of entering into the loan, and they are set out in the speech I made to the house.

Mr. PICARD: Before I go on with the remarks which I propose to make, I wish to note one of the arguments brought forward by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay against the measure. He says that we shall have to pay about $30 million a year in taxes if this goes through. Those who believe that the measure will enable Britain to get a better stabilization of the pound and allow us to exchange our credits in England to balance our debits in the United States, think it would be worth while even to pay the $30 million we might have to pay, because it is better to give part of what we shall earn than earn nothing and return to an era of scarcity, which would be the consequence if we lost our British markets. It reminds me of the men who before the war were penniless or unemployed. They received a high salary during the war and were called upon to pay a certain amount in income tax. Some complained bitterly, but others realized that it was better to give part of it than have nothing and be in the position they were before the war. Whether this measure will mean in the end a gift or a loan is quite immaterial. It is the purposes and the results that will count. In some ways

it can be considered as a shot in the arm to invigorate Britain and stimulate her world trade, help her to take her place in the industrial life of the world. The purpose is to strengthen the pound and promote a healthy basis of exchange between the dollar area and the sterling area.

The reaction upon Canada is expected to be the balancing of our external trade, which is of vital importance to us. If the British pound becomes exchangeable for dollars we can cover our unfavourable United States balances by our surplus of British pounds; therefore the loan is a necessity to us more than it is to the United States which is granting $3,750 million. The argument has been used before, and I think it is well to repeat it, that we cannot compare the $3,750 million which is the United States share with their wealth on one hand and the $1,250 million and our wealth on the other hand. We should integrate this with the importance attached to our country's export trade. The United States are relying on export trade for between seven and ten per cent of their production, while Canada's economy is counting on an export trade of about fifty per cent.

Mr. MacNICOL: About twenty per cent.

An hon. MEMBER: Forty-two per cent.

Mr. PICARD: If it is forty-two per cent, then I am not very far off. This loan will permit us to maintain a productive economy instead of a curtailment economy. To the people of my province as well as to the people of all Canada I sincerely believe it will mean a market for their agricultural products for a good many years to come. It will help to maintain decent prices for the fruits of their labour. Therefore I cannot do other than support the measure even though there are aspects to it which may not be all that we may hope for. I believe this is a necessity. We cannot afford not to make the loan unless we consider the possibilities that remain open to us. As I said a moment ago, unless we grant the loan we shall have a scarcity era, which means that we can produce only for ourselves and our small market outside Britain, or we must take a chance now on building a different type of external trade in the years after the war by diversifying our clients. If we do that, we might dispose during a few years of all our surpluses and keep the wheels of industry turning by accepting the trade of certain other countries that are clamouring for our goods to-day and are able to pay for them in a way that would enable us to equilibrate our trade deficit with the United States. Can we take that chance of establishing long-term contracts with such countries and maintain enough of these markets afterwards to replace the loss of the British market? Although I personally think it would be a much saner position for Canada to put herself in, to have a much more diversified external trade, I cannot authoritatively say that it can be easily done.

Our position at present is such a false one in a way that we should try to enlarge considerably our world markets on long-term contracts or by treaties so as not to be permanently in the ridiculous, I might say unsanitary, condition of depending on one client. Any store depending for its success on one client is doomed to failure because it is at the mercy of that client and must accept his terms. That is the position we are in now because of our trade policies, which were to a certain extent unavoidable at one time. Had we not had the British market we might not have had the onward advance of our Canadian economy. But is it a sanitary condition to be in permanently? I do not think so. I have not given enough study to the possibilities of our building a peace-time market among a number of clients to share with Britain our surplus production in order that we may not be entirely dependent upon one client, to give a definite opinion on the matter. I imagine, however, that the position can be greatly improved. However, it may be that in normal times many of the countries willing to trade with us now may be self- sufficient in most of our sources of export. England has a population of nearly forty-eight millions and cannot feed probably more than ten millions. We have an outright market there. The fact that we have only one client remains unsanitary. But how can we replace that market? Can we find another market for the products that compose our exports? How can we find any place to replace that market? I think we should endeavour to find new markets. Our department of external trade should endeavour to find new markets. However, I believe it would be dangerous to rely on that at the moment unless we have financial arrangements or engagements with these countries over a long period to come. It would be unwise to turn down the British loan which is our hope—and I sincerely believe it—of balancing our external trade under the same method as we did before the war.

I am sure that, concurrently with maintaining our British market which calls mainly for food products, we should have a more aggressive trade policy with countries that are apt to maintain their payments to us in goods and services or in notes exchangeable

on the United States market. Therefore we should meet the present emergency by the loan and try to correct our false position by extending and diversifying our foreign markets. Our industrial production should compete with that of the United States and the United Kingdom in many countries with which we have an interest to trade.

Let us not have a back-seat to the United Kingdom and the United States in a search for new markets. We have done enough in the last war to deserve to be given now a share of the world markets in order to be able to maintain employment and production at a high peak, but we must go and search for them.

We are in a favoured position compared with formerly industrialized countries like Germany. Let us make the best of it while we can. Another aspect of the British loan is that it is intended to try to restore Britain to its former position in world trade. There are two sentimental reasons to this question. Probably there are other reasons that may be invoked. There are two sentimental reasons for Canada giving this loan. British solidarity appeals to the sympathy of some people because of the sacrifices made in England during the war. I do not think that is a reason sufficient to warrant the loan. We should think of our own interest. Our own interests are enough to warrant it, but I think this is a reason that can be considered. It does enter into the minds of many who support it. I shall not undertake to describe to the committee the conditions I saw when I was over there. I admit I was greatly impressed by what the British people suffered during the war, the ordeal that they have gone through. I saw something of the destruction that has taken place. I learnt something of the sacrifices they made and are still making. That is certainly in the minds of many Canadians at the moment, as probably it was in the minds of those who had to consider this matter. Regardless of how great that sacrifice may have been, I do not think that would be sufficient reason for us to endanger our own economy; but it is a reason that exists just the same.

There is also the necessity of helping Britain to maintain on the continent of Europe the prestige of a democratic nation. I do not want to enter upon a speech on the necessity of counterbalancing the nefarious influences of totalitarian states; far from it. Yet, if we want to show the people of Europe in a certain way that our system of government is good we must make sure that the one country in Europe with a democratic government which stood throughout the war can yet regain its place in international trade, and can still be of great support and great help to many nations on the continent. Mind you, Mr. Chairman, ninety per cent of the population of Europe are underfed or starving. All these people are subjected to subversive propaganda of one sort or another. The only help they can look for is from Britain, the United States and ourselves. We can help in only a small way, but it is worth while to try because it is my personal belief that you cannot fight the propaganda which is being spread among those people who have nothing to eat just with nice words and empty hands. I believe we have to give them something; we have to give them confidence, and start them on their way to trade. I think Britain, with the help the United States and Canada are giving, is bound to regain, to at least some extent, the position she occupied before the last war in connection with trade on the continent of Europe.

One argument brought forward by sympathizers with Britain, in favour of the measure, is that it will certainly help Britain to regain her lost supremacy in world trade. Personally I think this is an illusion. Britain gained her industrial supremacy during the eighteenth century, when the invention of the steam engine gave her a chance to use her vast coal resources. Britain thus got an advance as well as an advantage over other nations. With the advent of electrical power and the needs of modern industry for oil, Britain had lost her industrial lead before the first great war. She remained the money market of the world up to the beginning of the second war, but the drain on her financial resources has been such as to change Britain from a creditor to a debtor nation. She came out of the war with a debit balance, we are told, of $13,000 million; not counting the $3,000 million of Canadian aid and the $29,000 million of United States lend-lease. Is it possible that these present advances of $5,000 million can permit her, as we hope, to regain her balance and get on the way to recovery? I sincerely hope so, but without being a prophet of doom I think it will be just a shot in the arm. I may be wrong; I hope I am, but even after having reached that conclusion it is not sufficient to deter me from supporting the bill, because I think we must take the chance that it will have the expected result. That is my first reason for supporting the bill.

In the second place, no matter how wrong I think it is to depend upon one client, I think we must face the facts as they are and must help Britain stabilize the pound sterling in order that we may equilibrate our world trade balances by using, to pay for our excess imports from the United States, the payments received for our excess exports to Britain.

In the third place I think it is better to lose the yearly interest on our money for five years and then the difference between the borrowing rate and the rate paid by Britain, than to reduce our industrial activities and curtail our production. It is better to have ahead of us what I might call a period of artificial prosperity than a period of depression; and even if this should prove to be a gift, as some people have said, because of the possibility of Britain's inability to meet her obligations, I think it is better for our economy in the next few years to go ahead with the measure just the same. I repeat, however, that it is high time we considered means to restore to Canada saner methods of external trade than that of the one client system. We should now gain new markets for our industrial production. In the past we have been exporters of raw materials and wheat. During the war we became a highly industrialized country, turning out ships, planes, tanks and heavy equipment. Let us carry our industrial recovery into the peace era and better equilibrate our external trade by seizing new markets for our industrial products. It is imperative that we do so unless we want our industrial and economic fate to be tied indefinitely to that of Britain. Canada is a young nation. She must look ahead for new fields to conquer. Let us not be limited by sentimentalism or a false method of world trade.

I am far from being enthusiastic about burdening the Canadian people with more charges, and I would not consider sentimental reasons only as sufficient to warrant this measure. It is not with pleasure that I see this provision for the cancellation of the British debt to our country, which is estimated in the present bill at $425 million. But if we consider the aim and purpose desirable; if we consider that it is imperative for the benefit of our Canadian economy to see Britain resuming her capacity to trade with the world, and if we consider it desirable to strengthen and support her currency in relation to the United States dollar, then we have no recourse but to cancel the debt, and I think the minister made the point quite clear a moment ago.

In short, I think in our present position we cannot act differently from the United States at the present time, and we must try to help British recovery, not only or not even because she deserves it on account of her contribution to the freedom of the world, but because in our present position a measure of British recovery is an economic necessity for the welfare of our own country.

[Mr. Picard.]

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): Mr. Chairman with your permission I should like to read one of the numerous protests I have received from our young people against the bill now under consideration:

Val D'Or Junior Board of Trade
April 15, 1946.

Mr. Ligouri Lacombe, M.P.,
Parliament Buildings,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—

We are enclosing herewith copy of a protest which our organization feels bound to submit in good faith, for the public weal and in the best interests of our country.

We hope that it may be possible for you to use it, thereby proving that the young people of this country can still find the time to deal with matters that directly concern them.

Trusting that you will kindly let us know your personal views on the matter, we remain,

Yours truly,
The Val D'Or Junior Board of Trade,
By Camille Deschênes,
Secretary

Here is the text of the resolution:

Copy of a resolution unanimously agreed to by the Val D'Or Junior Board of Trade, at its monthly meeting held on April 12:

Whereas the dominion government intends to lend to England a further sum, which in our opinion is enormous;

Whereas this loan will be at a rate of 2 per cent . . .

After 1951.

. . . while the dominion will have to borrow money at a rate not lower than 3 per cent in order to make that loan;

Whereas the country to which we lend money is itself making loans to other countries at a rate much higher than the one at which we would extend that loan;

Whereas it is recognized that by that loan England in no way undertakes to spend the money in our country;

Whereas the exchange is against us every time we borrow funds outside this country;

Whereas that loan is extended under conditions that are very little to the advantage of our country, as is being shown by some newspapers, which have been seriously discussing the matter during the last few days;

Whereas that loan will be extended at the expense of Canadian taxpayers;

Whereas the country to which we shall make that loan available has already decided to eliminate or considerably reduce the income tax, and to lighten materially the burden which the people in the lower salary brackets have to bear;

Whereas our government meanwhile takes no efficient action with a view to lightening our immediate burden;

Whereas the young people of this country are the ones who sooner or later will have to bear the burden of all such loans;

Whereas small wage-earners already consider themselves too heavily taxed;

Be it therefore resolved unanimously that our board should ask the authorities of this country and the members who will discuss the proposal not to pledge our financial resources unduly in a loan that would mortgage our future far too much.

An hon. MEMBER: Thank you.

Mr. RINFRET: Have they read the bill?

Mr. LACOMBE: It is all very well to claim that this loan will increase employment and stimulate industry in Canada. By whom has this statement been substantiated? Experience has taught us that nations, whichever they may be, are interested in one another only in so far as it serves their own interests. Self-interest is the motive behind the actions of individuals and peoples. This state of mind has existed since the beginning of time, and will ever remain the primary motive of any actions. It scorns conventions and statistics. The self-interest of individuals or nations overshadows the object of a loan. The purposes of a loan, its very object vanish before the interest of an individual or a nation because nothing will stop them if they think that that loan is going to prove a sound business proposition.

The principle of a free loan is wrong in itself, and more so when it is combined with an outright gift of $425,000,000 to England. It is a ridiculous policy, an essentially colonial policy. Some may be pleased thereby; it is their right. Self-interest is the motive behind all actions. One seizes an opportunity when it offers. Why worry? Let us help ourselves; it is the people who will foot the bill. Such seems to be the thought which gave rise to this bill, as shown by section 7 of the agreement which reads as follows:

> The government of Canada agrees to cancel the amount owing by the government of the United Kingdom to the government of Canada with respect to the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan, which amount the two governments agree is $425,000,000.

Why this agreement? The amount is or is not $425,000,000. This is a further compromise.

In another part of the bill, reference is made to the multilateral trade of the United Kingdom. Why not call a spade a spade? Have we got anything to hide? This multilateral trade of England which we are called upon to boost at the tune of $1,250,000,000 is what I would call financial imperialism. How costly it is for us! Canada is indeed an inexhaustible milch-cow. The British colossus owns one-fifth of the total area of the world. I do not know why fatality drags us into every military and financial venture of the United Kingdom. Just take cognizance of this surrender of a so-called sovereign state, as recorded in section 3 of the bill:

> For the purpose of carrying out the obligation of the government of Canada under article one of the said agreement, the Minister of Finance, out of unappropriated moneys in the consolidated revenue fund, may, from time to time, prior to the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and fifty-one, pay to or pursuant to the order of the government of the United Kingdom at its request amounts not exceeding in the aggregate one thousand two hundred and fifty million dollars ($1,250,000,000).

And, finally, section 5:

> The indebtedness of the government of the United Kingdom to the government of Canada with respect to the British commonwealth air training plan, as agreed upon in article seven of the said agreement, is extinguished and the Minister of Finance may take such action as may be necessary to write off in the public accounts of Canada the indebtedness so extinguished.

If this is not unadulterated colonialism, words must have lost their meaning. What has become of the statute of Westminster, this electioneering hoax? What about our constitutional evolution? By this financial agreement, the government is surrendering Canada in a strait-jacket to the United Kingdom authorities. At one stroke, they mortgage our national economy for over two thousand million dollars, if all the clauses of the agreement are taken into account. They make lavish gifts to the mother country, because they refuse to consider Canada as a major nation. This constitutes a set-back of over a hundred years in the evolution of our prerogatives. Do you not hear the sighs of relief from our contented imperialists and colonials at the realization that this loan will go through? Just imagine Canada, the child, makes its small annual gift to its mother. How unworthy of a sovereign nation all this seems! We must revert to the time before the Union to find a similar surrender of our prerogatives. Never have Lafontaine and Baldwin, Macdonald and Cartier, Laurier or Borden so bound Canada's future or so shamelessly flouted our sovereignty. The foundations laid by those statesmen are now crumbling under the weight of the commitments of a government which, since 1939, has increased the national debt by more than twenty billions. While young men by the thousands go begging for employment, the Government is handling out gifts at their expense. I know of veterans who are homeless and jobless through the very fault of a government which refuses to launch large-scale programmes of public works. Thousands upon thousands of those veterans are vainly seeking jobs worthy of the secrifices they made. But what is the Government doing to help them out? It gives and loans to others the funds required for their civil re-establishment. But, you will say, the United Kingdom will be a customer for our goods. You make me laugh. England will buy where she wishes and to suit her own convenience. Just read section three of the agreement. She is the one in command here.

Mr. LANGLOIS: It is section two.

Mr. LACOMBE: The original document of our constitution is in London. In fact, when the federal government, some years ago, wished to take the Alberta legislation to the supreme court, and had to produce a copy at the court's own request, they had to go to 10 Downing street to make a copy of the original document.

I remember the good constitutional joke of 1926 about Lord Byng's alleged interference. I was then a member of the House of Commons. Memory brings back this tempest in a tea-pot. Elections had to be won. If the constitutional joke had not existed then, it would have been made up. Then came the statute of Westminster, a pretty bubble which has pricked the fancy of many public men since 1931. This mock golden age has started Canada on the way back to colonialism. The government has sanctioned this climb-down by authorizing this new tribute of the colony to the mother country. If there is a vote, I shall oppose this financial agreement by voting against it, as a protest against any infringement of our sovereignty.

During the debate on the address, I explained my stand on this loan of $1,250 millions to England. I would have refrained from taking part in the debate, had not some hon. members, particularly the amazing member for Labelle (Mr. Lalonde), credited me with feelings and designs I have never held. The hon. member should gain neither dignity nor prestige from such unfounded assumptions. I have preceded my hon. friend in the house by a decade. Never have I, directly or indirectly, allowed discussions to sink to the level of race quarrels. When the hon. member, without any reason or justification, launched an attack against nationalist and dissident or independent Liberal members, on April 12, he made statements he knew to be false. If he is a man of honour, as I still believe him to be, he will withdraw the following words spoken in the house on April 12, 1946. I quote the statement of the hon. member for Labelle—

Mr. LANGLOIS: Fortunately he is not here.

Mr. LACOMBE:—as reported on page 812 of *Hansard* of April 12, 1946. My hon. friend says that fortunately the party concerned is not here! The absent are always in the wrong.

Mr. LANGLOIS: You were not present when he spoke.

[Mr. Lacombe.]

Mr. LACOMBE: I was absent Friday; might is right, but I will not allow myself to be fleeced. I quote the hon. member for Labelle:

I noticed that most of those who are against the proposal—I say most of them, because there are noteworthy exceptions—base their argument on a matter of sentiment and revive, in support of their claims, old race squabbles. The government have announced their intention of lending nearly 250 million dollars to France. Have any protests been voiced by nationalists? Not to my knowledge. They have kept silent because they have no other protests to advance about the loan to England than arguments based on race squabbles. This is clearly evidenced by a letter I have received from a Social Credit supporter, and from which I wish to quote some significant excerpts:

This is still the hon. member for Labelle speaking.

March 28, 1946.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that he did not read the whole letter, but only the main extracts.

Mr. Maurice Lalonde, M.P., for Labelle.
Sir,

I have read the statement you have made about the Social Credit in the province of Quebec. I believe that your are not well informed on this country's economic problems.

Alberta is in favour of the loan to England because the majority in that province is of English descent. Here in the province of Quebec, the people oppose the loan because the majority is French.

J. B. Bureau,
37 St. Bernard Street,
St. Malo, Que.

According to the rules of the house, the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Lalonde) should produce that letter and table it instead of merely quoting the main passages, in all justice to the writer, to himself and to us. The hon. member went on:

I am giving that for the prime consideration of hon. members across the way.

This individual unknowingly puts in concrete form the opinions of nationalists and dissenting Liberals, whose good faith and intent I respect.

He hugs them the better to smother them.

However, protests always have and always will come from a noisy minority which does not speak for the majority, in my province. The last federal elections have amply proven that the majority of my fellow-citizens can distinguish between constructive Liberal policies and a demagogic and impassioned appeal by a group of Quebec nationalists.

I do not fear to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have always supported constructive policies.

The hon. members for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond) and Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) remember their experience of June last, when, after having been elected as Liberals for many years by large majorities, they only succeeded in retaining their seats by very small margins.

That statement contains two untruths. In the first place I have been elected not by a small margin, but with a majority of 300.

In the second place, I have been elected not as a Liberal candidate, but despite the opposition of the Liberal party.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: As the leader of the Canadian party.

Mr. LACOMBE: The hon. member for Labelle was himself elected in 1935 despite the opposition of the Liberal party. I remember quite well that the hon. the Minister of Justice, Mr. Lapointe, had then sent a letter to the electors of the constituency of Labelle, asking them to elect Mr. Henri Bourassa as their representative, when the hon. member for Labelle was running against him.

Does my hon. friend want me to remind him that his leader, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) did not barely escape defeat, but actually suffered it in his own constituency of Prince Albert. The hon. member for Labelle always renders such valuable services to his party and the government that he places the right hon. the Prime Minister in an exceedingly awkward and humiliating position.

For my part, I oppose this loan and this financial agreement, because our economic condition forbids us such generosity. I shall not repeat all the arguments I expounded to the house in opposing this loan in the debate on the address. However, certain hon. members, only a very few indeed, feeling as the representative from Labelle, have for too long a time tortured our texts, misrepresented the facts and our true attitude in this house. It is about time that things be put to right.

Only his boldness allows my hon. friend to compare the loan granted to France at 3 per cent interest to the interest-free loan offered England. I certainly commend the loan to France, amounting to slightly more than two hundred million dollars. I would likewise have supported a 1,250 million dollar loan to England had the government only demanded a reasonable rate of interest. Let us at least keep the sense of proportions and the proper appreciation of facts. We want to see all countries that have been weakened by the war recover from that disaster. However, we are strongly opposed to bleeding the Canadian taxpayer white so as to allow England or any other country, for that matter, to lower taxes at a time when our fellow-citizens are carrying on under a heavy burden of taxes of every kind.

(Text):

Mr. MacINNIS: I hesitate to take part in this debate, but I have been so appalled at the lack of understanding of world affairs on the part of some who have opposed this loan that I thought I should say something.

We should approach consideration of this loan having in mind what happened to ourselves and others during the years of the war, the purposes for which the war was fought, and how we are to achieve those purposes. In my opinion, this loan is a step in achieving the purposes for which we fought the war. I am not supporting the loan because Britain is the borrower. I have favoured and have given my support to the various loans and credits which have been made by this government during the past few years. I am not supporting the loan on the ground that we have a moral obligation to help the people of Britain. I am supporting it, as I have said, because I believe that it is a part of the process of building the new world for which we fought the war.

We were together in the war. I have heard it stated in this house that we were in the war to help Britain. I have always objected to that because I felt that the war was Canada's war as well as Britain's. Canada had as much at stake as Britain had. Fascism was as much a danger to Canada as it was to Britain. Consequently we were in the war because the factors associated with the war were such that we could not be true to ourselves and keep out of it.

The Minister of Finance pointed out, I believe this afternoon, that Britain came out of this war much poorer than she went into it. I have before me the monthly letter of the Canadian Bank of Commerce for February, and I note there the statement that Britain lost about $30,000 million of her national wealth during the war. As the minister said, Canada has come out of the war richer than she went into it; at least our real and potential capacity for the production of wealth is somewhat greater than it was when the war began. This is not only indicated but proven by our war production. So that I think we should be glad that we have this opportunity of helping an ally and of restoring peace in the world. If the loan did not have any other purpose than that, even if we felt that the amount could never be repaid, if it can accomplish something for the building of a peaceful world the loan is worth while.

It seems to me that those who oppose the loan must fundamentally oppose it for at least two or three reasons: First, that Britain does not need it, that she is what might be

called panhandling in asking for the loan at all. I do not think anybody in his senses would believe that.

A second reason may be that they believe that Britain can survive and continue to play the part in world affairs that she is playing to-day without any economic or financial assistance from us. I do not think she can.

There may be another reason. The opponents of the loan may consider that it does not matter whether Britain can survive as a great power or not. I am convinced that no greater calamity could befall this world to-day than that Britain should fall from the position she now holds. In my opinion, she holds a key position, and if she is not able to maintain that position the possibility of an enduring world peace is, by that very fact, so much the less. It is because I feel that for Great Britain not to be able to hold the position she is now in would be a loss to Canada as well as to the world that I am in favour of this loan. I favour it not only because it is a good business proposition; I am quite willing to leave that part of it to the Minister of Finance; I favour it because it is as much our duty to help to build the peace as it was our duty to help to fight the war. In my opinion, that is the way in which we must approach this bill.

I was amazed to hear, I think it was on Thursday last, the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres say that Canada could go it alone.

Mr. MacNICOL: He would not understand a thing like that.

Mr. MacINNIS: I believe I met the hon. member for the first time in 1928. I had known him by repute a long time before that; and I have always heard him spoken of as an astute politician. I know that the word "politician" sometimes has an unsavoury connotation, but as one politician to another I do not mean anything sinister when I use it. The hon. member, however, did make this statement:

> I am not afraid of the future of my country, even if my country is left alone. Even if my country is left between the sterling bloc and the United States I have enough confidence in Canada to feel that Canada is capable of coming through her difficulties and achieving a prominent place among the important nations of the world, even though she is not assisted by the one side or the other.

That, I maintain, is not quite the position to-day. I maintain that there are only two countries in the world to-day that perhaps can stand alone. One is the United States and the other is the U.S.S.R., and God forbid that we should come to the day when either of these nations will say that they are going to "go it alone." That is the reason why we should support everything that will help to restore the economy of the world and keep the world as a whole so that we can carry on as one world.

We could, I suppose, impoverish ourselves as a country by being over-generous in giving away our wealth, but here again I am not afraid of that as long as the present Minister of Finance is head of that department. I doubt, however, if there is any danger whatsoever there. Great Britain will buy from us with this loan goods and services, or perhaps primarily goods. These will come out of the soil, out of the forests, out of the mines, out of the waters of our country, and out of the labour of our people. If we are careful, if we know how to conserve these things, we can, with the exception of our mineral wealth, restore to the soil and the sea the wealth we take out, and the country can be kept productive. That is the way nature operates. But if we lose this opportunity that we now have to help to build an orderly world it may be a long time before we have that opportunity again.

Let us not try to live in the past; let us not even attempt to return to the years before 1939. The world has altogether changed in the last six years. We are living in a new world in which I am quite satisfied very few nations can stand alone. Let us support this loan. As has been said, it is a good business proposition; but it is also an opportunity for Canada and Canadians to give of our riches, which were maintained intact when other nations suffered grievously, and which were, moreover, enhanced. Let us do that, and we can do it without impoverishing our country but, instead, greatly benefit ourselves and help others on to a better world.

(Translation):

Mr. MARQUIS: The question before the committee gives rise to different opinions. I wish to say at once that several hon. members do agree on some facts and reasons brought forward in the House. The difference is mainly one of conclusions. I do not in the least agree with the hon. member for Laval Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) who claims that the stand taken by more than two hundred members is ridiculous because they do not happen to think as he does. As far as I am concerned, I respect his opinion and that of those who spoke on this measure. This matter is sufficiently controversial to allow expression of various opinions. Like earnest, sincere and enlightened men, we must come to a conclusion, after serious consideration.

If I rise to-night to take part in this debate, it is because I would consider myself remiss in my duty if I refrained from expressing my views on so vital an issue. Certain reasons have been brought forward against this loan. For my part, I must admit, at the outset, that I have not been, at first, favourably impressed. However impressions always proceed from feelings. I have had to look into every aspect of the problem and to trace information back to its source. If I come to the conclusion that I must approve this loan, it is because, in all conscience, I believe it in the best interest of the Canadian nation and not of the British Empire; it is because after laying aside my personal feelings and having considered only the immediate and remote future of my country I deemed it proper to endorse this measure.

It is as useless to stir up passions against the loan in any part of our province as it is to appeal to prejudice in other parts of the country in its favour. We must judge it on its merits.

I wish to commend all the speakers who have discussed the matter from an objective point of view, and all newspapermen who have dealt with it as a business proposition based on figures, whether they approved of it or not.

It seems to me that we should consider this important problem in the light of the extraordinary conditions of the post-war period. We should not view it from a provincial angle or from the standpoint of a close economy, but in relation to existing world conditions. There is no use repeating, Mr. Chairman, that part of Europe, and part of the Orient now lie destroyed and in ruins; that millions of soldiers and civilians have fallen victims of murderous gunfire; there is no point in recalling that the natural resources of those countries were damaged as were also their lands, their oil wells, their coal mines which cannot now be put into production because all such property has been utterly destroyed by repeated bombardments. Need we mention too that these countries' production and economy have been completely disrupted? Need we add that business is at a standstill?

More than ever, we are now living in "one world" and when part of the world trade is paralysed, the effects of this stoppage are bound to be felt here indirectly; we are bound to feel them ourselves and our business will feel the consequences. Am I wrong in thinking so? I don't believe I am. Such is the opinion of many enlightened economists and such the teachings of past experience.

Fortunately, under such conditions, our country is perhaps in a better position than others. Our farms and factories are producing mightily. Production has increased and we have good reasons to think that, in the current year, it will remain at a very high level. Agriculture has taken a special impetus. Canada is to-day the storehouse of part of this famished world, the storehouse of part of devastated countries. It was ordained by the Almighty that Canada, which escaped bombings and destruction should occupy a strategic position in the western hemisphere, so that she could help in the recovery of overseas countries. I am considering that matter from that sole standpoint, and that is the only position that we Canadians can take.

Our objective is to maintain our production, to ensure continuous employment in this country and to guarantee to our farmers a substantial income as well as a high standard from the moral, religious, physical and economic standpoints. That is our objective; therein lies our ideal.

If we remain confined within our own borders, if we refuse to trade with other nations, I sincerely fear that Canada, instead of forging ahead will undergo a decline and that the countless efforts we put forth during the recent war will be of no avail whatever.

Mr. Chairman, should we not ask ourselves whether in refusing to support an agreement like this which was first concluded between the United States and the United Kingdom, if by refusing to ratify that agreement, we would not jeopardize our commercial and economic relations with our powerful neighbour. We are now facing a risk involving some 30 million dollars per year for five years and approximately 10 million dollars yearly for fifty additional years. But if we were deprived of economic relations with our neighbours, the United States, we would stand to lose much more than 30 millions for five years and ten millions for the remaining years; indeed we might be affected in our economic relations to the extent of billions within a few years.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MARQUIS: We are told that the interest rate has been set at 2 per cent, while it could have been set at 3 per cent. I quite realize, like all the other hon. members, that this interest rate has not been set by Canada. This rate was arrived at by the two nations who concluded the first agreement, which provided that in the event that we refused the same interest rate no agreement could be entered into. Is it necessary to add that the United States has agreed to make that loan even though they were not very interested in the agreement? They agreed to make that loan and they have accepted that interest rate

believing that it was the only way to re-establishing international trade. I would not be prepared to accept the responsibility of sabotaging the agreement concluded between the governments of the United States and of Great Britain, and thus cause an economic upheaval which might be much more detrimental to us than the agreement now under consideration.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I have for Great Britain and the United Kingdom that sympathy which we feel for another country with which we deal on an equal footing, and nothing more. I do not agree with the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) when he claims that this agreement is practically valueless but that morally we must assume this obligation; but I agree with the government when they say that it is a matter of national interest, a purely Canadian matter. I may be mistaken, but I take the facts as I see them; however I respect the views of others and I ask those who rise to speak in this house to respect the views of all hon. members, especially when those views are based on sound reasons.

It has been stated over and over again that the British market is our most important outlet. We have made heavy sacrifices to develop this market and it is the only large outlet which will be able to absorb our surplus production of the next few years.

I understand quite well that France and other countries need some of our products. I feel that we must ship some of our products to other countries but that we cannot and must not send them solely to those other countries. In fact, within a few years, France will be producing enough foodstuffs to be self-sufficient in that respect. The same may be said of Belgium. Then, Mr. Chairman, what will happen to us, in Canada, if we have no export markets for our surplus goods?

During the transition period, we must create good outlets in other countries if we are to distribute our surplus production to the four corners of the earth. But, for the present, we must not drop the substance for the shadow, because a bird in the hand is better than two in the bush.

The United Kingdom can feed but a quarter of its population; and it is from Canada that that country buys the greatest quantities of foodstuffs and which will always find a steady market there.

Were France to enjoy the same advantages, as the beneficiary of this loan rather than the United Kingdom, I wonder if the same arguments would prevail in certain quarters.

Mr. HAMEL: Surely.

[Mr. Marquis]

Mr. MARQUIS: To draw a fair and just conclusion, it is our duty to consider the problem as if France were involved rather than the United Kingdom. Such is my attitude Mr. Chairman, and I think it is logical.

This year, we shall export to the United Kingdom $764,000,000 worth of goods, while our exports to other sterling countries will amount to $255,000,000. A moment ago, I heard the hon. member for Laval-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Lacombe) say: "But we are going to pay $30,000,000 this year". Maybe so, and then, maybe not. I shall come to that later on. I must say, however, that if all this costs us $30,000,000 this year and if we vote to send one billion dollars worth of goods to the United Kingdom and the other sterling countries, we must take into account the profit to be made on that billion. We shall make a profit of at least $300,000,000 and the farmer will be the chief beneficiary, because that revenue will be produced by his work; consequently, his profits will be a net. If he does not sell his goods, he will lose them. I understand that, between a payment of $30,000,000 we shall have to make and the profit of $300,000,000 that will accrue to us, there is a surplus of $270,000,000 which calls for thought and the realization that the stakes are worth going after.

I also support this measure because I believe we must endeavour to maintain our exports at a high level and develop our international trade. We are now going through the most difficult period. War has swept over the world, leaving a trail of destruction, woe and ruins everywhere. Canada is a prosperous country, having a good income, a thriving agricultural set-up, factories to be converted from a war-time to a peacetime footing. Our country needs trade expansion, and it has the duty of contributing to the re-establishment of this hemisphere's economic life and the right to work for the restoration of Christianity and freedom in the world. If we get a billion dollars, if, through our sales of goods we put this amount in circulation to encourage production in our factories—we shall be promoting employment and fighting unemployment, at the same time. We will help to keep our young men on the farm and to set up veterans in the same calling so as to further the development of agriculture.

As I represent a farming community, to my mind the agricultural viewpoint matters more than any other. We must remember that agriculture is the cornerstone of our national economy. Nowadays, farmers enjoy profitable prices which accounts for an almost 50 per cent increase in farm production and

they must therefore find outlets for the marketing of their goods. Many are now welcoming back from overseas their sons who will contribute to the expansion of our national heritage in the field of agriculture. Thus, in spite of the apparent drawbacks apparently involved in the plan, I believe that in the final analysis, setting aside any electioneering prejudices and considering the interest of our country, we are in duty bound to approve the bill now before the house.

May I be allowed a further remark, Mr. Chairman, in the matter of national income and taxation? We are told in certain quarters: "If you're going to make a loan, how can you cut down taxes?" My reply to this, sir, is that, if national income is reduced fifty per cent, how can taxes be cut down? Unless our national income remains at the present level, namely 8 or 10 billions, and unless we keep on exporting at the rate of about 3 billions a year how can we raise the money required to meet government commitments and reduce the taxpayers' burden? I shall not attempt to argue, paradoxically, that the more we lend, the more we shall borrow, the more we spend, the more we shall cut down taxes. No, it is my belief that, because of peculiarly post-war conditions, because of conditions which compel us to step up industrial production and keep agricultural production at a very high level, we must develop our world trade as much as is practicable to preserve the national prestige so dearly bought during the last war at the price of so much effort and money.

To-day, there is no other solution for expanding our trade and securing a market for our goods. This is one more reason for approving the plan. I do not claim, Mr. Chairman, that we will consolidate our position by perpetually granting money and advances and by launching a loan program reaching into astronomical figures. We are told of our wartime contribution, but the cost of the war is a different matter. I cannot discuss the attitude of those who felt it necessary to take such a part in the last war. The allied nations the world over agreed to put all their strength, their funds and efforts in order to ensure the defeat of nazism and barbarism. Now, all that pertains to the war, all the expenses incurred to conquer the enemy no longer stand for capital; we are left as an aftermath of the war with nothing but a promise of survival and of safeguarding our freedom.

Mr. Chairman, thanks to our past expenditures, we have the right to carry our heads high, to face the world squarely and not to be considered as anything but slaves. I do not think we take into account those former expenses, which are totally different from the disbursements now proposed. Those expenses resulted from the war. We had to choose between slavery and freedom, between Christianity and atheism. We fought for Christianity, we fought for freedom. The cost was enormous, even fabulous, but it was the burden of war.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we have no other duty, no other aim but to go through life with our debts, our burden, our difficulties. It is our duty to face our responsibilities, as it is our duty to expand our trade, develop our agriculture, ward off unemployment, fight and work to restore our economy in the years ahead. If there are drawbacks to this measure, there are also certain advantages. We, Canadians, cannot avoid the unfortunate and terrible consequences of war. After the trials we went through with the rest of the world, we cannot say that it is all over, that we wish to go on our own and resume our advance towards progress as if we had never had a war. We must carry our share of the burden. Since world economy is completely upset and practically on the rocks, how could we expect to get a share in the benefits that could be derived from it, without contributing sacrifices and money, such is the situation. If I were to take stock of certain facts and opinions expounded by those in a small group around me, I might think that this transaction is bad; but we take the longer view, if we cast a glance on the future of Canada, and particularly the necessity for us, at the present time, of trading with the whole world, no one in this house could believe for a moment that our country may now remain aloof while a powerful nation like the United States has found it impossible to resort to isolationism. To-day, the interdependency of nations is a well-recognized fact.

There is another question we must ask ourselves. Were this measure to be set aside by the house, were we to sabotage the Anglo-American agreement, what would be the result? If the United States who have laboured for a period of two months toward the implementation of a plan for restoring the economy of the western hemisphere, if the United States thought that we did not want to make an efficient contribution to the re-establishment of the world economy, do you not think that this would not entail for this country the loss of a trade involving an amount ten or twenty times larger than the amount ventured in this measure? The interest of 3 per cent, as an honourable member said a few moments ago, might cost us a sum of about 30 million dollars during five years and 10 million dollars during the fifty addi-

tional years. This represents $3 per capita during five years and 75 cents later on. But this calculation serves only as a basis of my argument, taking for granted that we are going to make up the difference ourselves.

Before I resume my seat, Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion which might soothe the conscience of many and also throw a ray of hope and gladden the hearts. If it should be possible for the government to obtain that money from the banking or credit institutions at the rate of interest provided for in the agreement, I think it would be a splendid arrangement and that such an operation would be welcome by all. I would not think, Mr. Chairman, of opposing the views of people more experienced than I am, who do not share my opinion. The fact is that every one of us is free to express his own point of view. It is impossible for me to discuss every aspect of this question but I have endeavoured to indicate briefly a few points.

After the recent war we must all help in the economic restoration not only of Canada but of the whole world. Canada has waged war in all parts of the world and must trade with all parts of the world. We have invested tremendous amounts of money in war, I am now prepared to support the investment of a much smaller amount to ensure our country's continued freedom and happiness and to safeguard its opportunities and future prosperity.

(Text):

Sections 1, 2 and 3 inclusive agreed to on division.

On section 4—Continuation of interest-free provision of act of 1942.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 4 carry?

Mr. POULIOT: No. I want an answer to my questions. The minister answered only one of them. Besides that, I want the story of our transactions with Great Britain. I want to know what has been given by Canada to Great Britain and what has been given in return by Great Britain to Canada, during the war.

If it is a question of business, then let us have the information. The minister has said that he took some notes while I was speaking. I thank him for that. He has those notes, but he has answered partly only one of my questions, when I had asked many of them. They were serious questions. The leader of the C.C.F. party has acknowledged them, although he does not share my views. We are not going to railroad this piece of legislation through to-night; and if there is only one member who will oppose it, I will. And I am not going to receive any lecture from anyone.

I listened to the hon. members who spoke to-day, and noted that they adopted a much better tone than some who spoke the other day. We are in a democracy, and yet all we hear is "carried," "carried," "carried". It is scandalous to think that an amount like this is passing, without any questions being answered by the Minister of Finance. As a member of parliament I have a right to expect answers from the minister—and complete answers.

The whole story he has told us is a story of lamentations. The parliament of Canada has become the wailing wall of the Department of Finance. Isaiah, Jeremiah—all the prophets, major and minor, were not so eloquent as the Minister of Finance. This afternoon I compared him with Joe Chamberlain, but to-night I compare him with Jeremiah and all those other major and minor prophets. I was surprised that tears were not flowing from his eyes. I thought he was dreaming, because he told us something that he could have said only in a dream—"I am not an imperialist". If the minister had been awake he would never have said anything like that. If he is not an imperialist, then the word "imperialist" does not exist.

I have been against Arthur Meighen from the beginning of my political career—since I was a little boy, and when the hon. member for Bellechasse was still at college. I was going with Ernest Lapointe and with all the other Liberals, denouncing the Tory party and denouncing the union government because they were imperialists. It was the success of the Liberal party. The Liberal party has pitted itself against Toryism, not only in the province of Quebec but in other provinces. Quebec was the pioneer and banner province of Canada. It was because the Liberal party was preaching the same doctrine east and west; it was because the Liberal party was denouncing imperialism that Mackenzie King came back to power in 1921 after defeating the Union government. That was due to the preaching of that same doctrine of liberalism and liberty, the same doctrine of patriotism that had been preached by the Liberal party from coast to coast. The answer of the Canadian people was, "We believe in you; we are fed up with those who have two doctrines, who have one doctrine for the imperialists of the province of Ontario and another doctrine for the people who have followed another line of thought in the province of Quebec; we are fed up with

the duplicity, we want earnestness, we want sincerity and we want patriotism—we will try the Liberal party."

The Liberal party was elected on that very ground and on that particular policy. No one else would have thought that we would have such a policy as this enunciated by the Liberal party. If I denounce it to-day I do not denounce it as a French Canadian, I do not denounce it as a man who has been elected by a constituency in the province of Quebec. I denounce it as an old time Liberal; I denounce it as a supporter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; I denounce it as a supporter and very close friend of the late Ernest Lapointe. Hon. members who were here when Mr. Lapointe was in this house will remember that.

Do you think a man who had made the campaigns I have made when the Liberal party was suffering defeat could stand for treatment like that? Some members may find it extraordinary that I speak with a little animation, but I am being careful about the words that I use at the present time. It is inconceivable. I ask the leader of the opposition, who was siding with the Liberal party at the time, if what I have said is not true. I will ask the Minister of Finance, who was not in politics at the time. The Minister of Veterans Affairs was probably not in Canada at that time in 1917. He was in the army; he has a fine record and I congratulate him upon it. Then there is the Minister of Agriculture who was in politics at the time. He must remember that. Then there is my old friend, the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres (Mr. Cardin) who was insulted the other day by a new member to this house.

Mr. BEAUDOIN: I do not think the hon. member who is speaking has a right to say that I insulted the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres just because I said to him a few things which I think he deserved to be told under the circumstances. I ask the hon. member to withdraw what he has said.

Mr. POULIOT: If the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres had not made the speeches that he made throughout the province the Liberal party would not have been strong enough to elect the hon. member for Vaudreuil-Soulanges.

Mr. CARDIN: He would not be here.

Mr. POULIOT: He would never have been here. The Liberal party would have fallen to pieces before.

Mr. GARIEPY: What section are we on now?

Mr. DORION: Liberal section.

The CHAIRMAN: We are on section 4.

Mr. POULIOT: When I spoke at three o'clock—

The CHAIRMAN: I believe the hon. member for Three Rivers has raised a good point of order. I would refer the hon. member to standing order 58 which provides:

> Speeches in committee of the whole house must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

I would ask all hon. members to observe that rule.

Mr. POULIOT: I agree perfectly with you. Is it section 4 or section 5?

The CHAIRMAN: Section 4.

Mr. POULIOT: This reminds me of the man who had never been on a train before, who was making his first trip. He was surprised when the train stopped at a station because he thought the train had enough speed to go two stations further along. What is section 4? It reads:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of section four of the War Appropriation (United Kingdom Financing) Act, 1942, no interest shall be payable in respect of any period prior to the first day of January, nineteen hundred and fifty-one, under any obligation of the government of the United Kingdom delivered to the government of Canada under that section.

When did this United Kingdom financing start? The minister told us the story on March 18, 1942, when he asked us to look at the record of the past. At that time he said:

> When we are proposing to open a new chapter in our financial relations (with Great Britain and United States), the record regarding the past should be made quite clear.

That is the statement which was made by the Minister of Finance on March 18, 1942, when the house was considering for the first time the billion dollar gift—United Kingdom financing. The minister continued:

> To the United Kingdom alone our shipments increased from $331 million in 1939 to $532 million in 1940 and $702 million in 1941. To the rest of the British empire, including Egypt, our shipments rose from $104 million in 1939 to $157 million in 1940 and $300 million in 1941. But notwithstanding some increase in our imports, the empire as a whole had an aggregate merchandise deficit with Canada of $445 million in 1940 and $723 million in 1941.

He did not mention the amount of our imports. I worked it out myself in pencil and I sent him the result of my work in order to verify my calculation.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock, the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, April 17, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

THE EARL OF ATHLONE

REPLY TO FAREWELL ADDRESS FROM BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that the Clerk has laid on the table to-day the reply of the Right Honourable the Earl of Athlone to the joint address of farewell presented to him by the Senate and the House of Commons, as follows:

Honourable members of the Senate,

Members of the House of Commons,

I thank you most sincerely for the kind address of farewell which you have presented to me on the occasion of my approaching retirement as governor general of the Dominion of Canada.

It is with feelings of regret that I am concluding my official relationship as the representative of His Majesty the King in this country. It has been an honour and a great privilege to have served as governor general during the most eventful and calamitous years in the history of our time. The period of the war was fraught with innumerable difficulties many of which appeared at the time to be insurmountable. But parliament and the Canadian people, by their unselfish and untiring devotion to the cause of freedom, played a major part in the victorious struggle of the united nations against the implacable enemies of democracy.

My numerous tours of this vast country have enabled me to see almost every section of Canada.

I have been a witness of the efficiency, perseverance and courage displayed by the men and women of Canada, whether they served in the armed forces or were engaged in factories or in one of the numerous societies which performed such miracles of organization and effectiveness. This ready response to the call of duty was an evidence of the loyalty of the Canadian people to His Majesty the King and to the British commonwealth of nations, of which Canada is so important a part.

I am very much pleased to record that my relations with the members of both houses have been of the happiest.

I shall not fail, on my return to England, to convey to Their Majesties the King and Queen the loyal sentiments so admirably expressed in your address. It will be my pleasure also to convey to Queen Mary your kind remembrances. Her Majesty the Queen Mother has the warmest interest in the people of this country.

I join with you in expressing the hope that Their Royal Highnesses the Princess Elizabeth and the Princess Margaret may pay a visit to Canada in the near future.

On behalf of Princess Alice I wish to convey to you Her Royal Highness' appreciation for the very kind references you have made to her in your address. These have touched us both very deeply.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

We shall never forget what Canada has contributed during the past six difficult and testing years. She earned the admiration and true gratitude of all free peoples for her magnificent and munificent contribution to the victorious prosecution of the war and to the welfare and rehabilitation of the suffering peoples of the world.

In bidding you farewell, Princess Alice and I wish to assure you of our deep and abiding affection and at the same time to express our complete confidence in the continued prosperity of Canada and the maintenance of her proud position as the senior dominion of the British commonwealth of nations.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

GREAT LAKES SEAMEN—HOURS OF WORK

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I should like to supplement the statement I made in reply to the question asked yesterday by the leader of the opposition with reference to a threatened stoppage of work on ships operating on the great lakes, by reading a letter addressed by myself to Mr. Sullivan on April 11. The letter reads as follows:

I have your letter of April 9 and there is a necessity in my opinion to record the facts up to date as we understand them.

You met with me on March 25 and in addition to your committee, you will recall that Messrs. MacNamara and Maclean were present. The statement of myself and officials is that it was agreed that a telegram would be sent to the parties urging that a meeting take place on April 8 which was the earliest date convenient to you.

It was further stated that the meeting could be held in the Department of Labour office at Toronto if the parties so desired and also that a conciliation officer would be available if the parties asked for him.

In accordance with this understanding telegrams were dispatched to both parties and copies of same are attached.

It does seem to me that there is no room in the wording of the telegrams for any misunderstanding.

I am still of the opinion that it would have been advisable to meet with the operators. However, your committee decided otherwise.

You, of course, will at once agree that I could not, under the circumstances, say to the operators that they had refused to meet you.

It is noted that your executive has decided to take a strike vote beginning April 15 and I suggest to you that inasmuch as the process of collective bargaining between yourselves and the ship operators has not yet been concluded, a strike vote at the moment seems to be unnecessary and cannot be said to be in accordance with the provisions of the wartime labour relations regulations, P.C. 1003, which requires the parties to a dispute to bargain in good faith one with the other.

You may be assured that the department will do its utmost to bring about a mutually satisfactory agreement between the operators and

the employees. However, the department is still convinced that the most satisfactory solution would be one brought about by collective bargaining rather than by the passing of legislation providing for an eight-hour day.

I further wish to inform you that the labour department has requested the Department of Justice to review the relative authority as between the dominion and provincial governments and, in addition, the department has arranged for the submission of an independent legal opinion on this question.

Yours sincerely,
(sgd) Humphrey Mitchell

Mr. BRACKEN: Has the minister considered calling these groups together in order to try to iron out this matter?

Mr. MITCHELL: I have already done that. The operators are meeting on April 24 and I understand that a submission is to be made to the men's organization. It can be fairly stated that I have had some experience in labour negotiations, not only as chairman of boards of concilation but also as a negotiator for trade unions. I have never yet felt that anything is lost by negotiation. Sometimes when settlement of a dispute seems hopeless and a strike is inevitable the interested parties meet and in many instances an agreement is arrived at and work goes on unimpeded notwithstanding the difficult situation that existed.

May I give a word of advice to both sides? We have set up machinery for the settlement of disputes of this kind, and anybody who has a good case should never be afraid to come before an impartial tribunal. The machinery of the labour relations board—and I speak now from memory—has dealt with about 3,200 disputes. In only eight cases has there been a strike. I believe that is a fair average, and compared with other countries it gives an indication of the soundness of the legislation that this parliament has adopted for the settlement of disputes of this kind. I hope that good sense will be shown by both sides; that they will obey the law and use the machinery that most other organizations have used since the establishment of the code in this country.

BUTTER

REFERENCE IN DEBATE TO QUESTION OF PRICES

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): As a matter of privilege I should like to clarify a statement which was made the other evening and upon which there have been some reports that are creating some difficulties. Most of us find it rather difficult to get any butter in these days. Following my remarks the other evening the suggestion was made that I had said there might be a further increase in the price of butter. Naturally that would cause persons who have butter to hold it for the higher price. I just wish to state that I had no intention of making any such suggestion either to this house or to the country, and I want to emphasize that fact. What I did was suggest that already there had been an increase in the price of butter and that there might be other products in connection with which increases might be necessary, but there was no reference to butter in the latter part of the statement.

PRIVATE BILLS

SENATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 31 for the relief of Esther Irene Lind Booth—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 32 for the relief of Katie Hoffman Pinsky—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 33 for the relief of Dorothy Adams Acer McDougall—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 34 for the relief of Helen Douglas Stewart Rankin—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 35 for the relief of Olive Esther Rose Ewen—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 36 for the relief of Andrew Prem-Das—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 38 for the relief of Reginald Wesley Titcombe—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 39 for the relief of Hilda Forsey Pearce Johnston—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 40 for the relief of Ann Low Fuller Mitchell—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 41 for the relief of Marguerita St. Catherine McKeigan Guillevin—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 42 for the relief of Bessie Goldrosen Green—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 43 for the relief of Audrey Helen Jackson Maxham—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 44 for the relief of Frank Russell Yeoman—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 45 for the relief of Florence Joy McGibbon Lafleur—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 46 for the relief of Isobel Cameron McLaggan Oswald—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 47 for the relief of John Louis Charlebois—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 49 for the relief of Georgina Hylda Swaffield McKenzie—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 50 for the relief of Dorothy Ellen Cope Kimpton—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 52 for the relief of Charles Patrick Kavanagh—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 53 for the relief of Irene Gertrude Carry Staley—Mr. Maybank.

Mr. CASE: I may be out of order, Mr. Speaker, and if so you will rule accordingly; but I propose to oppose the third reading of every divorce bill presented from the senate.

NAVAL SERVICE ACT

PROVISION FOR SEA CADET CORPS

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services) moved the first reading of bill No. 56 (from the senate) to amend the Naval Service Act, 1944.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. ABBOTT: The purpose of this bill is to insert in the Naval Service Act a section similar to one contained in the Militia Act, by which the sea cadet corps, the naval cadets, will be authorized in the same way that the cadet corps for the army are now authorized under the Militia Act. During the war the sea cadet corps were authorized by order in council under the War Measures Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE ACT

PROVISION FOR AIR CADET SQUADRONS

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air) moved the first reading of bill No. 57 (from the senate) to amend the Royal Canadian Air Force Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): This bill is to amend the Royal Canadian Air Force Act to make provision for the formation and establishment of Royal Air Force cadet squadrons. These squadrons were formed during the war under the provisions of the War Measures Act, and this bill is being made in order to provide for their retention.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

INCOME TAX—PROSECUTIONS

Mr. JAENICKE:

In each of the provinces during the years of 1944 and 1945: 1. How many prosecutions were taken under section 77 of the Income War Tax Act, chapter 97 R.S.C. 1927?

2. How many persons were convicted?

3. What were the total fines in respect of such convictions?

4. In respect of how many convictions do the fines remain unpaid?

5. How many of the convicted persons have made their return and have paid their income tax?

6. How many actions or proceedings have recently been taken under sections 70, 71, 72, 73 and 74 of the said act?

7. How many persons having been assessed for income tax have been relieved from payment of such tax and on what grounds were they so relieved from payment?

Mr. McCANN:

1. The sections referred to do not provide for prosecutions or convictions. Therefore, there have been none.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Answered by No. 1.

5. Answered by No. 1.

6. Answered by No. 1.

7. None, unless insolvent estates, bankruptcies and compositions with creditors under bankruptcy proceedings may be regarded as such and if so the information is not available.

ATOMIC ENERGY—COST OF DISCOVERY AND PRODUCTION

Mr. FRASER:

What share did Canada have in the cost of discovering and producing atomic energy?

Mr. McILRAITH: Although Canada had membership on the combined policy committee which was responsible for the over-all general policy relating to experiment and production of atomic energy, it is impossible to give Canada's share of the total cost because the cost to other nations is not known. Canada, however, has spent a sum of approximately 27 million dollars on research and development in the field of atomic energy.

WAR ASSETS—MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. WEBB:

1. Are priorities required to purchase jeeps, station wagons, automobiles and trucks held for sale by War Assets Corporation?

2. If so, to whom are they issued?

3. If not, what is the proper procedure to buy one?

4. What are the names of individuals or municipalities in the county of Leeds who have purchased vehicles or materials of any kind from War Assets Corporation?

5. Is there a local office of War Assets Corporation in Leeds county?

6. If so, where is it located?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1, 2 and 3. The policy of War Assets Corporation in the disposal of vehicles is to meet, in the first instance, the priority requests of

federal government departments, provincial government departments and municipalities. The remaining vehicles are then disposed of through the normal channels of business i.e. dealers, subject to a veteran's preference.

4. The county of Leeds has made no application to purchase equipment or material from War Assets Corporation; the municipality of the town of Brockville applied for an ambulance which was offered to them on December 17, 1945. No reply was received from the municipality. The Brockville police department applied for a motorcycle which was offered to them on January 7, 1946, and no reply has been received. The municipality of Gananoque applied for a floor polisher, fire hose, ladder trucks and steel fencing with posts. This equipment is not available.

It is not possible to give the names of individuals.

5. No.

6. Answered by 5.

WHEAT BOARD—1945 SALES

Mr. McKAY:

1. How many bushels of wheat were sold by the Canadian Wheat Board in 1945 at (a) $1.25 and (b) $1.55 per bushel basis number one northern, Fort William?

2. What number of bushels of wheat was used for such domestic purposes as flour and feed in 1945?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. Wheat sold basis No. 1 Northern, Fort William/Port Arthur or Vancouver:

Basis $1.25 per bushel	131,775,015
Basis $1.43 per bushel	92,917,711
Basis $1.43 to $1.54 per bushel ..	37,382,159
Basis $1.55 per bushel	175,126,270
	437,201,156

2. Used for domestic purposes—76,920,218 bushels (subject to revision).

VETERANS LAND ACT—FARMS PURCHASED IN LEEDS COUNTY

Mr. WEBB:

1. How many farms have been purchased in Leeds county under the Veterans Land Act?

2. Where are these farms located and from whom purchased?

3. What acreage in each farm and what price was paid for each?

4. What is the name of the inspector who recommended these purchases?

5. How many applications are now pending awaiting inspection?

6. Who is the district officer in charge of the D.P.A. Veterans Land Act in Leeds county?

Mr. TUCKER: With regard to paragraph 3 of this question, it is considered that the public disclosure of details as to prices paid for various lands being purchased by the Veterans Land Act administration would be detrimental to the administration and operation of the act, and not in the best interests of the veterans for whom the land has been purchased. Subject to that, the question is answered.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is that not new procedure?

Mr. TUCKER: If the hon. member is interested in any particular parcel of land and wishes to ascertain what has been paid for it, there is no objection to giving him the information. But the public disclosure of the amount paid for each parcel of land of course will operate to the detriment of the administration of the act, because it may cause others to ask far more for their land than otherwise would be the case.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is not a matter of the detriment to the administration; it is the detriment to the public, is it not?

Mr. TUCKER: It is felt that it would work to the detriment of the veterans who have to pay for the land.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not sure that is so. It might mean that the veterans would get the land for less.

Mr. TUCKER: The answer to the remainder of the question is as follows:

1, 2 and 3.

Land Description — Vendor — Acreage—Appraiser

Pts. Lots 28 and 29, Con. 1, Twp. Elizabethtown, Mrs. Muriel M. Bryan, 55, William G. LaTour.

Pt. Lots 20 and 21, Con. 2, Twp. Elizabethtown, Winifred Wright, 124, H. O. McMillan.

E. ½ Lot 19, Con. 4, Twp. Front of Lansdowne, Chas. N. Horton, 100, E. R. Donaldson.

Central Pts. Lots 32 and 33, Con. 5, Twp. Elizabethtown, W. H. Davis, 137, E. R. Donaldson.

Lots 20 and 21, Con. 2 and 3, Twp. Front of Escott, Mrs. Jessie Hagerman, 92, Wm. G. LaTour.

Lot 29, Con. 1, Twp. Kitley, and Lot 26, Con. 1, Twp. South Elmsley, John A. Dalgleish, 168, Wm. G. LaTour.

Pt. Lot 8, Con. 2, Twp. Kitley, W. J. McCabe, 100, Wm. G. LaTour.

N. ½ Lot 9, Con. 3, Twp. Lansdowne, P. H. Pederson, 100, M. B. Cochran.

E. ½ Lot 7, W. ½ Lot 8, Con. 12, Twp. Lansdowne, Samuel Gluck, 150, H. O. McMillan.

Pt. Lot 10, Con. 12, Rear of Lansdowne Twp., Stewart Singleton, 80, M. B. Cochran.

Pt. Lot 8, Con. 13, Twp. Rear Leeds and Lansdowne, J. Robt. Sheridan, 45, H. O. McMillan.

W. ½ Lot 4, Con. 1, 60 acs. of Lot 4, Con. 2, 80 acs. of Lot 5, Con. 2, Twp. N. Crosby, A. V. Egan, 240, H. E. Henry.

Rear ½ Lot 13, Con. 1, Younge Twp., Mrs. Alice Clow, 98, H. O. McMillan.

Pts. Lots 19 and 20, Con. 2, Younge Twp., H. R. and C. L. Knowlton, 165, Wm. G. LaTour.

Pt. Lot 6, Con. 10, Twp. Younge, P. H. Robeson, 100, Wm. G. LaTour.

Lot 9 and N.E. ¼ Lot 10 and 2 acs of Lot 8, Con. 7, Twp. Kitley, Roy B. Gardiner, 252, E. R. Donaldson.

N.W. Pt Lot 22 and N.W. Pt. Lot 21 (74 acs.), N. Pt. 21 (10 acs.), Con. 10, and 10 acs. in Central Pt. Lot 21, Kitley Twp., Wm. Crothers, 95, E. R. Donaldson.

S.W. ¼ Lot 13 and S. ½ Lot 12, Con. 6, Leeds Twp., Jacob Dormer, 150, M. B. Cochran.

Lot 21 and W. ½ Lot 22, Con. 7, Rear of Leeds and Lansdowne, T. MacMillan, 260, E. R. Donaldson and E. W. Bradley.

N.W. ¼ Lot 18, N.W. ¼ Lot 19, Pt. N.E. ¼ Lot 20, N.W. ¼ Lot 20, Con. 4, and Pt. S.W. ¼ Lot 20 and Pt. S.E. ¼ Lot 21, Con. 5, Twp. Front of Younge, George Davis, 207, E. R. Donaldson.

4. Purchases recommended by the regional advisory committee rather than inspector or appraiser. Appraisers' names are given above.

5. Six.

6. Mr. H. L. Armstrong, regional supervisor, Kingston.

RADIO BROADCASTING—SACKVILLE STATION

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's):

1. Is the Department of Trade and Commerce utilizing the facilities of the short wave radio broadcasting station?

2. If so, to what extent?

3. What payments are being made to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the service?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. The Department of Trade and Commerce, in cooperation with other government departments, does make use of the short wave radio station for broadcasting trade information, bureau of statistics reports, etc. This department does not purchase time nor sponsor any particular programme.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. No payments whatever are made by this department.

BUTTER PRICES

Mr. HATFIELD:

When the regulation was made increasing the price of butter 4 cents did it include butterfat and dairy butter? If not, why not?

Mr. ILSLEY: When the price of butter was raised April 1, the increase applied to creamery butter only. The price of dairy butter has been correspondingly increased effective April 15. This has resulted in an increase in the price of butterfat used in the manufacture of creamery and dairy butter.

CANADIAN ARMY—PERSONNEL STATIONED NEAR COURTENAY, B.C.

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. How many army personnel are presently stationed at the Iron River Timber Company's camp near Courtenay, British Columbia?

2. Are these soldiers doing work for a private logging company?

3. If so, what is (a) the name of the company; (b) the nature of the work?

4. By whom are the said soldiers paid?

5. If by the company (a) what is the hourly or daily wage; (b) is there any deduction for board or other expenses?

6. If the said soldiers are paid by the Department of National Defence, what payment, if any, is made to the department by the company for work done by the soldiers?

7. Is there a written contract between the Department of National Defence and the company regarding the employment of said soldiers?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. Two officers and 77 other ranks.

2. Yes—reforestation for the provincial forestry service. The men are provided for this work at the request of the British Columbia forest service and British Columbia loggers association. It is expected the work will be completed by 15 April, 1946.

3. (a) Comox Logging and Railway Company.

(b) Reforestation.

4. The soldiers are paid Army rates by the Army.

5. Answered by No. 4 above—see also answer to question 6.

6. The logging company pays to the receiver-general, through the Department of National Defence, 60 cents per hour plus a bonus of 20

the job until it is completed. A deduction is made for board, the amount of which is not cents per day for Army men who remain on available at present.

7. No. Arrangements made through D.O.C., M.D. 11 to provide personnel for urgent national work in isolated camps for which civilian labour could not be found.

SUGAR CONTROLLER—ACADIA SUGAR REFINERY

Mr. ISNOR:

1. Was the Acadia Sugar Refinery, at Woodside, Nova Scotia, closed by order of the sugar controller of Canada?
2. If so, has application for reopening of plant since been made by owners?
3. What answer was given?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

REMOVAL OF RIPPLE ROCK AT SEYMOUR NARROWS

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East):

1. What is the total amount expended by the federal government to date, in the attempted removal of Ripple Rock at Seymour Narrows?
2. What steps have been taken by the government to proceed with this project?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull):

1. $802,825.47.

2. (a) Methods of improving navigation are being given consideration. (b) Other methods of removing the rock are being studied.

SASKATOON AIRPORT—EXTENSION OF RUNWAYS

Mr. KNIGHT:

1. Does the contract for extension of runways at the Saskatoon airport specify an approximate date for completion?
2. If so, what is that date?
3. Does progress up to the present indicate that the work will be completed by that date?

Mr. McILRAITH: In so far as the Department of Transport is concerned—

1. Grading of E/W runway 75 per cent completed last fall. Tenders are being called for the construction of two complete runways and are due April 29. The completion date specified is November 30, 1946.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Yes.

HOGS FOR DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What is the quota of hogs granted for domestic consumption only in each of the following centres: Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Regina, Edmonton, Vancouver?

2. On what basis are the above hog quotas established?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. The total quota of hogs granted for domestic consumption is as follows: Halifax, no quotas imposed; Montreal, 6,853 per week; Toronto, 7,217 per week; Winnipeg, 4,963 per week; Regina, 324 per week; Edmonton, 2,827 per week; Vancouver, 3,394 per week.

Note.—These are the numbers that may be slaughtered per week in these cities but it must be remembered an important percentage of the resultant pork is shipped to areas outside of these cities.

2. The general policy followed by the wartime prices and trade board in establishing hog quotas for domestic consumption is to permit an operator to slaughter at the rate of 75 per cent of a basic period.

Exceptions to the general policy have been made in the case of deficiency production areas, and in the case of domestic processors who normally secured their pork by purchase from slaughterers.

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD—CARPENTERS

Mr. LaCROIX:

What is the hourly salary paid to carpenters working for the national harbours board in (a) the Toronto harbour; (b) the Montreal harbour; (c) the Quebec harbour?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Furnished by the national harbours board. (a) The Toronto harbour is not under the administration of the national harbours board; (b) Carpenter, 95 cents; timberman (rough carpenter), 80 cents; (c) carpenter, 80 cents; timberman (rough carpenter), 70 cents.

CANADIAN FORCES—PERSONNEL IN SERVICE OUTSIDE OF CANADA

Mr. BRUNELLE:

1. How many Canadian soldiers are still in service outside of Canada?
2. How many of that number are in the army or armies of occupation and how many are not?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. 36,300 all ranks (as of 31 March, 1946).

2. Canadian army occupation force, 16,900; others, 19,400.

Note: Above figures do not include 3,000 soldiers in transit to Canada.

VEGETABLE OIL

Mr. HATFIELD:

What quantity of vegetable oil was imported into Canada during the year 1945 and from what countries?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

Canadian imports by countries, of vegetable oils during the calendar year 1945

Item	Unit	Country	Qty.	Value
Cocoanut oil, n.o.p., edible..	Cwt.		....	$ ....
Cotton seed oil, n.o.p., edible	Cwt.	Brazil	580	6,916
		United States	169	2,773
		Totals	749	$ 9,689
Olive oil, n.o.p., edible	Cwt.	Spain	752	$ 50,514
		United States	68	4,383
		Totals	820	$ 54,897
Peanut oil, n.o.p., edible ...	Cwt.	United States	760	$ 13,874
Soya bean oil, n.o.p., edible	Cwt.	United States	34,929	$ 565,338
Castor oil	Cwt.	British India	1,109	23,547
		Brazil	89,722	1,251,660
		Paraguay	1,823	29,983
		United States	4,850	80,989
		Totals	97,504	$1,386,179
Chinawood oil	Cwt.	Brazil	12	$ 559
		United States	3,596	156,603
		Totals	3,608	$ 157,162
Cocoanut oil, not edible	Cwt.	United States	980	$ 26,967
Cotton seed and oil for mfr.	Cwt.	Argentina	161,257	1,896,561
		Brazil	78,501	915,049
		United States	5,056	70,898
		Totals	244,814	$2,882,508
Essential oil, n.o.p.	Lb.	United Kingdom	7,258	14,239
		British India	3,360	5,580
		Ceylon	5,418	4,517
		Jamaica	974	4,262
		Trinidad	2,337	16,326
		Br. W. Indies, other	410	1,872
		Australia	329	1,919
		Brazil	9,043	12,332
		France	1,693	18,299
		Haiti	50	207
		Mexico	5,106	35,328
		Paraguay	50	111
		Spain	2,379	4,691
		Switzerland	373	19,527
		Porto Rico	50	97
		United States	738,817	2,260,021
		Totals	777,647	$2,399,328

Questions

Item	Unit	Country	Qty.	Value
Eucalyptus oil	Lb.	Australia	21,475	$ 18,937
		United States	2,088	2,548
		Totals	23,563	$ 21,485
Flaxseed or linseed oil	Cwt.	United States	1,769	$ 40,281
Foots of cotton seed or olives	Cwt.	United States	3,045	$ 38,650
Olive oil for manufacturing	Cwt.	Portugal	608	11,688
		United States	644	13,093
		Totals	1,252	$ 24,781
Palm oil, not edible	Cwt.	Nigeria	258,103	$1,028,313
		Belgian Congo	38,291	234,166
		United States	32	668
		Totals	296,426	$1,263,147
Peanut oil	Cwt.	United States	162	$ 2,958
Peppermint oil	Lb.	Brazil	6,902	16,617
		United States	31,841	262,459
		Totals	38,743	$ 279,076
Perilla oil	Cwt.		....	$ ....
Resin oil	Cwt.	United States	5,600	$ 35,866
Sesame seed oil	Cwt.	United States	4	$ 114
Soya bean oil for manufacture	Cwt.	United States	595	$ 7,890
Vegetable oil, n.o.p., not edible	Cwt.	United States	5,448	$ 84,696
Rape seed oil	Cwt.	Argentina	2,455	$ 33,648
		United States	4,497	71,288
		Totals	6,952	$ 104,936
Cashew nut shell oil	Cwt.	United States	1,101	$ 21,943
Oiticica oil	Cwt.	Brazil	3,685	94,569
		United States	13	310
		Totals	3,698	$ 94,879
Sunflower seed oil	Cwt.	Argentina	160,500	$1,484,913
Vegetable oils for textiles	Cwt.	United States	10,168	$ 202,846
Lemon oil and orange oil	Lb.	Jamaica	2,400	5,234
		Br. W. Indies, other	210	884
		Brazil	10,661	14,635
		United States	63,618	200,779
		Totals	76,889	$ 221,532
Spearmint oil	Lb.	United States	12,084	$ 53,445

BUTTER AND CHEESE EXPORTS

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What quantity of butter was exported from Canada during the period from March 31, 1945 to March 31, 1946, and to what countries?
2. What quantity of cheese was exported from Canada during the period from March 31, 1945 to March 31, 1946, and to what countries?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1 and 2. Exports of butter and cheese, by countries, during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1946:

Country	Butter Cwt.	Cheese Cwt.
United Kingdom	—	1,304,574
Aden	14	—
British East Africa	—	114
British South Africa	—	2
Gambia	94	60
Gold Coast	1,690	447
Nigeria	—	299
Sierra Leone	—	100
Bermuda	2,317	1,764
British India	—	23
Ceylon	—	557
Straits Settlements	—	347
British Guiana	6,043	2,656
British Honduras	1,428	516
Barbados	6,485	1,120
Jamaica	2,840	1,853
Trinidad	18,930	3,290
British West Indies, other	5,539	1,251
Hong Kong	—	10
Newfoundland	6,566	7,227
Colombia	1	1
Greenland	117	15
Egypt	—	2,193
French West Indies	125	—
St. Pierre	1,063	167
Iraq	—	36
Italy	—	953
Mexico	—	2
Norway	62	5
United States	—	1,434
Totals	53,314	1,331,016

VETERANS AFFAIRS—SASKATOON MILITARY HOSPITAL

Mr. KNIGHT:

1. Does the Department of Veterans Affairs operate a military hospital at the former No. 4 Service Flying Training School at Saskatoon?
2. If so, does this hospital provide only care for convalescents?
3. Is other medical or surgical care provided?
4. How many beds are in use?
5. What is the number of patients?
6. Has any physiotherapeutic equipment been provided for this hospital from (a) war assets equipment declared surplus; (b) any other source?

[Mr. Chevrier.]

Mr. TUCKER:

1. The Department of Veterans Affairs operates a veterans' hospital at said premises.
2. No.
3. Yes.
4. Bed capacity at April 6, 1946: 148.
5. At April 6, 1946: 93.
6. (a) yes; (b) yes.

AIR TRANSPORT BOARD

Mr. CASE:

1. Who are the members of the air transport board?
2. Through which member of the board is the postmaster general's department represented, or in what other manner is that department represented?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Robert Alexander Cecil Henry, chairman; Alan Ferrier, member; Joseph Pierre Romeo Vachon, member.

2. Not represented through any member nor in any other manner. The Postmaster General's department is, however, advised of any matters of direct concern to it.

STEEL PRICES—AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS

Mr. SENN:

1. Are agricultural implements included in the list of basic iron and steel products on which the ceiling price is raised as announced by the finance minister on Tuesday, April 2?
2. If so, what increase is being allowed?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. No increase was allowed as of April 1st, the date on which the prices of other iron and steel products were permitted to increase.

2. An increase of 12½ per cent in the retail price of farm implements was permitted effective April 13, 1946.

NATIONAL REGISTRATION

Mr. THATCHER:

1. Are Canadians still compelled by law to carry registration cards?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. Have any prosecutions been made since January 1, 1946, because of failure to produce a registration card, and if so, how many?
4. How many people are still employed in the administration of national registration?
5. What is the total monthly cost to the government of employing these people?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Yes; all Canadians, sixteen years or age and over, are still required by law to carry national registration certificates when residing in Canada, except

(a) Cloistered nuns;

(b) Members of the naval, military and air forces of Canada on active service;

(c) Persons confined in asylums for the insane or feeble-minded, or in penitentiaries or prisons;

(d) Inmates of institutions excepted by the chief registrar for Canada upon the recommendation of the registrar for the electoral district in which the institution is situated.

2. The principal reasons are:

(1) To assist the authorities in the rehabilitation of the large number of adults displaced by the exigencies of war.

(2) To assist the authorities in clearing up unfinished cases and investigations of desertions from the armed forces, defaults and delinquencies under the national resources mobilization regulations, the defence of Canada regulations and other wartime controls.

(3) So that the national registration records from which much information is still being supplied may be kept as up to date as possible.

3. Very few prosecutions have been made or instituted since January 1, 1946 for failure to produce a registration certificate. The exact total of such cases is not available as the provincial and municipal law enforcement authorities do not report all cases to the dominion authorities.

4. At March 31, 1946, there were 232 persons employed in the national registration branch, Department of Labour.

5. The total monthly cost to the government at present is approximately $30,000.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—PERMANENT SITE

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. Have any representations been made to the government or to any Canadian delegation to the united nations organization in connection with the choice of Navy island as a permanent site for the headquarters of the united nations organization?

2. If so, when and by whom were such representations made?

3. What steps were taken by the government or the Canadian delegation as aforesaid to ensure that the permanent site of the united nations headquarters would be in Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Yes.

2. A number of representations were made at different times. Some of these were verbal. Those of which there is a record include the following:

By Mr. J. E. Lawson, on July 31;

By Mr. Davis Duff and Mr. Arthur A. Schmon, October 4, 1945;

By Senator J. J. Bench, December 31;

By Mr. Chauncey J. Hamblin and Mr. John A. Williamson, December 18.

In addition Mr. E. J. Anderson, Mr. Roy H. Davis and Mr. Louis Blake Duff brought this matter to the attention of the Canadian government and the Canadian delegation in London on a number of occasions.

3. Action on the part of the Canadian government or any Canadian delegation to the united nations could not ensure that the permanent site for the headquarters of the united nations would be in Canada.

However, everything that could appropriately be done was done to ensure that the united nations should be aware of possible Canadian sites when giving consideration to the location of the permanent headquarters of the united nations. Representations concerning Navy island and other Canadian cities and localities were brought to the attention of the preparatory commission of the united nations. The preparatory commission circulated a list to delegations of possible sites, which included Navy island and other sites in Canada.

The preparatory commission decided that the permanent headquarters of the united nations should be located in the eastern part of the United States of America. A committee to make recommendations on the permanent site of the united nations was set up by the preparatory commission, and this committee sent an inspection group to the United States, with its terms of reference limited to specified areas around New York and Boston. The Canadian government made representations both in London and Washington with a view to having the united nations inspection group examine sites on the international boundary of the Niagara river.

The attitude of the Canadian government, like that of other member governments of the united nations, including the United States government, was that the choice of a permanent site was a matter for collective decision in the broad interests of the united nations.

*RAILWAY GRADE SEPARATION

Mr. CHURCH:

For the period of the war, by years, what sums of money have been spent by each of the provinces on railway grade separation in Canada?

Mr. CHEVRIER: In this question the hon. member for Broadview asks what sums of money have been spent by each of the provinces on railway grade separation in Canada during the war years. The only jurisdiction over this subject matter is that of the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada, and they do not keep separate accounts for the provinces. They have an accurate account of

the moneys spent by the dominion, and I could put that on the record. But as the question stands I have no way of answering it, and I would suggest that if the hon. member were to communicate with the provinces he would get from them information as to the moneys they have spent on grade separations.

Question dropped.

VETERANS LAND ACT—QUEENS COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. McLURE:

1. How many farms have been purchased in Queen's county, Prince Edward Island, under the Veterans Land Act?
2. Where are these farms located and from whom purchased?
3. What acreage in each farm and what price was paid for each?
4. How many veterans are now established on farms in Queen's county?
5. Who are the officers in charge of Veterans Land Act in Queen's county, Prince Edward Island?

Mr. TUCKER: The same observations would apply in regard to this question as in regard to the question of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Webb). I have spoken to the hon. member who asks this question, and he is satisfied that the third part should not be answered. Subject to that, the question is answered as follows:

1, 2, and 3.

Farms Purchased in Queen's County, Prince Edward Island, per Head Office Records, 13th April, 1946.

Location—Vendor—Acreage

At Kingston in Lot 31, Leonard Willis, 73.
At Union Road, Beecher Bryenton, 146.
At Appin Road, Samuel Condon, 130.
At Marshfield, Herbert C. Nelson, 68½.
At Dunstaffnage, Twp. 35, Robert E. Connelly, 105.
At Mount Stewart, Twp. 37, Stewart MacEachern, 152.
At North River, Hugh M. Walker, 74.
At Union Road, Lot 33, George H. Newman, 98.
At Winsloe, Lot 33, Harold Prowse, 87.
At Sea View, Edwin Donald, 85.5.
At Springvale, Lot 32, Lorne Coles, 53.
At Stanley Bridge, Twp. 22, A. E. Fyfe, 75.
At Westmoreland, William MacVittie, 101.
At Little York, Twp. 34, Lester Keizer, 69.
At Clinton, Lot 20, G. E. Woodside, 85.
At North Rustico, Lot 24, J. E. Bulman, 98½
At Inkerman, Lot 29, A. W. Newson, 100.
At Nine Mile Creek, Lot 65, R. H. Lowther, 100.
At Stanhope, Lot 34, W. H. Ross, 60.
At Eldon, Lot 57, G. A. Davies, 100.

At Avondale, Lot 49, E. A. Curran, 100.
At Park Corner, Lot 21, R. C. Episcopal Corp., 71.
At Canoe Cove, Twp. 65, F. MacDougall, 50
At Mount Albion, Lot 48, S.S.B., 76;
At Summerfield, Twp. 67, Mrs. W. F. Curley, 62.
At DeSable, J. D. McFarlane, 133.
At Cherry Valley, Twp. 50, Geo. and Wm. Hayden, 153.
At Alberry Plains, Twp. 50, P. Cairns, 75.
At Nine Mile Creek, Lot 65, N. MacDonald, 102.
At Cherry Valley, Lot or Twp. 50, Trueman Jenkins, 96.
At Suffolk, Twp. 34, W. S. MacArthur, 118.
At Suffolk, F. W. Godfrey, 97.
At Vernon River, Lot 50, Owen Doherty 58.
At Brookfield, Lots 23 and 24, P. A. Horne, 94.
At Rusticoville, L. Gallan, 50.
At Mayfield, Twp. 23, Lemuel Wyand, 82.
At New London, Rutherford Cotton, 95.
At Flat River, Twp. or Lot 60, and Twp. 48, R. A. Mackenzie, 100.
At Wheatley River, Lot 24, Emile Dulong, 48.
At West Covehead, Lot 34, Mrs. B. MacMillan, 114.
At Loyalist Road, Russell Proude, 45.
At Tracadie Cross, Lot 36, D. B. MacDonald, 100.
At Rusticoville, L. F. Gallant, 47.
At Hunter River, Lot 22, A. B. Bagnall, 122.
No. 35 Dunstaffnage School Dist., B. McMillan, 101.
No. 35 Dunstaffnage School Dist., Wm. and Daniel O'Connell, 80.
Near Fredericton, Lot 67 and 21, H. Buchanan, 97.
Union Road, Lot 33, G. E. MacKinnon, 104.
DeSable, Lot 29, D. C. McLean, 100.
Glen Valley, Lot 67, H. MacPherson, 205.
Cavendish S.D. 163, Lots 22 and 23, B. Graham, 135.
Bonshaw, Lot 30, G. MacLeod, 80.
Lundale, Lot 57, N. W. MacDonald, 90.
Canoe Cove, J. A. Maclean, 100.
Bonshaw, Lot 30, Wm. Gillis, 100.
Mayfield, Lot 23, DeWitt Brown, 52.
Shamrock, Lot 67, D. D. McDonald, 100.
Cornwall, Lot 31, H. Howard, 50.
Clyde River, Lot 31, W. Boyle, 77.
Argyle Shore, Lot 30, J. G. Inman, 50.
Springton, K. MacLeod estate, 100.
Near Newton Cross, Lot 57, W. D. and Euphemia Gillis, 91.
Wheatley River, J. L. Matheson, 100.
Canoe Cove, R. McNevin, 100.

At Long River, Lot 20, D. F. Paynter, 65.

At Belfast, Lot 58, C. Panton, 100.

At Rose Valley, R. M. Gamble, 200.

At Frenchfort, Lot 35, J. C. Owen, 140.

At West Valleyfield, Lot 57, J. J. MacPherson, 80.

At Little Sands, H. Bonnell, 55.

At Kingston, Twp. 31, Derril White, 74½.

At New London, P. Johnstone, 43.

4. Forty-three of the above properties have been disposed of to veterans.

5. Mr. E. W. Campbell, Regional Supervisor, Charlottetown.

ARTHRITIS AND RHEUMATIC DISEASES

Mr. BENTLEY:

1. Has the Department of National Health and Welfare investigated the method of treatment for arthritis and rheumatic diseases used by Dr. I. J. K. Golden of Chicago?

2. If so, what were the results of such investigation?

Mr. CLAXTON: 1 and 2. No.

INCOME TAX—PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many (a) inspectors; (b) investigators; (c) other officials, are now engaged in connection with the collection of income tax in each of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

2. Is any portion of the salary and expenses of the above named officers payable in whole or in part by way of bonus on a commission basis?

Mr. McCANN:

1.		Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta
Inspectors	(a)	1	2	2
Assessing tax returns	(b)	133	83	127
Other employees	(c)	250	220	262
Total employees		384	305	391

2. No.

WAR ASSETS—CROWN PROPERTIES

Mr. LENNARD:

1. Has the Department of Reconstruction sold any crown properties direct to purchasers?

2. If so, why were these not sold through War Assets Corporation?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

CENSUS COMMISSIONERS

Mr. ZAPLITNY:

1. What are the names and addresses of the census commissioners appointed this year in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

2. Which of these are veterans of first or second world war?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. See list below.

2. Information not available. We can procure this.

List of Census Commissioners Census of Prairie Provinces, 1946

District—Name—Address

Manitoba

1. Brandon, Charles E. Woodcock, Pipestone, Man.

2a. Churchill South, J. W. Campbell, Minitonas, Man.

2b. Churchill North, A. G. H. Mast, Cranberry Portage, Man.

3. Dauphin, E. A. Marcroft, Dauphin, Man.

4. Lisgar, W. T. Pringle, Manitou, Man.

5. MacDonald, F. M. Ferg, Glenboro, Man.

6. Marquette, Robert Peel, Miniota, Man.

7. Neepawa, J. S. Dempsey, Neepawa, Man.

8. Portage la Prairie, Robert E. Poldon, Box 667, Portage la Prairie, Man.

9. Provencher, A. S. Beaubien, St. Jean Baptiste, Man.

10. St. Boniface, Albert Lambert, 462 St. Jean Baptiste St., St. Boniface, Man.

11. Selkirk, C. S. Trick, Stonewall, Man.

12. Souris, Donald John McDonald, Boissevain, Man.

13. Springfield, W. Horodyski, Beausejour, Man.

14. Winnipeg North, Peter Taraska, 325 Mountain Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

15. Winnipeg N. Centre, Guy H. Gislason, 412 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg, Man.

16. Winnipeg South, Captain Albert James Mitchell, 270 Ashland Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.

17. Winnipeg S. Centre, Albert Forcese, 778 Broadway Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.

Saskatchewan

18. Assiniboia, Ernest Wiggins, Estevan, Sask.

19. Humboldt, L. C. R. Batten, Humboldt, Sask.

20. Kindersley, Fred Watt, Cavell, Sask.

21. Lake Centre, W. J. White, Lockwood, Sask.

22. Mackenzie, J. F. P. Barschel, Canora, Sask.

23. Maple Creek, James E. Tetreau, Gull Lake, Sask.

24. Melfort, F. W. Falkner, Tisdale, Sask.

25. Melville, R. A. Crosby, Lipton, Sask.
26. Moose Jaw, Cecil Cull, 8 Woolworth Blk., Moose Jaw, Sask.
27. North Battleford, Leon A. Pirot, Medstead, Sask.
28. Prince Albert, Robert Young, Prince Albert, Sask.
29. Qu'Appelle, Vernon Hack, Grenfell, Sask.
30. Regina City, Hark D. Macpherson, Suite 3, Capitol Theatre Block, Regina, Sask.
31. Rosetown-Biggar, Robert S. Hay, Rosetown, Sask.
32. Rosthern, Andrew W. Michayluk, Wakaw, Sask.
33. Saskatoon City, John Cairns, 405 Birks Building, Saskatoon, Sask.
34. Swift Current, Frank J. Dickson, Swift Current, Sask.
35. The Battlefords, Walter Kingston, Cutknife, Sask.
36. Weyburn, D. J. Mitchell, Weyburn, Sask.
37. Wood Mountain, C. W. Johnson, Melaval, Sask.
38. Yorkton, Sol Saper, Yorkton, Sask.

Alberta

39. Acadia, John McDonald, Veteran, Alta.
40. Athabaska, Laval J. Fortier, St. Paul, Alta.
41. Battle River, J. D. Adam, Vermilion, Alta.
42. Bow River, Thomas B. McFarlane, P.O. Box 750, Drumheller, Alta.
43. Calgary E., Leonard H. Barnes, 1308-4th St. N.W., Calgary, Alta.
44. Calgary W., D. J. Young, 310 Lancaster Bldg., Calgary, Alta.
45. Camrose, Roy W. Willis, Stettler, Alta.
46. Edmonton E., Geo. A. Campbell, 10018-83rd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
47. Edmonton W., Edward C. Fisher, 10242-105th St., Edmonton, Alta.
48. Jasper-Edson, Donald MacLeod, Lake Isle, Alta.
49. Lethbridge, Chas. E. Dawson, Room 10, Stafford Block, Lethbridge, Alta.
50. Macleod, N. Nicholson, Cowley, Alta.
51. Medicine Hat, Percy Yeo, 14 Empress Theatre Bldg., Medicine Hat, Alta.
52. Peace River, C. J. Schurter, Slave Lake, Alta.
53. Red Deer, C. J. Davidson, Three Hills, Alta.
54. Vegreville, Ryerson B. Christie, Bruderheim, Alta.
55. Wetaskiwin, Stan Puffer, Lacombe, Alta.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. WINKLER:

1. When were conscientious objectors accorded permission to volunteer as such for active service?
2. How many enlisted as such?
3. Are conscientious objectors who enlisted required to conform to-day to the regimentation of the Department of Labour under National Selective Service regulations?
4. Is any class of Canadian citizens other than conscientious objectors required by the Department of Labour to submit to regimentation at this time? If so, who?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. September 16, 1943.
2. 768.
3. No.
4. No persons in civil occupations are subject to labour controls at this time other than conscientious objectors who are performing alternative service in view of having been postponed from service in the armed forces. Many men called or enlisting for service in the armed forces have not yet been demobilized.

Mr. WINKLER:

1. How many conscientious objectors were registered at the first registration following the outbreak of war?
2. How many are registered to-day?
3. When was the last one registered?
4. Are any conscientious objectors working in government camps (in national parks) at the present, under government supervision?

Mr. MITCHELL: To get the information asked for in the first part of this question would mean going through tens of thousands of files. There were millions of people registered at that time, and it would be wellnigh impossible to get the information. The third part of the question is in the same category. We should have to go through all those files. Then, who would decide when the last one was registered?—I do not know. I suggest that the question be dropped and resubmitted on the basis of the second and fourth parts of it.

Question dropped.

JUDGES

Mr. NICHOLSON:

How many (a) county and district court judges (b) supreme and appeal court judges in Canada are (1) over 90 years of age; (2) between 80 and 90; (3) between 70 and 80; (4) between 60 and 70; (5) between 50 and 60; (6) under 50?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: (a) (1) None, (2) None, (3) 19, (4) 39, (5) 53, (6) 16; (b) (1) None, (2) 6, (3) 31, (4) 49, (5) 36, (6) 14.

UNRRA—SEED POTATOES

Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. Has the Canadian government offered UNRRA a gift of Canadian seed potatoes?

2. If so, what steps have been taken to see that seed potatoes from Prince Edward Island are included?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. No. The usual procedure in UNRRA procurement is for UNRRA to requisition the necessary supplies. The Canadian Export Board then procures these. So far there has been no requests from UNRRA for seed potatoes.

2. Answered by No. 1.

POSTMASTERS—REVENUE OFFICES

Mr. SHAW:

1. What is the present policy with respect to the discharge or retirement, due to age, of postmasters now in charge of revenue post offices?

2. Are postmasters now in charge of revenue post offices eligible for pension if and when discharged due to age? If not, on what basis are they retired?

3. Are all postmasters now in charge of revenue post offices paid regular salaries? If not, how is their remuneration computed?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier):

1. Postmasters of offices with not more than $3,000 post office revenue are not released on account of age. Postmasters of offices with more than $3,000 post office renvue will be released on reaching 70 years of age commencing 1st January, 1948.

2. No. They are not under the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

3. No. This remuneration is based on the post office revenue of their offices plus other allowances for specific service for work performed.

PARCEL POST—HUNGARY

Mr. KNIGHT:

1. Is the rate of parcel post to Hungary higher than the rates to Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia?

2. What is the greatest weight of food that will be accepted by the post office for transmission to Hungary by parcel post?

3. How often may such a parcel be sent by one individual in Canada?

4. Is Hungary on an equal basis as compared with other countries in regard to (a) weight of parcels allowed to be sent; (b) the frequency with which they may be sent?

5. If not, what is the reason for the difference?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): The mail from Canada to Hungary operates via the United Kingdom, and as the United Kingdom have not yet resumed their parcel post service to Hungary the Canadian post office cannot accept parcels so addressed.

There is, however, a letter packet service operating from Canada via the United Kingdom to Hungary, and gift food packets weighing up to 4 pounds 6 ounces may be forwarded prepaid at the letter rate of postage.

These packages may be sent by any one sender to two different addressees each week and the regulations as regards Hungary are the same for similar letter packets forwarded to other countries to which the letter packet service has been restored.

The restoration of the parcel post service to Hungary is at present before this department, and it will be placed in operation as soon as the necessary facilities are available.

UNITED NATIONS—EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION—CANADIAN TEACHERS

Mr. KNIGHT:

1. Did the united nations educational, scientific and cultural organization recommend that a national committee or commission be set up in each signatory country?

2. If so, is the government presently in communication with the Canadian teachers' federation with regard to the appointment of (a) members of such national committee; (b) delegates to the main conference?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Article VII, section 1, of the draft constitution of the united nations educational, scientific and cultural organization drawn up at the conference held in London, England, last November and submitted to the participating governments for acceptance, reads as follows:

"Each member state shall make such arrangements as suit its particular conditions for the purpose of associating its principal bodies interested in educational, scientific and cultural matters with the work of the organization, preferably by the formation of a national commission broadly representative of the government and such bodies."

2. The Canadian teachers' federation has written expressing the hope that the government will appoint a national commission and suggesting the names of persons who might be appointed to such a commission and as Canadian representatives to meetings of the organization.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—RESEARCH AND PLANNING

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. How many houses were completed during (a) 1944; (b) 1945, under the National Housing Act?

2. How many houses now under construction under the supervision of N.H.A. when com-

pleted will cost (a) less than $3,000; (b) from $3,000 to $3,999; (c) from $4,000 to $4,999; (d) from $5,000 to $5,999; (e) from $6,000 to $6,999; (f) from $7,000 to $7,999; (g) over $8,000?

3. (a) How many limited dividend housing corporations have been established as provided by section 9 of the Housing Act; (b) how many housing units have been completed by such limited dividend housing corporations?

4. (a) How many rural houses have been completed as provided in part 3 of the National Housing Act? (b) how many rural houses are now under construction as provided by part 3 of the National Housing Act?

5. (a) How much money has been spent on housing research and community planning as provided by part 5 of the National Housing Act; (b) how many persons are presently employed exclusively on housing research and community planning?

CIVILIAN CORPS OF CANADIAN FIRE FIGHTERS—INCOME TAX

Mr. WEBB:

1. How many Canadians served overseas in the civilian corps of Canadian fire fighters?

2. Is the pay and allowances received by these men while serving overseas subject to income tax?

3. If so, what steps, if any, have been taken to exempt such pay and allowances from income tax?

Mr. McCANN: Return tabled.

SUPPLY OF FOODSTUFFS TO INDIA

Mr. THATCHER:

What specific steps have been taken by the government to supply foodstuffs to India, since January 1, 1946?

REPRESENTATION—PROVINCES AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Mr. TOWNLEY-SMITH:

1. What is the estimated present population of the Mackenize district of the Northwest Territories?

2. What federal representation has the territory been granted?

3. What were the populations of each of the provinces upon the entry to confederation?

Mr. MARTIN: I tabled that this afternoon.

BRITISH COLUMBIA AERODROME SITES

Mr. PEARKES:

1. How many aerodrome sites have been developed in the Vancouver-New Westminster southwest mainland area of British Columbia?

2. Are there any other sites which could be developed?

3. If so, is Boundary bay one of the above?

4. Is it being retained?

CREAMERY BUTTER

Mr. LACOMBE:

1. What was production of creamery butter in Canada during March, 1946?

2. How much less was production of creamery butter in March, 1946, compared to March, 1945; quantity; percentage?

[Mr. Nicholson.]

3. What is the estimate of production of creamery butter from May 1, 1946 to April 30, 1947?

4. What caused the present shortage of creamery butter in Canada since January?

5. Was the present shortage of creamery butter caused by a heavy decline in production of butter in the prairie provinces?

6. Are returns to farmers from cheese making higher than from butter making?

7. Could butter production be rapidly increased if less cheese was produced for export to United Kingdom?

POSTAL SERVICE—URBAN DELIVERIES

Mr. HAMEL:

1. What is, by provinces, the total expenditure of the post office department?

2. What Canadian cities, towns or municipalities have home delivery of mail by postmen?

3. In what year was such service inaugurated for each of the above?

4. At what time, what was the population, number of householders and revenue for each post office?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the first paragraph, because the records of expenditures are not kept by provinces and it is impossible to give them in that way. The other three questions will be accepted as an order for return, which will be filed in due course.

Mr. SPEAKER: Paragraph 1 dropped; paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, order for return.

IMPORTS OF OIL INTO PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Mr. HARKNESS:

1. What were the sources of supply of oil imported into the prairie provinces in 1946?

2. What was the amount from each source?

3. What was the delivery point for the oil from each source?

4. What were the companies to which this oil was delivered and the amount to each?

5. What was the subsidy per barrel in each case?

6. What was the cost per barrel at source?

7. What was the freight rate in each case?

8. What was the gravity of the oil at source in each case?

WAR ASSETS—MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough):

1. How many trucks, station wagons, and passenger cars have been delivered to (a) army; (b) navy; (c) air force, since (1) V-E day; (2) V-J day?

2. How many of these vehicles have been declared surplus?

COST OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

Mr. HANSELL:

1. What was the total cost involved in Canada's part in the (a) Dumbarton Oaks conference; (b) Bretton Woods conference; (c) San Francisco conference?

WAR CASUALTIES

Mr. CHURCH:

What is the estimated number of casualties in killed, wounded and missing in the Great War from 1939 to the end of 1945?

WARTIME HOUSING—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many houses have been erected in (a) Regina; (b) Saskatoon; (c) Moose Jaw, by government authority under Wartime Housing and/or other government agencies or plans?
2. What is the total contract price for each type?
3. Have any been sold? If so, what is the price for each type which has been sold?
4. If rented, what is the rental asked for the various types?

RED DEER, ALTA., CUSTOMS OFFICE

Mr. SHAW:

1. What volume of business was done through the customs office at Red Deer, Alberta, during each of the years 1935 to 1945?
2. How many employees were there in this office during each of the said years?
3. What was the total amount paid to such employees in each of the above-mentioned years?

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—SASKATCHEWAN—SUPERVISORS AND INSPECTORS

Mr. McCUAIG:

1. What are the names of the P.F.R.A. supervisors and inspectors working in the province of Saskatchewan in 1945?
2. How long was each employed in 1945?
3. What amount of salary did each receive in that period?
4. What amount of travelling expenses was paid to each in the same period?

MOTION FOR PAPERS

SIX NATIONS INDIANS—BRANT LEASES

Mr. CAMPBELL:

For a copy of the report made by the three trustees appointed by Sir John Colborne, Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada, in 1830, on behalf of the Six Nations Indians to investigate and report on the claims under the Brant leases.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should say a word about this motion. It asks for a report made over a hundred years ago. I believe it is a rule that where information is available either in the library of parliament, a public library or in other public institutions members of parliament, like everyone else, are expected to go to those sources for information. In other words it is not to be expected that the public service will be used as a means of obtaining information on questions concerning which they may wish to obtain such information, where the information is public and obtainable from recognized sources.

Hon. members will see in a moment that if one were writing a book, and wished to have the research work done by the public service, this would be the way to have it done. I suggest the document requested will be as available to others, as to the government and should be obtained from recognized sources.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the Prime Minister assure me that the information is in the library?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot assure the hon. member of that but I will assure him that if he cannot find it in some generally recognized source the government is not likely to be more successful.

Motion dropped.

MINERAL RESOURCES

PROPOSED GOVERNMENT CONTROL AND OPERATION

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South) moved:

Whereas private enterprise in the development of the mineral resources of Canada has not operated in the best interests of all of the people of Canada either in time of peace or in time of war;

Therefore be it resolved that, in the opinion of this house, the government should consider the advisability of bringing the developed and undeveloped mineral resources of Canada under government control and operation.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting to discuss this resolution for the past five years. I am sorry that this afternoon, on the eve of a house adjournment, and perhaps at a time when a great deal of government business remains to be done, I have to initiate a discussion which I believe deals with a matter of urgent importance to the people of Canada.

The resolution suggests that I should be free to discuss all mineral resources in Canada. I can assure hon. members that a discussion as broad as that would require some considerable time. Therefore in the time at my disposal this afternoon I shall confine my remarks chiefly to the coal mining industry of Nova Scotia. I assume that hon. members from other parts of Canada who represent constituencies in which coal mining operations are carried on will take advantage of this opportunity to place the position of the industry on record in the house.

I believe I am safe in saying that the remarks I shall make with reference to the industry in Nova Scotia will be applicable to the whole of industry across the country. The coal mining industry is a very sick one at the present time. It has been indicated in the house on many occasions that employment

conditions generally in Nova Scotia leave much to be desired. The whole economy of that province is based upon coal mining, and when that industry is in bad condition the whole economy suffers as a result.

For the past thirty years at least it has been the practice of the federal government to subsidize very heavily the mining operations in Nova Scotia. For the past five years the federal government has supplied practically all the funds required to keep the industry in operation. Any industry which has to draw on the public treasury to the extent to which that is done by Nova Scotia coal mining operations certainly should have some degree of public supervision.

I am not going to leave the impression that the remarks I shall make respecting the condition of coal mining in Nova Scotia are only my personal opinions. The Minister of Industry and Publicity in the Nova Scotia legislature, Hon. Harold Connolly—and that is a Liberal government—

Mr. MARTIN: A good minister.

Mr. GILLIS:—made some pertinent remarks in the legislature within the last couple of weeks. I notice that the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) has said that he is a good minister. I hope, then, that my hon. friend will support what the Minister of Industry and Publicity in the Nova Scotia government had to say respecting the mining industry of that province.

Mr. MARTIN: I will support every good cause.

Mr. GILLIS: Federal action is necessary for the rehabilitation of this industry. If subsidizing the coal industry of this country was any solution under the system of free enterprise the Nova Scotia mining industry should be a very prosperous industry to-day because it has been heavily subsidized. However, the fact of the matter is that that industry is in a worse position to-day than at any time in its history. The minister of industry acting for the Nova Scotia government, tabled a report in the legislature for the year ending November 30, 1945. At that time he said that too much emphasis could not be placed upon the deplorable position of the coal industry of that province. He stated further that the total production for the last fiscal year was only 5,170,400 short tons, a decrease of 637,710 tons from the production of 1944. This was the lowest figure since 1902. The production per man fell to 1·58 tons.

These figures take on an even more alarming aspect when considered against the background of the 1944 report. In the 1944 report the minister referred to the lamentable decrease in the total production from the previous year. The production per man shift in 1944 was 1·66 short tons, the lowest rate since 1900 and the lowest rate for which statistics are available.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is 1944?

Mr. GILLIS: 1944. He was comparing the 1945 report with the 1944. The total production and man-shift production in 1945 dropped below the 1944 figure. Despite the fact, as the Minister of Reconstruction well knows, that the federal government came to the rescue of private enterprise in the operation of this industry, and has been practically carrying the financial load of the continued operation, the industry continues to go down. This suggests to my mind that the time has come when the federal government, in the interests of the taxpayers of Canada, should accept some responsibility in the operation of this industry. In his report the minister went on to outline some of the disabilities under which the industry operates. He stated that all signs pointed to the fact that the loss in production was attributable not so much to the physical conditions in the industry as to human relations. He said a great change must take place in the attitude of all concerned if the industry was to retain its former place in the provincial economy.

That is the opinion of the minister of industry in the Nova Scotia government. The question is one which should concern not only the people of Nova Scotia but hon. members of this house, particularly the Nova Scotia members. It would be difficult to exaggerate the gravity of the situation as revealed in the formal language and hard statistics of the official report.

I do not raise this question in spirit of fault-finding or recrimination. I do it more to focus the attention of the government on the problem in order that they may take some constructive action to see that this industry is not blotted out. It is the responsibility of the governments, provincial and federal, who are the custodians of the natural resources of the country and who have been providing funds, for the last five years at least, in order that this industry may continue to function.

As I said at the beginning, if private enterprise and the system of subsidizing industry were any solution, the problem would not be as acute as it is to-day. They have had a fair trial in the mining industry and in my opinion

that industry has failed completely to meet the needs of this country, both in times of war and in times of peace. To-day the government is underwriting the losses of this industry and is acting as their sales agents. In my opinion it is the duty and responsibility of the government to take over the industry, reorganize it and operate it as a government enterprise. The government is paying the bills anyway.

As hon. members know—and this is particularly within the knowledge of the Minister of Reconstruction—there is a royal commission now probing the whole mining industry across the country. This commission will cost the taxpayers of Canada a considerable amount of money, but in my opinion it will be money well spent. I know some of the personnel of that commission, and I am reasonably sure that when its report is made we shall have for the first time a realistic picture of the coal mining industry across Canada.

Regardless of what this commission may find, or what its recommendations to the minister may be, I am convinced that there is no solution for the problems facing the coal industry unless the federal government take it over and operate it in the interests of the people of Canada. I believe the mining industry of Nova Scotia is in much the same position to-day as was the mining industry of Great Britain up to the time the British government took it over and operated it. The workers in the industry in Nova Scotia have lost confidence in those who operate the industry. In Great Britain there were many independent operators, whereas in Nova Scotia it is a straight monopoly. This makes it all the more necessary for the federal government to step in and reexamine the whole set-up on the basis of the commission's findings.

The government should consider the advisability of nationalizing the coal industry of Canada, particularly that of Nova Scotia. This government should follow the mechanics employed by the British government. The matter was studied in that country for a long time and discussed on many occasions in the British House of Commons. The men who laid down the mechanics of taking over the industry in Great Britain had long experience, and we should do well to study what was done over there. I believe the time is not far distant when the government will have to take this step.

A national board should be set up consisting of men with the necessary experience and qualifications. It should function under a separate minister who would be responsible to parliament for the operation of the industry. In addition there should be two regional boards in Nova Scotia, one on the mainland and one on the island of Cape Breton. While the national board would consist of experts working under the direction of the minister, in order to get the active cooperation of the workers the regional boards should consist of equal representation of management and the workers, so that they could work out the basic problems that exist underground and enable the national board to get a complete picture of the operation.

In addition to the two boards which would manage the industry under the minister's direction there should be set up, as was done in Great Britain, an industrial coal consumers' council. This council is responsible for processing and marketing, and for making contacts with the industry and acting as sales agent in the marketing of coal; it also fixes prices in conjunction with the national board.

In addition there is what is known as a domestic coal consumers' council, which acts as sales agent in the domestic field in the processing and marketing of coal, all under the direction of the national board.

In my opinion, if these simple steps were taken in this country under the direction of a minister like the Minister of Reconstruction, who in matters of this kind is very realistic, who is an engineer and likes to get things done, much could be done. I should like to see him in charge of that kind of set-up, and I am certain that the steps that I have mentioned will have to be taken if the province of Nova Scotia is to survive. Either that or an emigration policy from Nova Scotia to other parts of Canada will be necessary.

One of the government's officials, the Hon. Michael Dwyer, who is maritime director of selective service, addressing a commercial club in Halifax not so long ago, stated that on the average for many years fifteen hundred young people had left the province of Nova Scotia every year to go to the United States or other parts of Canada to seek employment. The war has brought us no relief from that situation. Indeed, the employment situation in Nova Scotia to-day is fifty per cent worse than it was in 1939. On the island of Cape Breton alone there are over 4,500 registered unemployed, of whom 1,500 are ex-service men who never did a day's work in their lives, who went from the street into the army and through the war and are now back on the street. Many other service personnel in that part of the country are not registered, because so long as they are receiving their out-of-work benefits they do not go through that channel. The consequence is that a serious unemployment situation is developing in Nova Scotia which will have to be dealt

with very soon. The basis of it all is the coal-mining industry, and there can be no relief under your system of free enterprise, because to rehabilitate that industry will require a large amount of capital expenditure. As hon. members who sat on the reconstruction committee with myself in 1942, 1943 and 1944, will remember, the heads of the Dominion Steel and Coal company, when questioned as to their plans for the future, the making of new openings and further mechanization of the mines already developed, stated frankly that it would cost a lot of money and that they were not going to spend the money to make those developments; but if the federal government would make the capital available, yes, they would go to work. If the federal government would do that, I am sure that there are some profits to be made in that industry. If a proper valuation of the industry were made it would be found that perhaps fifty per cent of the stock is watered. Let the minister take that industry over and squeeze the water out of the stock, fix wage rates and the selling price of coal on the basis of the costs involved, and then I am sure the coal can be marketed economically and that new openings can be made for employment in Nova Scotia. This step must be taken if the industry is to survive.

Every government in Canada is responsible for the situation in the coal mining industry to-day because they have been the custodian of that resource in every part of Canada. All our minerals were placed in the ground by the Lord, and they belong to the people. No one has any right to exploit mineral resources for private gain. Those who have operated those resources for private gain in the past have taken out the coal that was easiest to get out of the ground and got as much out of it as they could in the way of profits. Shack communities were built around the mines where the miners had to live under deplorable conditions, in every section of the mining industry all across Canada. Go to Minto, New Brunswick, and see how the miners live and work in that area. The conditions there are not peculiar to New Brunswick; the same is true of Nova Scotia. Towns which a few years ago were prosperous communities are now nothing but ghost towns. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were invested in the building of churches and schools and halls in these communities, and to-day they are falling down. Those who were operating the mines extracted as much profit as they could out of the industry, faulty mining practices were carried on, the resources were destroyed, and now these communities, in which hundreds of thousands of dollars were invested by the people who lived here, are falling down, while those who drew most of the money out of the industry live up in Westmount, Montreal, in beautiful mansions. They never saw that industry and know nothing about it. They were merely interested in getting what they could out of it. In the meantime the workers were left to slave underground and live under the conditions I have described, conditions which no one here would tolerate. The smokeless smoke-stacks in these ghost towns in Nova Scotia and other parts of Canada are a grim monument to those who have been sent here for the last twenty-five years to make our laws. They are an indictment against us.

In my opinion the time has come for the federal government, recognizing the fact that the provincial governments have fallen down on the job of managing that particular industry, to step in and take it over and put it on its feet. If the mechanics as set up in Britain to-day for the nationalization of the coal industry were adopted here, under a realistic minister who wants to get things done, I am sure that the industry in Nova Scotia could be put back on its feet and occupy its proper place in the economy of the province.

There is another thought that I would leave with the house. We must consider the coal resources of this country as a potential supply of fuel oil requirements in the future. I read an article just a few days ago, written by a Toronto university professor, who pointed out that the fuel oil supplies on this North American continent were running out and that with the terrific developments in air transport we would have to turn to the coal resources of this country to meet the requirements of air transportation in the future. That is a long story and a technical one and I shall not go into it this afternoon. I just leave the thought with the members of the government who will be examining the report of the royal commission when it is brought down.

There has been criticism that the commission has taken too long in making its inquiry and report. Personally I am not concerned as to the length of time it takes. I want it to take all the time that is necessary to do a real job. When the commission brings down its report it will be the duty of the members of this house, particularly those from coal-mining areas, to study it closely and to press the federal government for action as soon as possible to preserve and develop our coal resources.

The minister of industry in Nova Scotia pointed out that the major disability from

which the industry was suffering was labour relations. I know something about that, and there is a lot in what he says. This labour relations question goes back forty years, when there was terrific opposition to unions in Nova Scotia. Miners were thrown out one hundred per cent from the company houses and lived for nine or ten months in the basements of churches, in tents, all over the country, simply because they wanted to form a union. They were gaoled by the hundreds. The federal government sent in the army, the navy and cavalry, and barbed-wired the province—

An hon. MEMBER: What about the air force?

Mr. GILLIS: They were not organized at that time. This was done at the request of the mining magnates of Canada. That is why there is this bit of resentment; they remember these things. The sons of the men who went through this experience feel that the attitude of the bosses of steel and coal has changed very little. Under a government owned set-up I believe this picture would change. Knowing the miners of Nova Scotia as I do, I believe they would feel that they were working for themselves.

Mr. MITCHELL: I can tell my hon. friend that it has not changed the situation in Great Britain.

Mr. GILLIS: It has not? The minister has not followed the British *Hansard*.

Mr. MITCHELL: Oh, yes. I have been reading about it.

Mr. GILLIS: Besides, I would not expect the situation in this country to change in four or five months. It is a job which would take a little time. But if I were still in those coal mines and I found a federal government which had the courage to face up to this problem, I would say that I was working now for myself, and that I had equal responsibility with the government of this country in that they were honestly trying to rehabilitate the industry, get down to brass tacks, increase production, and do everything they could to put the industry on its feet.

Make no mistake about it: the miners at our end of the country know this problem better, perhaps, than anyone else. In their brief to the royal commission which sat in Sydney when it began its work, the miners of Nova Scotia strongly emphasized the necessity of nationalization of that industry. They have no illusions. They have had boards and commissions for thirty years, but nothing came out of it. It was the same old story: pour more money into the coffers of Dominion Steel and Coal, another deficit for them to show at the end of the year as a plea that "we can't pay wages, we can't fix our houses, we can't do anything but sit tight, put pressure on the federal government and squeeze more money out of them." Not a sales agent in the field, but send a wire to Ottawa for new markets and get a delegation of citizens to go there to plead for them. The government has pap-fed them so long now that they sit back and consider themselves your baby, and you continue to hand them the milk-bottle. The industry to-day is completely inefficient and mismanaged, simply because the federal government has given them the money necessary to increase their depreciation at the end of the year, to put money in the reserve fund and to juggle profits from one subsidiary to the other.

I should like to see as quickly as possible the federal government take that industry over, set up the boards I have mentioned, ask the cooperation of the miners of Nova Scotia in putting the industry back on its feet, get a proper valuation of it, squeeze the water out of the stock, and zone the markets of this country that are fairly economical in so far as their industry is concerned. In my opinion if these things were done the labour relations would improve. I believe you can make money in this industry. It is one of our greatest natural resources; it has to be maintained; but I cannot see why the taxpayers of this country should spend millions of dollars a year in subsidizing an industry where the head of the company draws an annual salary of $100,000, another fellow draws a salary of $75,000 a year, and so all the way down the line; and they spend four or five months every year down in Florida fanning themselves with a panama "under the bamboo tree." That kind of person is not necessary. The taxpayers of Canada should not pay such salaries to people who have badly mismanaged one of our greatest resources.

I am going to conclude by urging the federal government to take the necessary steps to give back to the people of Canada a resource which belongs to them, which was deeded over to private interests without asking the people anything about it, which has been badly mismanaged under the system of free enterprise, which has gone down to nothing, which as far as the federal government is concerned has been on relief for the last twenty-five years. It is time the federal government took it over and earnestly considered restoring it to the people, putting it back on its feet, making what money can be made from it and passing the returns back to the people of the industry and the people of Canada in the way of social services.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I ask the hon. member a question, purely as a matter of information, and quite aside from the merit of the argument he has been making with respect to taking over these mines?

Mr. GILLIS: Certainly.

Mr. BRACKEN: The hon. member gave the figure of the production per man per day of coal as being 1·66 tons last year and 1·58 at present. Can he tell us what the average production per man is in Great Britain, and also in some of the better mines of the United States—just as a matter of information.

Mr. GILLIS: Yes. They are away above that.

Mr. BRACKEN: Has the hon. member the figures?

Mr. GILLIS: I have not the actual figures here, but speaking from memory, the United States production is away up, about three times as much.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is about seven tons a day. I can give the approximate figure. I am speaking from memory, but I do not think I am far out. It is down now to almost a ton per man per day in Great Britain. It is just over seven tons in the United States, and I think it is a fraction over three tons in western Canada. Of course there is a reason for this disparity, a reason it is quite easy to give. Mining in the United States is somewhat different. You get there the strip operations and open pits.

Mr. BRACKEN: What was the most production per man in the more favourable days in Nova Scotia?

Mr. GILLIS: It was up around three or four tons. Of course as far as Great Britain is concerned the explanation is that their mines are worked out. They are old seams; they are submarine; they are difficult, and the further you go into them the longer your hauls, so your production per man per day necessarily drops.

Mr. BRACKEN: And the same applies here?

Mr. GILLIS: The same applies in Nova Scotia. New openings are necessary in Nova Scotia. Conditions in the United States, of course, are not comparable at all. It is a straight mechanized electrified proposition. In many instances they just run a steam shovel in the side of a mountain and shovel out the coal.

Mr. COLDWELL: Or they strip the seam.

[Mr. Gillis.]

Mr. GILLIS: Or they strip the seam. The grand average is taken for the industry. Conditions here are less favourable. Nevertheless this is one of our great natural resources and we have to take it as it is. This is the way we shall have to do it. The economy of the province is based on coal. Either you have got to rehabilitate it and put it on its feet, or you must start to move the people of Nova Scotia out of that province. I am reasonably sure that with a proper capital investment and a few new openings in Nova Scotia the industry can be rehabilitated. But you are not going to get that capital investment from the present operators.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): I certainly appreciate the opportunity which has been given to the House of Commons to speak on mining in general. I was surprised to some extent by what I heard from the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis), although I must praise him for bringing forward so forcibly the situation of the section of the mining industry in which his province and indeed the whole of Canada is vitally interested, namely coal mining. But I know he will realize that I am not digressing if I discuss mining in general, including gold mining, in which my own section is more particularly interested.

Before I go further, however, may I say that I believe I sense in the remarks of the mover of this resolution something a little milder than might have been heard two or three years ago. I read some of the propaganda which was made by the Socialist party in Great Britain during the general election last fall. Speaking of the question of nationalization of coal mines in Great Britain, the supporters of that party were not backward in telling the British electors that if they were put into power the coal problem would be settled immediately. It was pleasing indeed to me this afternoon when the hon. member for Cape Breton South realized and recognized that it might take some time, even some years, to settle the problems of the coal mining industry in Canada. This surely applies to Great Britain also. At one time the British electors were led to believe that the moment the party got into power the question would be solved immediately.

Mr. COLDWELL: No.

Mr. BRADETTE: I want to complete my thought. It is always easier to theorize and criticize when you have not the responsibility of government. I say that without any bitterness of spirit or any idea of criticism. Our friends of the C.C.F. have that experience in Saskatchewan to-day. In the distant future

they may have it in Canada. They may have the responsibility of government. They may theorize at the present time on problems that seem easy of solution, but they may find them awfully hard to solve when they have the responsibility of office.

I read British periodicals and papers of Conservative and Socialist inclinations. Even to-day the British consumers and the British people generally are far from satisfied with the coal situation. The government, through Mr. Attlee, the Prime Minister, and some of his ministers, have told the people, and rightly so, to be patient. They have asked them to endure the same sacrifices that they experienced during the war. In that they are right again. I make this statement deliberately. We all realize that it is much easier to make promises than to fulfil them the moment a party gets into power. I do not say that as an alibi for the shortcomings of my own party. They have been in power for a long time, and they realize the heavy responsibilities that fall not only upon the shoulders of the government and the representatives of the party in the house but also upon the shoulders of parliament.

I want to compliment the hon. member for Cape Breton South on presenting so eloquently and warmly the case for the coal miners and the coal mining industry in general. However, to him the solution is lamentably simple, and that applies to his party generally. Of course we are used to that in the House of Commons.

During the debate on the speech from the throne an amendment was proposed by the historical—it is not historical now; it is too new a party for that—Progressive Conservative party. The amendment suggested that it was possible to solve all the problems of Canada by following some of the policies of the Progressive Conservative party. Then there was a subamendment brought forward and ably presented by the C.C.F. party. Their formula was the simplest one possible: all you had to do was to socialize all industries and all activities in Canada. If that were done you would have a new earthly paradise as far as this country was concerned. All problems would be solved. Later on the able leader of the Social Credit party introduced a subamendment. They are sincere also in their proposals. I studied their policies. I even studied their basic dividends, which none of my relatives in Alberta ever received, although the party promised that it would be the solution of all problems. To their way of thinking the amendment they offered would solve all the problems of this country. It would be done by one simple amendment, one simple gesture. It does not work that way, Mr. Speaker. In my opinion that is one of the weaknesses of democracy.

I was speaking to some fine young men and women the day before yesterday in my office, —the youth movement. I said to them: "As Canadians are you ready to make the sacrifices that the Russian people are called upon to make at the present time for their government and for their country?" In Canada we apparently do not appreciate the benefits of democracy. Generally speaking we are ready and willing to take all the benefits, but very few of us are ready and willing to accept the necessary sacrifices to make it a going concern.

If we have a socialist government next year, or ten years from now, that government will soon find out the solution does not lie in a simple socialist formula.

What is the import of the resolution? It reads as follows:

> Whereas private enterprise in the development of the mineral resources of Canada has not operated in the best interests of all of the people of Canada either in time of peace or in time of war;
>
> Therefore be it resolved that, in the opinion of this house, the government should consider the advisability of bringing the developed and undeveloped mineral resources of Canada under government control and operation.

This is a far-reaching resolution. If it were approved by parliament it would mean that all Canadians would be led and governed by the government. If you socialize the mineral resources of the country you must of necessity, in my opinion, include all the industries. If my hon. friends are sincere, if they want to go the whole show, as they may some day, they would put a resolution on the order paper calling for the socialization of land. One step leads to the other. You cannot socialize mining, you cannot single out one industry without socializing the whole, the manufacturing industries and so forth. The next step would be socialized farming.

To my way of thinking there is no simple remedy, no one formula to solve the problem. Democracy, as we understand it and practise it in this country and as it is practised in some parts of Europe, learns by its shortcomings and by its errors, and by constructive criticism and by speeches such as we had this afternoon. Through these processes it finds the solution to some of the big problems that have to be faced at the present time. Those problems will never be solved by appealing to demagoguery and promising a new heaven on earth.

One thing I deplore in intelligent and capable people is that for purely political reasons they find it advisable to decry Canada, to

speak of other countries, such as Sweden, which we all respect, to speak of countries such as Norway, Australia, New Zealand and so forth, telling us that they are away ahead of us and much better countries in which to live. So far as I am concerned I am satisfied to live in Canada. I think it is the best country under the sun. You will never have a human system which is absolutely perfect. We shall never solve our problems by appeals to passion and promising pie in the sky. During the last federal election in my section of the country we had two fine C.C.F. candidates, one in Temiskaming and the other in Cochrane. One of them was a high-school teacher, a well-qualified, highly-respected citizen. The other was a prosperous pharmacist from Kirkland Lake. Every time I listened to their speeches on the radio I found that they never had a word of praise for their own country. I said to the people of my constituency: "Where is the Canadianism of these two men? Surely there must be something good in Canada. At some time, either in the not distant past or in the near future, there will be something that Canadians should be proud of." But never, never at any time, did they find it possible to utter a word of praise for what Canada had been doing. It was always a country some thousands of miles away from Canada which they praised. They never gave a bit of credit to their own country. I am not speaking politically when I say that, because they did not give any credit to the Liberal party; but at least they could have given some credit to the Canadian people who live here, who want to make it a bigger and better country. These were the only objections I had to their campaign. I have no advice to give to any party, but I do not believe in pessimism. I believe in optimism. I believe in a reformed progressive capitalistic system.

I come from a section of the country where we have been fighting the elements, fighting with nature, where you run by yourself with very little help from any government. We want the country to do as much as it possibly can. It will be no solution to the coal mining problem of Canada for the government to take it over overnight. To my mind the solution would be the finest cooperation possible between the federal and provincial governments, the unions and the owners of these mines. They are all Canadians and they want to build up this country.

The hon. member for Cape Breton South used the old cliche that somebody gets $100,000 a year. He knows quite well that nobody gets $100,000 a year without the Minister of Finance taking seventy-five per cent of it. Then he used the old cliche of their going down to Florida and fanning their faces with a panama hat. I know he wants to be fair. I had to send some of my poor relatives to Florida and I had to go into debt on account of it, but they went down for their health. People do not always go there for pleasure. I deplore any such luxuries and extravagances also, but I do not believe it is fair to group together all the people who happen to be owners and say they are all doing these things, while the fact is that most of them are trying their best to make this a bigger and better Canada. I do not think it is fair to try to make others believe these people are not playing the game with the workers of their particular section of the country. I am making these statements sincerely; I know we are going through strenuous times, but I repeat that these problems will never be solved by any such simple formula.

I could tell the house of perhaps three or four mine owners in my own section of Canada who have been practically a disgrace to the country, and who have done harm to its economy and to the capitalistic system; but they form an infinitesimal minority. Where you get one of these men acting in that way you have hundreds or thousands of others who play the game with everyone. I well remember travelling with a member of the C.C.F. party when the war expenditures committee went to Sault Ste. Marie. I am sure he was quite sincere when te told me, "I realize that to-day no man could become president of a corporation like that purely by accident." Surely it is not fair to this parliament to try to make people believe that because a person happens to be a mine owner or a mine president he is dissipating in California or Florida, or something like that. I resent such statements. They will not help this country generally. I know our hearts go out to those who suffer. I have every sympathy with the miners mentioned by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, just as I have sympathy for my own people if they do not receive justice. I have spent weeks and months at a time with my own men in the lumber camps, to see that they received the consideration they deserved.

Mr. PROBE: Was the hon. member subsidized by the government when he was doing that?

Mr. BRADETTE: Subsidized for what?

Mr. PROBE: When you were doing this work about which you are speaking?

Mr. BRADETTE: Oh, no, I did that on my own, as the member for my riding and as a citizen of this country. I thought it was my duty to stay with the men, to go with them to the camps to see what the living conditions were, in order that anything that was wrong might be rectified. But if I had gone before these men and said, "Yes, you should keep on striking because the general manager of the Spruce Falls mill is getting $40,000 a year," for instance, would that have helped the situation? Would that have helped these men? Not at all. We went to these higher authorities and told them both the wages and the working conditions were unsatisfactory, and in most cases we won our points.

I am speaking sincerely on this subject, because I believe my constituency is one of the greatest gold mining centres in Canada, if not on the north American continent. I will not mention the names of the men who are at the head of these gold mines, but the hon. member for Cape Breton South was there last winter; no doubt he met some of them and spoke with them, and he must have been struck with their humanitarianism. The homes of most of these general superintendents are open day and night to any of the men; not their offices but their homes. They have made mistakes at times, because, after all, they are human, but they have tried to rectify those mistakes.

Mr. GILLIS: I was not talking about superintendents, because, after all, they are workers too. I am talking about the fellow who lives in Westmount, in Montreal, and who does not see the mine.

Mr. BRADETTE: Well, you go and speak to these men in Westmount. They will tell you they are workers too. Everyone is working in his own way. We cannot all have the same occupation. We are working as members of parliament, sitting here this afternoon discussing the problems of the moment. We call ourselves workers. Men who work in the bush or on the drive would say we were having a wonderful time, not doing anything. You cannot apply the same standard to every walk of life, to all the activities of human beings. I do not make that statement with any feeling, because I repeat that I appreciate the fact that the hon. member has brought the situation of the coal mining industry of Canada to the attention of this country. In our section we are far away from the coal mines, and naturally we have to pay high prices for the coal we use in our industries.

Let me give the house another example of what public ownership has done in my part of the country. Twenty-five or thirty years ago some fine old prospectors—and God bless them; they are doing wonderful work for this country—found a great lignite field in northern Ontario. Immediately they came to our section they raised money among themselves; they went back again to stake the land and so on. Then, and I do not say this in a critical way because I believe it was done with the very best intentions, Hon. Charles McCrea, an outstanding man who was in Mr. Ferguson's cabinet, expropriated that lignite field without any compensation at all to those of us who had put money into it. Very high hopes were entertained that the government was going to see that the lignite field would be worked and exploited for the benefit of the people. That was over twenty-five years ago, but I do not believe we have seen more than three or four tons of that lignite coal. In connection with that field there has been more political gerrymandering than I have ever seen anywhere else. All governments have to take some blame for that situation, because they all went in and made an awful mess of it. I maintain that if private interests had been allowed to invest capital and take a chance there, as we do in our own mining section, the needs of northern Ontario to-day would be largely supplied from that lignite field. I am sure the Ontario members who are listening to me will agree with that statement.

Talk about public ownership of mines! We all remember the old, historic town of Cobalt, where silver mining boomed for many years. When it was at its peak the Ontario government, again with the best of intentions, expropriated one of these mines which was to be run by the government. What happened? Prior to being expropriated that mine was showing a fine surplus each year. After being operated by the Ontario government, for a year and a half it had such large deficits they had to close up the mine and get out of the mining business.

I give these examples in order that the house may realize the exact situation. I repeat that I think there is only one solution of the problems of the coal mining industry, which is so vital to our economy; and that solution is not an easy one. We realize that with all the coal we have in the east and the west most of our industries in southern Ontario have to use coal brought from Pennsylvania; and that applies even more forcibly to northern Ontario. It is true that coal has no nationality, and we have to do this because of transportation costs and also,

in many instances, because of the quality of the coal we must buy. So that if we are ever to solve the coal problem, of which my hon. friend spoke so eloquently, we must find some method by which it will be possible to get that fine Nova Scotia coal to both southern and northern Ontario. If that could be done we would be your best customers and would readily buy all that coal we could use in order to help the miners of Nova Scotia and strengthen the whole national economy of this country.

I have mentioned mining in general. I offer no excuse if for a few moments I speak of the gold mining of my own section, with which I am more familiar. Many people think gold mining is such a bonanza that one can put in a dollar and after a year or two be worth a million dollars. I know my hon. friends from Nipissing and Temiskaming, and others who have invested money in gold mining operations, have always come out losers. I know I have been a loser all the way through.

An hon. MEMBER: You should be a promoter.

Mr. BRADETTE: I must say to the hon. member that with all the regulations we have from Toronto, even promoters do not always come out on the right side. We have at Queens Park some fine, well trained watch-dogs. It is true that sometimes, through bucket-shop practices, some people may be fleeced, but that was never done with official sanction, whether we had a Progressive, a Conservative or a Liberal government in office. They have always tried to play fair with everybody. The gold mining industry means a great deal to our national economy, but it is highly speculative. I wish I could put on record how many people are making money in it, and how many people are always showing deficits. As hon. members all know, personal initiative means a very great deal in connection with gold mining, silver mining, nickel mining, or any metal mining development. No doubt many hon. members listening to me this afternoon have met prospectors, both old and young. How keen these men are; how they love their jobs. Could you visualize putting these men into government service as civil servants? Could you visualize a young prospector, who has his heart in the north country, being told, "Now, we are going to put you under a civil service organization. You are going to be allowed to go to this territory only so many days or so many weeks. Then you must come back and report." You could never have any real prospecting under such conditions.

[Mr. Bradette.]

Mr. GILLIS: But the government is sending them out now.

Mr. BRADETTE: Oh, no, not now. They are sending expert men to make a map geology analysis of the whole country, to show prospectors, promoters and others who may be interested the possibility of undertaking new ventures. Surely my hon. friends do not want to create the impression that this government has a special department of prospectors, who prospect for and promote the mines they find? It does not work out in that way. Again I say that the minute you make a businessman a civil servant for the rest of his life, just at that moment you lose most of his qualifications and ability for personal initiative.

Mr. GILLIS: You release him from bondage. You take him out of the hands of the companies.

Mr. BRADETTE: The word "bondage" may have different significance in different places. It sounds as though the hon. member wishes to create the impression that we in the north country are in the relationship of masters and slaves.

Mr. GILLIS: The hon. member mentioned prospectors. I said that the government all through this war and even at the present time have sent prospectors out all over the country, grub-staking them and financing them. Then, when they found something they had to come back and turn it over to one of the mining companies. Why not turn it over to the government?

Mr. BRADETTE: It was done under war conditions.

Mr. GILLIS: They are still doing it.

Mr. BRADETTE: Not on a large scale. To prove what I say, I shall place before the house some of the features about mining, particularly in my own section of the country. Prospecting for new minerals at the present time in Canada has all but ceased and, if the mining industry is to continue on any worthwhile basis, this unfortunate situation must be corrected immediately. Emphasizing the necessity for quick action is the fact that under war-time demands for maximum metal production, coupled with a labour shortage, development work at producing mines has been necessarily and drastically curtailed, and ore reserves are being dissipated at an accelerated pace.

We have all heard of Mr. LaBine, who went away up into the north country, into the far north, which most of the Canadian people knew nothing about. Most people thought it was too far away; they really did

not realize how far it was—up in the Great Bear lake district. But what a great thing it was for the world when there were found pitchblende, the ore from which radium is derived, and uranium.

Would that have been done under the civil service? Would it have been done by men who were paid by the government at so much an hour or so much a day? Great sacrifices were made by the men who went there. At the present time we have hundreds of young men in my section of the country—men from Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, men from every centre of population in Canada. Those men are preparing themselves, equipping themselves, to go into the wilderness, in among the flies and in the rain and bad weather, where they will have none of the comforts of life.

Why do they do it? They do it because they believe in private enterprise. They do it because they believe that to a certain extent we should work out our own salvation. Can we visualize their working for any government, provincial, municipal or federal, and working under those conditions? Can we visualize their asking for two or three months leave to do prospecting work of that kind? This applies to all walks of life.

I for one, of French descent, can never visualize the British people being absolutely tied down under the yoke of socialism or Marxism. The British empire, as we know it, would never have developed or would never have been built under a principle of socialism, because socialism simply means this, that the individual loses his identity. That would, generally speaking, be absolutely repugnant to the British people. Without trying to prophesy, I am certain that never in Great Britain, even under a so-called socialistic government will they have absolute state socialism. That is my belief, so far as that country is concerned.

This brings up some strange things. I wish the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) were in his seat at the moment. He made certain references the other day to the royal family which, perhaps, I shall have another occasion to mention.

Some people are inclined to the view that the mining industry generally is making large profits. I well remember the days when Viscount Bennett was prime minister of this country. At that time, ignoring the advice of an able minister from my northern section of the country, a gentleman who was then minister of labour, Hon. Wesley Gordon, a bullion tax was put on gold. It was thought that this would be good policy, and that it would be a popular move. But the first thing he knew, not only did he have the mining interests coming to Ottawa with their protests, but in addition he had the prospectors. He had the investors, the retailers, the wholesalers, the manufacturers—all of them were coming here and telling him it was a mistake. After a few months the government was honest enough to withdraw that bullion tax. Yes, it looked good on paper, because people are always thinking in terms of profits of gold mining or nickel mining; but it did not work out in practice.

The hon. member for Cape Breton South has shown, and rightly so, that the coal mining industry at the present time is not in a position to produce all it should, or to permit working conditions which should be permitted. That bullion tax was taken away because it would destroy the initiative of those connected with mining operations.

I have no doubt that everyone is interested in gold mining in this country. I can well remember the hon. member who formerly represented the constituency of Grey-Bruce, Miss Agnes Macphail, being invited to speak at the commencement exercises which took place in the vocational school at Timmins. In her opening remarks she said, "You are a strange people up here in the north country. You sweat and work day and night all your lives to extract these things from the earth; then you ship it down to our section of the country and we bury it in the ground." Then George Drew—not the premier of Ontario, but another George Drew, who was mayor of Timmins—said this to Miss Macphail: "Well, what you say is possibly true. But I understand you come from a section of the country where you produce large quantities of tobacco. Up here we buy that tobacco at fair prices—sometimes at high prices—and turn it into ashes and smoke." This shows that in a national economy there is a necessity for all manner of activities which may be found within the boundaries of a country.

Regardless of what some of my Social Credit friends may say, there is a sound reason for gold mining in Canada. If that industry were denied to the country, we would realize what a tremendous influence it has had. For instance, in my own section alone there are tens of thousands of people who are interested and employed in gold mining. More than that, we have always a ready market for our product. Surely we should be the last to destroy a community which has that gold production. Indeed, the whole world seems to have been satisfied with the find which was made in South Africa only a few days ago.

So that it shows there is no special privilege given to this industry. There was a member in the house at one time who represented one

of the Winnipeg seats—I believe it was Mr. Heaps, who is now in the government employ—who discussed the bullion tax, and referred to gold mining as a sheltered industry. I rose in my place immediately and said that there was certainly no shelter so far as gold mining is concerned. They have never wanted anything from any government. All they want is to live their own lives and to be dealt with fairly by government in matters of taxation.

One cannot visualize the government's going into mining. Let us picture the government spending the public's money and then, after a year or two of functioning, finding out that the venture was not what had been expected, with the result that the property would be left as it was in the first instance, possibly after losing a million dollars. Let us remember that in Flin Flon private capital and private enterprise spent about $30 million before it was in a position to produce.

What can the government do? Will it spend $30 million on a venture? Let us suppose that it does venture, and does spend $30 million on something which proves to be a fizzle, on a property where the ore bed did not measure up to expectations, and where the country has to spend large sums of money for nothing. These are the things we must remember when we think of mining.

Let me say this, too, that governments have very few qualities of human beings, but very many of their faults—and that applies to all governments. For instance, let us consider nazism. Would any citizen of any country of his own initiative, through the activities of a single man, allow youth to be destroyed by the millions and tens of millions? That is what is done by governments. Can you visualize, for instance, what would have happened in England if there had been nationalization of industry at the time of the invention of the steam engine and the internal combustion engine? Can you visualize the government investing $5,000,000,000 to replace equipment that would be discarded almost overnight? It has never been done and it will never be done.

I repeat that I believe implicitly in the closest possible cooperation. Of necessity we must revolutionize our capitalistic system, but in doing that the workers will have to make some sacrifices, management will have to make sacrifices, and every citizen of this country will have to make sacrifices in order to make it a going concern.

You will never hear a whisper of a strike from the workers or farmers in Russia. I am not here to discuss communism or the internal policies of that wonderful country, but no one can make me believe that in Russia they enjoy the same liberties that are enjoyed in Canada or in other sections of the world. The Russian government has instilled into the minds of its people the necessity of sacrifice by everyone for the good of the whole, and they are doing it. We will never deprive the workers of their right to strike when it is necessary to strike. More than that, we will never deprive any section of our population of full access to our governmental machinery. But even in times like the present, every section of the population must be prepared to make some sacrifice in order that we may arrive at a solution of the problems of peace.

I should like to give a few figures in connection with metal production in Ontario in 1941. Of the mineral production 76·4 per cent was derived from mineral areas discovered prior to 1910. We have to be careful with our mining industry. We do not want to destroy it. Some of the older mining fields have been worked out. The hon. member for Cape Breton South has referred to places in which there are ramshackle buildings, but those are in districts in which the mines have been worked out. Some hon. members may remember the old town of Cobalt, although many are too young to have seen it in its best days. In the past few years that district has been deteriorating because the mining is playing out. Of the mineral production 13·2 per cent was derived from mineral areas discovered between 1910 and 1920; 4·3 per cent was derived from mineral areas discovered between 1920 and 1930, and only 6·1 per cent was derived from mineral areas discovered since 1930. I am putting these figures on *Hansard* because I am afraid that a resolution of this kind may scare away some of the capital which is necessary for the development of our own section of the country.

I can remember when Mr. Howard Ferguson was minister of mines and forests for Ontario. He went over to the United States and was able to interest $15,000,000 worth of capital in the development of the natural resources of the province. Those men were willing to risk their money. Many risks have been taken in connection with mining. Mining is not wholly on a dividend basis. Hon. members will probably be surprised to know that the Ontario records show that 2,800 claims were recorded during the period of 1907-41 inclusive for each company which paid one or more dividends. There was a total of 317 companies which reached production, but only 113 reached the taxpaying stage in any amount. Only 1·8

per cent of some 4,426 organizations formed for precious metal mining were sufficiently successful to make any return whatsoever to their shareholders. It will be noted in this connection that not all of this 1·8 per cent could be considered to have been economically successful.

Before concluding I should like to make a few remarks about private and public enterprise. I come from a section of the country in which we have had to stand on our own feet as far as development is concerned. We could never have developed our forests and our mines if we had had to wait for the government of the day, whoever they might have been, to carry on this development. I have always been in favour of the Ontario hydro, but I should like to make a statement which may astonish some hon. members. I have farmed and resided in northern Ontario, in the Cochrane district, for nearly forty years, and still we have not the benefit of the Ontario hydro. During that period the provincial treasury has paid $10,000,000 to subsidize rural lines in southern Ontario. I have no quarrel with that because I am perfectly satisfied that the farmers of southern Ontario should enjoy the full benefit of the Ontario hydro, but we in the north country have helped to pay for the hydro lines in southern Ontario and we receive no benefits. I can remember going to Toronto and appearing before the hydro commission to inquire what they were going to do about providing hydro for our part of the country and I was always given the answer that the field was too speculative.

The fine industrial town of Kapuskasing was built by private enterprise. The Porcupine and Kirkland Lake districts, the Rouyn-Noranda district, and the Sudbury district, were all developed by private capital and private enterprise. These private enterprises have paid taxes into the provincial treasury, which taxes have helped to support the Ontario hydro. I am not criticizing that; besides, this is not the time to go too deeply into that matter. However, I want hon. members to know that the Ontario hydro has paid no taxes whereas the private corporations have.

Private enterprise took its money into the wilderness and gambled with it. Private enterprise has had to pay all the taxes I have mentioned. Only two years ago the Ontario hydro expropriated the Northern Power Company at Timmins and immediately the town of Timmins found itself short $35,000 in municipal taxes. I want hon. members to realize that it is not all so golden and rosy as some people would have us believe. If we had had to wait for the Ontario hydro to develop northern Ontario, we would be waiting yet.

There must be cooperation between private enterprise and governmental activities, but I do not believe, nor do I think the majority of Canadian people believe, that the solution of the problems of this country will be arrived at by socializing our mining and other industries, and eventually our land. If you socialize one section of the national activities, you must socialize others. I should like to quote H. D. Ainley, of the C.C.F. who said:

> The C.C.F. has considered socialization of land. . . There are many advantages to the farmer from some form of socialism . . . We can learn much from Russia in this respect . . . Social security cannot be obtained as long as we leave control of our production in the hands of private individuals.

That is going pretty far. I believe if that language were repeated to the western farmers they would not fall in with such a system.

Mr. COLDWELL: What is the hon. gentleman reading?

Mr. BRADETTE: I am quoting Mr. H. D. Ainley.

Mr. COLDWELL: Never heard of him.

Mr. BRADETTE: Mr. H. D. Ainley on agricultural policy.

Mr. COLDWELL: He is a private member of the organization. We do not smother people's views if they want to express them.

Mr. POULIOT: Yesterday evening it was not the same thing.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not smother his views; I repudiated them.

Mr. BRADETTE: Here is another statement by the C.C.F.:

> We cannot definitely state how much land a man will be allowed to hold. We propose that land socialization shall be voluntary.

Mr. COLDWELL: Who said that?

Mr. BRADETTE: That is from the C.C.F. Saskatchewan farmer-labour group hand book, 1933. Then the following statement was made at the annual convention of the British Columbia C.C.F. on April 17, 1943:

> Collective agriculture by the institution of methods of collective farming, such as have featured Soviet Russia's system, and by the creation of a provincial government monopoly in the purchase, processing and wholesaling of farm products, both those grown here and those imported.

These are definite words. I am just quoting them to the house to make hon. members realize that once you get started you cannot

stop half-way. Natural resources belong primarily to the provinces. If the resolution were adopted by the government there would immediately be conflict with the provinces. The provincial premiers, the premier of Ontario, the premier of Quebec and the premier of Saskatchewan, who are always ready to fight for provincial rights, would be among the first to protest against such nationalization. I know the ability and energy and honesty of purpose of the premier of Saskatchewan because I have listened to him for years in this house. No one can doubt his sincerity of purpose but even he has not honesty of purpose of the premier of Saskatchewan. He has picked out a few industries but has not extended the field of socialization to mining. He has not even yet expropriated land for collective farming. I know enough of the western farmers to know that the moment any government sought to introduce collective farming there would be a terrific revolt because every farmer wants to own his own farm. No one can tell me that the western farmers are ready for socialization of farming.

Mr. COLDWELL: They do not have to be socialized because in this country a few people do not own all the land. The land is already socialized through individual ownership.

Mr. BRADETTE: That is only a relative statement. The hon. member, who is so capable, knows that I may have a mortgage on my home or a farmer may have a mortgage on his farm, and while the law might compel me to pay the mortgage, no government has the right to interfere with the property.

Mr. COLDWELL: Nobody wants to.

Mr. BRADETTE: The same principle applies to farms owned by the farmers of the west. They may have obligations on their land; but the land is theirs; their home is theirs, and even the King of England has no right to enter without permission. But under socialization it would be entirely different. Let us be fair. You cannot call it fish at one time and flesh at another; it must be the same at all times. Our problems are great and difficult, but I believe in the intelligence of our people. I believe that in this parliament and in our provincial legislatures it will be possible to find a solution of all our problems.

In conclusion, I just wish to say how grateful I am personally—and this applies to my section of the country—for the spirit in which the premiers of the provinces met with the dominion last year to discuss dominion-provincial relations. No part of this country is greater than the whole. Every member of this parliament is primarily a municipalist; that is, we believe in our own little town or big town, as the case may be, in our rural sections. Secondly, we are provincialists. But over and above all that, we stand for this wonderful country which is Canada, and I hope that when the premiers meet the dominion again the same spirit will animate them which prevailed in the last two conferences. That will be one of the best signs that we are going to develop into a still greater and better Canada.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to follow the argument of the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) because he dealt with coal mining. The resolution however, distinctly refers to the mineral resources of Canada, and that is the subject with which I wish to deal.

In my time I have had a lot to do with minerals of one kind and another, and I am familiar with all the difficulties experienced by prospectors, geologists and engineers in the discovery and opening up of our mineral resources. If what they have done could be written up it would be a romantic saga of their achievements.

The mining industry has been one of the great industries of Canada. I do not say that it is the greatest but it is one of our very great industries. It is one industry that has done a major job in opening up this country. If I may turn to the resolution for a moment it says:

> Whereas private enterprise in the development of the mineral resources of Canada has not operated in the best interests of all of the people of Canada either in time of peace or in time of war . . .

That is a very broad statement which could not possibly be proved in any way. I am opposed to the resolution because I am in favour of private enterprise and private initiative. I have seen in my lifetime the marvellous achievements of private enterprise and private initiative, and my opinion based on that experience is that it would be impossible to have much initiative or enterprise in the mining industry if it were taken over by the government. The achievements of the mining industry are the result of private enterprise and private initiative. I think of the men I have met in the far north, the prospectors, and what they went through, how they had to endure the black flies, or bulldogs as they called them, and huge mosquitoes, grandfather and grandmother mosquitoes as they called them, when there

was no such thing as Stayaway and other such liquids for protecting the human race against these pests; and when I think of all they went through and of what they achieved my hat goes off to them on every occasion. They never would have done it had it not been for private enterprise and private initiative. No man living would have endured what they endured if they were working for the government and had no chance of obtaining something for themselves through their own enterprise and initiative.

The resolution goes on to say:

Therefore be it resolved that, in the opinion of this house, the government should consider the advisability of bringing the developed and undeveloped mineral resources of Canada under government control and operation.

Your honour, that is such a stupendous order that, in my opinion, it is absolutely impossible for any government to undertake it. Think of the capital invested in the mining industry, at present between one and a quarter and one and one-half billion dollars, and employing anywhere from 115,000 to 150,000 people. To think of the government undertaking to control that amount of capital and make it pay and that number of employees just in one single industry—it is out of the question; it just could not be done. The whole industry would go to pieces under any such basis of operation.

There are three classes of minerals. There are, first, the precious metals, gold, silver, perhaps copper, nickel, aluminum, platinum and radium, if it is a mineral, and so on. Then there are the base metals, such as iron, lead and other minerals of that order. Then there are the industrial minerals, if they may be so called, such as gypsum, mica, feldspar, and in particular, dolomite, because from it we get a real mineral, magnesium metal. Each one of these classes is a wide study in itself; each one has a long history behind it and many ramifications. To me it is inconceivable that any government with the material it has at hand could direct or control, much less operate, production in these various lines of minerals. It takes all the ingenuity, skill, ability and experience of private enterprise to bring about production of the various kinds of minerals.

The last speaker said, quite rightly, that the mineral problem is largely under the jurisdiction of the provincial governments. Just how this government could step into Ontario, which produces 49·4 per cent of all the mineral production of Canada, or into any of the provinces which supply the remainder of the production, and undertake this class of production, I do not know. I do not know how they could operate under this resolution. This is provincial business, and we have difficulty enough in getting along now with the provinces, without any further interference in such a wide and large business as mining with all its ramifications of employment and laws in connection therewith. I do not believe it could be done. Therefore the resolution, in my opinion, could not be put into effect.

Take just one of the minerals which I have mentioned—nickel. In that industry anywhere from $170 million to $200 million is invested. There are employed in that industry approximately 15,000 men and women. How any government could undertake to operate the nickel industry I do not know. In the first place the government would have to obtain the capital necessary to take it over. In the second place it would be wholly out of the question for a government to operate the nickel industry with 15,000 people; a government would require not less than 30,000, probably 45,000. I believe the ratio as between government and private industry operation is as three to one. This, of course, would provide some additional employment, but it would also certainly add to the cost of production and make it impossible to compete in the world's markets. I suppose it could be contended that this is not wholly true of the nickel industry, because Canada contains not less than ninety per cent of the world's nickel resources. But, as the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette) pointed out, if we socialized the mineral industry the process would not stop there. We would have to socialize every industry. Just fancy the government operating every industry in Canada! It is utterly out of the question.

I am perhaps more familiar with the iron and steel industry. At the moment Canada does not produce a great deal of iron ore, but we are rapidly getting along, and we are going to produce more. In recent months I have been to some big iron mines and before long they will be producing a great deal of iron; other large new mines are about to be opened up. The iron and steel industry has invested in it something like $235 million and it employs approximately 35,000 employees. When you start socializing a nation's industries you get into astronomical figures. At the moment these industries are handled and operated by tried and trained men, men who could not possibly work under government direction. I would no more work under government direction in industry than I would fly up in the air. Once I was required to lose my initiative, my right to initiate private enterprise, I would get out of the business immediately. Therein lies the difference between private enterprise and government operation.

If I might speak personally, I know one man, engaged in processing raw iron into the finished product, who wore himself out and had to go to hospital for four months to recover, from sitting up all hours of the night, and even thinking in bed after he got there, trying to figure out methods of production of a particular form of lathe, a machine which did more than any other individual instrument in Canadian industry toward winning the war. It is inconceivable that any government employee would sit up all night long, week in and week out, trying to determine how to achieve this or that. It would not be done; it is not done outside of private industry. But it takes both private industry and private initiative to achieve what this country has achieved. I have a thorough knowledge of that in connection with the iron industry. I was in it; I myself worked all hours of the night, week out and week in, to discover and process plans for the production of the lines of material I was in. No one could conceive of employees of the government doing that. You would not expect them to do it. They are not employed to do it. They are employed to carry out the directions of the departments, and do it well, and no country in the world is served better by its public employees than Canada is. I have the highest regard and respect for them. But I would never expect them to go through what I went through when I was in industry, or what a multitude of others whom I know went through.

I remember when, a few years ago, gold was increased in value. The hon. member for Cochrane, whose riding I know well, has spoken of gold. I have spent considerable time at the Lake Shore mines, at Wright Hargreaves, Macassa, in the Lake Shore area, at the Hollinger, Dome and other mines in the Timmins area. This country owes a vast amount of respect for what the mining industry of northern Ontario has accomplished. At that time the price of gold was, I believe, $20.67 per fine ounce. The world was in the throes of the depression. Through the efforts of our own government here, the then prime minister, Mr. Bennett, and the then president of the United States, as well as others, a conference was organized in London at which the price of gold was raised to what it is now, namely $35 plus exchange, or $38.50 Canadian per fine ounce. What was the result? It broke the back of the depression. That is what started the world on its way again, and that is one thing we owe the mining industry. The amount of purchases made by this industry is almost inconceivable.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

Think of the thousand and one items of manufactured material which have gone, for example, into northern Ontario, as one great mining area, or into the Flin Flon area, or into the Yellowknife area, where there are great gold fields. Materials purchased by these gold mines, initiated and operated by private enterprise, have kept thousands of factories in operation in eastern Canada. To my mind, anything which interferes in any way with the initiating of new mines of any description would be bad for this country. Yet this resolution calls for taking over not only the present mines, but potential ones. That is a large order and would be detrimental to this country. I do not believe that capital would come into this country and open up new mines under such a programme. Any restrictions on the mining industry that would interfere with the investment of capital will not get my support. We need more capital to open up more and more mines. Any restrictions on that would be detrimental to this country.

I have no option but to oppose any resolution such as this. The hon. member for Cape Breton South is an earnest man. I have sat on many committees with him and I have always found that he used his own best judgment. He was always sincere and earnest in what he proposed in the committees. All I can say with regard to this resolution is that perhaps he has not had the wide business experience that is required to discuss a matter of industrial advance. I believe that he is wrong in so far as the terms of this resolution are concerned. If he had mentioned ways and means of expanding the mining industry, as I believe it can be expanded in Canada, for there is no country in the world that has such incomparable mineral resources, then I could have supported him.

The mining industry can be expanded. Some hon. member mentioned sending out more and more geologists. That is one way in which it could be done. More geologists should be sent out. Another hon. member said that in the last few years the government has been sending young men into the mining areas during the holidays. I supported that because it gives them an opportunity to learn how to prospect. When they return to the universities—the great majority of them are university students—the experience they have gained in the field will help them in their studies, and when they finish their studies they will be much more capable of achieving success in the prospecting they undertake.

In addition to increasing the number of prospectors, I would increase the number of

geologists and mining engineers. That is one way in which we can advance this country. If we develop our mines we develop our country. I am sure that the hon. member for Cape Breton South is just as anxious as I am to increase the mining industry in Canada. He knows as well as I do that in that way we can expand industry all over Canada, because in some way or another, in the last analysis, much of our industry is associated with the mining industry.

Some time ago I advocated a plan whereby the federal government could assist the provincial governments in the development of roads in the mining areas. I was happy to learn that my suggestion was carried out in connection with mining areas in northern Ontario. I do not say that the government should finance it, but they should do something to assist the local provincial governments in the development of mining roads. It will be remembered that as a result of a recommendation in this house the roadway from Hawk Junction in northern Ontario was extended to the Helen Mountain iron mine where they are turning out about 750,000 tons of siderite ore a year, which, when smelted, produces about 250,000 tons of No. 1 pig iron. In that way the government can help. I would support the government taking other means to make it easier for investors to get into the mining areas, and for the mining companies to expand those areas and then get the raw product out to the market. That is one way in which we can assist in the opening of our mining areas. I take a strong stand on this, because industry in this part of Canada is frequently engaged in making large machines for the mines. That is true all over Canada. I remember when I last visited Yellowknife. I saw on the docks large amounts of iron and steel equipment made in Dundas by the Bertram company. It was shipped to the Yellowknife for use in some of the mines in that area. That is the way the country expands. We open up new areas. Orders come here which mean jobs for men in the factories in the eastern part of Canada. From your own city, sir, a large amount of mining machinery is shipped to northern Ontario, to Flin Flon, to the Yellowknife, to the Yukon and to British Columbia, which is also a great mining country.

I believe one or two other hon. members wish to speak on this resolution and I think they should have an opportunity. I am opposed to this resolution because I am for private enterprise and private initiative. I am for government assistance in every legitimate way to open up the country and provide jobs.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): I think I should take just a few minutes to place before the house the views of my group regarding this resolution. If the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) had brought in a resolution regarding the coal situation in Canada and had confined it to that subject I am satisfied that coal would have received much better consideration here this afternoon than will possibly be the case when it is attempted to discuss this resolution as it is placed on the order paper. I am happy that the hon. member brought it forward, however, and I am pleased at the indications of widespread concern over the coal situation. However, I shall not be able, in the few minutes that I shall speak, to deal with coal in any comprehensive way. I must confine myself largely to the principle of the resolution itself.

Before I enter into that part of the discussion, I should like to refer briefly to one or two matters which were brought up in the course of the remarks of the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette). I should like to point out to him that if his memory is so bad that he has in his mind only the one principle of the national dividend which has been advocated by the social credit organization, I would suggest that he improve himself by a little more reading and studying, because nobody in this organization has ever said that the implementing of a system of national dividends would solve all our problems. That principle is only one of a whole series that makes up the complete philosophy of social credit.

We believe in a system of economic and political democracy. Our philosophy is comprehensive and complete, a philosophy of life. We are in no way merely monetary reformers. We in no way advocate a single, simple solution of our complex problems in this land. We know they are complex, and we know no single thing will solve all these problems. But we do say, and with very good reason and evidence to support our assertion, that if the principles advocated by the social credit organization were applied we would set this old country on the road to peaceful prosperity. The rest of it would have to be worked out as we go along.

I was surprised that the hon. member took so much time to sideswipe the various political organizations represented in this house, of course with the exception of the Liberal organization, when he should have devoted

his time to a discussion of the resolution itself. Some of the arguments he presented in support of the mining of gold bear little weight. One would almost think he was pleading the cause of the gold people. As far as I am concerned I do not care whether another pound of gold is ever mined in this or any other country. I am satisfied that the thousands of people now engaged in the gold mining industry in Canada could find work just as lucrative, just as pleasant, and just as congenial in some other field that would yield a much better return to the whole world. I never saw anyone who could eat gold. I never saw anyone who could clothe himself in gold. I never saw anyone who was very happy when he was involved in the intricacies of gold. I have yet to see anyone successfully demonstrate that gold is of vast importance in our national economy as the hon. member suggests. I am going to leave my remarks with respect to the hon. member's address at that.

I wish to point out briefly, Mr. Speaker, that I look upon this resolution as one more step toward the centralization of power in the hands of the federal government. I am opposed to this principle on the ground that true democracy simply cannot exist under centralization of authority. The best guarantee of good administration, good government and the orderly development of our resources is to decentralize as far as possible. If this resolution had been brought forward in one of the provincial legislatures; if rather than federal government ownership, it had provided for further decentralization so that the municipalities of that province might have more or less say in the control and development of the resources, then I would have given it sympathetic support. Let me point out that the western provinces, particularly Alberta and Saskatchewan, were not granted control of their resources in 1905, when they became provinces. Their resources were left in the hands, and under the administration, of the federal government under a system of completely centralized control and ownership. I would point out also that it was a very real government ownership. Nobody owned, and nobody controlled, except the federal government. During the twenty-five year period from 1905 to 1930 the dominion government demonstrated what happens when centralization takes place and when a central government attempts to own, control and develop the resources. It left to Alberta and Saskatchewan a legacy of complicated problems and disabilities which it will take many decades to clear away.

[Mr. Low.]

What are some of these problems? In a short discussion of these matters I cannot confine my remarks merely to the mineral resources, but what I have to say in general about the resources of the province of Alberta will, of course, hold true for the mineral resources. The first problem created, which has complicated the lives of the people in Saskatchewan and Alberta, was the haphazard land settlement policy of the federal government, which owned and controlled those lands in those two western provinces. They allowed, yes, encouraged, the building of widespread communities, some of them hundreds of miles apart in the hinterland, in the wild, undeveloped areas of the provinces. There was no orderly settlement, no orderly policy of settlement and there could not be with the government three thousand miles away, having no intimate association or knowledge of conditions existing in those areas and, I might add, not very much interest. They allowed the settlement of marginal and sub-marginal land. Not only did they allow it; they encouraged the settlement of land in the Palliser triangle which they knew perfectly well was not fit for settlement. I say they knew this perfectly well. The Palliser report was in the hands of the federal government for a good many years prior to the time the settlement of that area was entered upon. But they brought in settlers just the same; they colonized the land largely through the homestead method.

I might just point out that the settlement of those marginal and sub-marginal lands has cost the people of Alberta fully $25,000,000 in rehabilitation alone. They have written off their books more than $16,000,000 of taxes, seed grain advances and relief advances. To rehabilitate those areas fully after this haphazard settlement will require many more millions. That settlement in Saskatchewan and Alberta was so poorly planned under federal government ownership, administration and development that in Alberta, for example, we have had to build 96,000 miles of roads to link up the scattered communities of the province, which in itself is no mean item when it comes to maintenance. So that I say I have yet to be convinced that government ownership and development is the policy we should follow.

The second problem is the alienation from the crown—the people—of not less than 50 per cent of the total mineral resources of Alberta. The people found they did not own even 50 per cent of the mineral resources, after those resources were returned to them in 1930. They had been given away as gifts to the Hudson's Bay company, to the Canadian

Pacific Railway company, to the C. and E. Corporation and others; and when it came to trying to obtain a fair share of the returns from the development of these resources the people of Alberta could not do so simply because under centralized federal government control and development those resources had been alienated from the crown and therefore from the people of the province.

Mr. PROBE: Is the hon. member arguing at this stage that this is an example of government ownership and control? It seems to me that would be a most flagrant case of government maladministration.

Mr. LOW: I am pointing it out as a fair sample of what we can expect if we centralize the development and control of resources in the hands of the federal government.

Mr. PROBE: Of the Liberal organization.

Mr. LOW: No doubt the C.C.F. would be entirely different.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member who has the floor may not be interrupted without his permission.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I am asking permission of the hon. gentleman, if he will allow me to ask a question. Would he say, then, that he would be in favour of government ownership under the control of the provincial government, but not under the federal government?

Mr. LOW: Near the close of my few remarks I shall explain the policy I advocate, if the hon. member will allow me. I shall not forget it. Let me go on for just one moment.

The third problem that was created in that period of federal government ownership, control and development, in the twenty-five years between 1905 and 1930, which has had far-reaching results, was the depletion of the timber resources, and particularly those of Alberta. This has come about through timber slashing. Those resources were wasted; there was no reforestation; there was no attempt whatsoever to preserve watersheds. Streams became dry and, as a result, atmosphere and rainfall conditions changed.

A careful study of the situation over the years has shown that the federal government in its own areas has been a notoriously bad fire-fighter. As a matter of fact, in some areas it has done nothing whatsoever to assist. Last year I happened to visit in the United States just across the boundary line from Waterton lakes national park. I got into the area known as Glacier national park in that country. While there, I met dozens of young men who were acting as wardens and who looked for fires every day. The United States government was spending considerable money, but it was also making money because those young men were watching and preserving the timber resources of the country. At the same time, just across the border line in Alberta fires were raging in our own Waterton national park, an area which is supposed to be watched over and preserved by the federal government. Nothing was being done in Canada; the watersheds were being destroyed. It is high time something was done to prevent that sort of waste.

Another problem has been our coal problem. The hon. member for Cape Breton South made a strong plea on behalf of that industry, particularly as it applies to Nova Scotia and the Cape Breton area. In the few remarks I shall make about coal let me say at the outset that in Alberta we have a big coal problem. Coal is our greatest mining operation and, next to agriculture, our greatest resource. In Alberta for many years we have attempted to develop the Ontario market for our coal.

During the war we have seen another example of what happens under centralized federal controls, and the house should know about it. The government appointed a fuel administrator. Under his dictatorial powers he set aside certain areas in Albert which were supposed to be supplementary strip-mining areas. He built tipples and spurs of railway track. He brought in huge implements and machinery, and commenced a process of strip-mining. Mind you, those strip mines produced the worst coal we have in Alberta. With only a small amount of overburden, it is only natural that that coal would be our poorest quality. The average depth of our mines would run from 200 to 400 feet, and at those depths the coal is of better quality. But, would you believe it, the coal for which permission was granted for shipment to Ontario, to keep up the market for Alberta coal, was derived from those strip mines! No wonder some of the people in northern Ontario said, "What in the world do you mean by sending us such stuff as that?"

Mr. PROBE: To make the Pennsylvania coal more popular.

Mr. LOW: Perhaps that is it. But that is just one example of the quality of the control that is exercised by a centralized federal government, which is located so far away from the actual scene of operations. We realize that the coal problem is an extremely big one, and that it is complicated. There is no simple formula for its solution, and it is well to remember that. Perhaps in Nova Scotia, as in Alberta, our greatest single problem in con-

nection with coal is that of marketing. Markets have to be found as near the mining operations as possible. I am convinced that the solution for Alberta in the future is so to develop that resource that the product can be used in the province. I am convinced that Alberta sits on the site of the greatest chemical industry in the world, and we shall not solve our coal problem until we begin to develop that industry in its diversified forms, with all its derivatives. We must develop those products which come from coal and which can be used right there among the people, or shipped to nearby areas of population. Our solution is certainly not found in shipping all our coal to Ontario—certainly not in the light of the arrangements the federal government now has with the United States.

One other point I should like to mention is this. It seems to me that the coal operators in Alberta, as well as those in Nova Scotia, have been losing a good bet in that they have failed to process their coals, and properly to clean and grade them before sending them to the markets in those areas where they are required. I am satisfied that if the Alberta producers would pay more attention to that phase of their activity, and see to it that the coal is properly processed, cleaned and graded, they would find a better market in Ontario for their product. I throw out that suggestion, because I believe it is true.

I am ready to assert that, in the past, natural resources have not been developed and administered in the best interests of all the people of Canada. I am ready to admit that there is much room for improvement, but I am convinced that improvement will never be brought about by centralizing administration and development in the hands of the federal government. I have good reasons for my conviction.

In addition to those already stated, I might place on record this further one, if any further is required to prove my contestations. When the war situation began to intensify the federal government asked Alberta for permission to come in and take over the Abasand oil properties in the Athabaska tar sands field, and there to carry on some developments for the purpoe of helping to supply the requirements for fuel oils and derivatives in the war effort. Everyone, especially those of us who come from the west, is quite familiar with the fiasco that followed, when Alberta did allow the federal government to come in, set up their pilot or experimental plant, for the attempt to develop and devise new ways of extracting oil from those sands. The attempt was a complete wash-out. They have shown no beneficial results whatsoever, so far as we in Alberta have been able to ascertain. That is why the provincial government joined with private enterprise in setting up a pilot plant in the Athabaska tar sands area for the purpose of making further investigations respecting the best methods of extracting the oil and bitumen from those sands. That ought to be sufficient evidence to show that centralization of controls in the federal government brings only disappointment and maladministration of things so far from the seat of government.

Mr. MacNICOL: The Alberta government has discovered a process, has it not?

Mr. LOW: Yes, it has. I further assert that there is one province in Canada in which great progress has been made in the last ten years in connection with administering and developing resources in the interests of the people. But that has not been done under government ownership. Rather, it has been done under a carefully and wisely and regulated system of private enterprise with government assistance. They have obtained results.

I do not want especially to sing the praises of Alberta, but for over ten years I was familiar with what took place there, and for that reason it is the best example I can give. In the first place we did take hold of things, and saw to it that proper conservation measures were introduced. Those conservation measures came belatedly, because many of our resources had already been wasted. As a result of the policy introduced into that province of a government regulated system of private enterprise there was gained for the people of the province a fair share of the returns from the resources of the province.

At the same time ample allowance was made to provide a sufficient reward to those people who came into the province under their own steam, and who took their own risks. They took big risks in the province, as can be shown by the record. They were permitted, we think, to obtain a just reward for their efforts and risks. The people have had a fair share of the returns from the development of these resources except in those cases where the resources had already been alienated from the crown by the action of the federal government prior to the time Alberta received her resources in 1930.

In the third place, orderly development has taken place instead of the haphazard development that occurred in those cases where the administration was located at a point thousands of miles away from the scene of the

actual work. Exploration has been intensified in the gas, oil, gold and most other fields. People who wish to risk their capital are not afraid to come into the province of Alberta because they know they will get a fair deal under the system of government regulated private enterprise.

Alberta has not solved all her problems by any means. She has not solved the problem of coal, but I am satisfied that the future holds some hope of a solution, provided that we go forward in faith and work carefully in an effort to find this solution. I do not believe that government ownership can possibly take the place of private ownership and development. I believe in a system of private enterprise. I believe that a private risk should bring with it a fair reward for the risk taken and the effort put forth. Basically that is the policy of the group which I represent.

Social credit simply means laying down basic and fundamental conditions and providing a financial and political reorganization within so that we may have a nation of good and free consumers or customers. Business cannot keep going unless business has customers. It is our policy to see that we have a nation of customers who are good and constant customers. Under such conditions there will be an optimum market for all wanted goods and services, coal or whatever the people may want, and there will be minimized the opportunities for exploitation of the people. Therefore, taking all these things into consideration, I cannot support the resolution as it stands. I must oppose it.

Mr. M. E. McGARRY (Inverness-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, as a good neighbour gesture I must congratulate the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) upon the splendid presentation he has made this afternoon of the case he puts forward. I agree thoroughly with the hon. member when he said that things are not well with the mining industry of Canada, particularly the coal mining industry. I agree that that industry requires all the sympathetic support and stimulus that can be accorded to it. The hon. member for Cape Breton South has made a fairly good diagnosis of the ills of this industry, but unhappily his prescriptions are not such as I think will relieve the industry.

I think it was Longfellow who in his good-natured way of offering solace to a disappointed wooer said to talk not of wasted affection because affection never was wasted. We cannot apply that saying to all efforts that are made. When an hon. gentleman rises in his place in this house and puts forth a splendid effort, such as has been put forth by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, if that effort is made on behalf of nationalizing the mineral industry of our province then it can be said that that effort is entirely wasted so far as convincing this house or the Canadian people is concerned.

The ideas advanced by the hon. member look all right in theory. If they could be translated into the reality of actual successful performance then the prescription would be splendid and the industry would have a chance to be relieved of its troubles. Unfortunately the theories which he advances have been put into effect, not only in connection with the mining industry but also in other phases of government activity and found wanting.

The Canadian National Railways is a government-owned transportation system. For years before the war this transportation system came back to the government with annual deficits ranging from $26,000,000 to $35,000,000.

Mr. PROBE: Would the hon. member suggest that that was because it was a government-owned institution or because of the obligations that the government assumed when they took the system over from the Grand Trunk?

Mr. McGARRY: In any event it is and has been operated by the government. It was only when this system had the stimulation of abnormal transportation demands that it was able to come back with a decent surplus. Over the war years I believe it declared a dividend of about $25,000,000, which is the equivalent of the annual deficit during times of peace.

If I am permitted I should like to deal with a matter of regional interest. I refer to the operation of a coal mine in my own constituency. That mine has been operated by the government since 1933; ever since it was taken over by the government there has been a persistent decline in total production and man-day production, and the only increase that we have seen is in the deficits from year to year. The 1945 production in that government-operated mine was less than it had been in 1933. The man-day production fell to 1·22 tons which is nearly the lowest in the whole dominion, while the deficit rose to $293,000. These are a couple of examples of what can be done unsuccessfully under government control.

I fail to understand the great urge for government control. I fail to understand the urge to nationalize our industries in the face of the failures which have obtained under government management, particularly when we see what can be done under private enter-

prise, as, for instance, in our war effort when private enterprise effected an industrial development which was the envy of all the nations.

Mr. PROBE: We subsidized private enterprise in the war.

Mr. McGARRY: I do not catch the hon. gentleman's remark.

Mr. PROBE: During the war we subsidized private enterprise and when a particular operation required special emphasis it was put under public ownership.

Mr. McGARRY: Would the hon. member say that everything that was done in the way of industrial production during the war was done under government control?

Mr. PROBE: Or subsidy.

Mr. McGARRY: Then the hon. member's diagnosis is quite different from that of the majority of our citizens. We achieved so much under private enterprise as to be the envy of the world. Was it government control that brought this country from the days of the pioneers to its present position? My conception is that we had better move along under the same policy under which we have operated from the beginning. It is my conception that the function of government is not to operate industry, but so to legislate that a favourable opportunity will be accorded free enterprise to invest its capital, thus giving employment and contributing to the financial needs of the nation.

Some hon. members bring up the hackneyed question of "no profits" operation. Those who imagine that the sole and only motive in our free enterprise is profit are singularly ignorant of human nature. No undertaking can thrive under persistent losses. No undertaking can thrive unless from time to time there is some profit in it. I fail to see why we cannot continue to depend on the same spirit of enterprise which, as I said before, has brought this country from the days of our pioneering forefathers up to the position which we hold to-day, when we have reached the peak of our industrial production.

Why is it that government cannot manage industry as economically as private enterprise can? One reason is that under government management you cannot get the coordination and simplification and saving of time and effort that characterize private management. These are ideals that do not enter into government operation. The matter of losing a little time or a little effort does not enter so much into the minds of the government as it does into the minds of the businessman who is carrying on an enterprise of his own. There are exceptions, of course, but the conditions where you have these exceptions are not such as to satisfy the business executive. This lack of coordination, lack of simplification and saving of time and effort is not applicable alone to public ownership in Canada. It applies also in the United States. Nor is it peculiar to our generation. It is a condition that is natural to government service, but it is unnatural in private business. You will always find under government control what businessmen characterize as red tape, seniority or some such thing, which you do not find under private enterprise. I contend, therefore, that it is not wise for the people of Canada to turn over to the government to do the things which they themselves can accomplish.

Wise leaders in governments to-day are telling businessmen things that they should know. They are telling them that they have a national duty beyond the bounds of their own enterprise and that if they will step into it and do their public duty it will not be necessary for the government to take over so many projects for which it is not fitted. I am strongly convinced that individual enterprise and freedom of contract is the policy that should be followed in this country if we are to maintain and develop Canada. This is not the day of revolution either in industry or in any other effort. It is the day of evolution. Let is try to improve the policies and methods we have followed from the beginning. I do not see that we the Canadian people are suffering at all from the rheumatic pains of old age. I believe that we are suffering from the growing pains of fast and successful development. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this resolution. I think it is a move in the wrong direction.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order, until Monday, April 29.

Monday, April 29, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

CONVENTION BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO GREAT LAKES FISHERIES

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I beg leave to table the text of the Great lakes fisheries convention between Canada and the

United States of America, signed at Washington on April 2, 1946. The convention was signed by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bridges) and the Canadian Ambassador, Mr. Pearson, on behalf of Canada, and by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, on behalf of the United States of America. The convention will come into force when ratifications have been exchanged.

Mr. BRACKEN: Could the Prime Minister or the Minister of Fisheries indicate briefly the substance of the convention which has just been tabled?

Mr. BRIDGES: I think there will be an opportunity later to make a statement concerning this matter; therefore I should prefer not to say anything at the present time.

Mr. BRACKEN: We shall have copies of the document?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, copies will go to my hon. friend.

HOUSING

TABLING OF P.C. 1513 VESTING RESPONSIBILITY IN MINISTER OF RECONSTRUCTION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The speech from the throne opening the present session of parliament forecast action to bring all matters relating to the construction of housing, as largely as possible under the administration of one minister of the crown. By order in council P.C. 1513 of April 16, 1946, the responsibility for housing has been vested in the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply. Hitherto, the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply has been responsible for the operations of Wartime Housing Limited, but other aspects of housing responsibility have been vested in the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Under the new arrangement, the responsibility for the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, which was established early this year under the Minister of Finance and which has responsibility for the administration of the National Housing Act and of the emergency shelter regulations, in addition to the financing of housing construction, will be transferred to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply. Arrangements have also been made to coordinate the operations carried on under the Veterans Land Act in relation to non-farm housing with the activities which will now centre in the Department of Reconstruction and Supply.

I wish to table a copy of order in council P.C. 1513 of April 16, in relation to housing.

PRIVILEGE

EDITORIAL IN "SATURDAY NIGHT"—REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT IN CIVIL SERVICE OF NATURALIZED CANADIANS

On the order for motions:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. An editorial entitled "Classifying Canadians" appears in the current issue of *Saturday Night*. The first paragraph thereof reads as follows:

> We should be sorry if parliament were to adopt Mr. Gordon Graydon's proposal and refuse to employ naturalized Canadians in the civil service. The further suggestion that even born Canadians be barred from the service if their parents were naturalized was probably not intended very seriously.

The remainder of the editorial is devoted to a critical analysis of the position I am supposed to have taken. My purpose in rising is to say that at no time have I taken such a position or made such a proposal, and I fancy every hon. member of the house will agree with me on that. I know that *Saturday Night*, whose columns are always characterized by fairness and reason, would want me to put the record straight at the first opportunity. This I am doing. Were the statement to go unchallenged, a grave injustice unwittingly might easily be done to scores of thousands of loyal naturalized citizens of Canada, many of whom have served with high distinction in the last war and this. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I think it must have been a case of mistaken identity, but I have not been able to run it down yet.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

RECOGNITION, OBSERVANCE AND COMMEMORATION—PROVISION FOR LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. L. R. BEAUDOIN (Vaudreuil-Soulanges) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 58, respecting the recognition, observance and commemoration of Canadian citizenship.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. BEAUDOIN: It is suggested by this bill, Mr. Speaker, that each year a day be set aside as citizenship day, a public occasion for the recognition of all who in consequence of the adoption of the Canadian citizenship act will have attained the status of Canadian citizens; a public occasion for all Canadians to develop mutual understanding and promote national unity.

I know the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) will endeavour to provide effective and impressive ceremonies for the admission of new

Canadians into the Canadian family. The house agreed with him when he said, as reported at page 504 of *Hansard:*

One thing we hope to do, following the passage of this measure—

That is, the Canadian citizenship bill.

—is to provide a more effective and impressive ceremony for admission into the Canadian family.

Also when he said:

We are convinced of the desirability of emulating the form of ceremony which characterizes the admisssion of persons into United States citizenship.

Canada may want to emulate the form of celebration, which does not interfere with admission ceremonies, instituted by the United States on May 3, 1940, which takes place on the third Sunday in May of each year, and is designated as "I am an American" day. This bill proposes to create "I am a Canadian" day. Service clubs, social organizations and other institutions in Canada have shown their willingness to do the spade-work to bring this sort of celebration into being. For instance, at one of their annual conventions the junior chambers of commerce of Canada adopted a resolution in which they suggested a special citizenship week each year, which would be called Canada week, and I am informed that such a move is now being organized, with the period fixed as June 2 to June 8 next. Let us give these patriotic organizations our encouragement; and a debate on this bill, should it take place, I am sure will bring out most valuable suggestions. Incidentally I would hope that the proclamation of our official flag might coincide with the proclamation of our citizenship bill.

The purpose of this bill is to help Canadians, old and new, especially the older Canadians who are supposed to set the good examples and lead the way for the new, not only to realize and take pride in the achievements and the greatness of Canada but to promote national unity by reminding all of us of our present status and future aspirations as a nation. According to this bill, each year throughout Canada the anniversary of the day fixed by proclamation of the governor in council as the date of coming into force of the Canadian citizenship act, which it has been said "symbolizes our aspirations as a nation" shall be a legal holiday, kept and observed as such under the name of "Canadian citizenship day".

Let me close my explanations with these words of the Secretary of State when introducing the Canadian citizenship bill on October 1, 1945, and again on the motion for second reading of the bill on April 2, 1946:

For the national unity of Canada and for the future and greatness of this country it is felt to be of the utmost importance that all of us, new Canadians or old, have a consciousness of a common purpose and common interests as Canadians; that all of us be able to say with pride and say with meaning—

And may I add, to proclaim at least once a year, in some sort of official and solemn way: "I am a Canadian citizen."

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS—SENATE BILL

Bill No. 51 for the relief of Vera Harriet May Kinghorn Hodgson.—Mr. MacLean.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

STEEL PRICES

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. What was the amount of the increase in the price of steel allowed by the wartime prices and trade board to manufacturers of steel?

2. In granting this increase in price to the steel manufacturers, was there any stipulation written or implied that a certain amount of the increase was to meet wage increase to steelworkers?

3. If so, what amount of the price increase was intended for wage increase?

4. Were the steel companies instructed as to when the wage increase should become effective?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. Board order No. 617 authorized an increase in steel prices based on $5 per ingot ton of steel produced.

2. No, but the manufacturers were required to provide a forecast of probable operating costs, estimated production, sales and distribution volume and other cost and financial information on the basis of which the board reached its decision as to the price increase which seemed reasonable in all the circumstances.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 2.

TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES—AIRCRAFT AND AIRPORTS

Mr. KNIGHT:

1. How many of the transport planes known as D6 are at present (a) in use by T.C.A.; (b) on order with manufacturers for T.C.A.?

2. What is the contract price per plane?

3. When are the planes now ordered to be delivered?

4. How many Canadian airports are at present of a standard fit for the use of the D6 fully loaded?

5. What are such airports?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. (a) Nil. (b) None, known as D6, but 20 aircraft of the 4-engine transport type are on order.

2. Not yet determined.

3. Beginning September 1946.

4. There are no D6's regularly operating in Canada but experience gained by United States authorities would indicate that 14 existing Canadian airports would be of a standard fit for use by the type of aircraft referred to in 1 (b) above.

5. Whitehorse, Watson Lake, Fort St. John, Prince George, Penticton, Vancouver, Grande Prairie, Namao, Edmonton, The Pas, Churchill, Montreal, Seven Islands, Dartmouth. It should be noted that 4-engine aircraft are intended for use on the transatlantic, transpacific and South American services and not at present for services in Canada.

CANADIAN NAVY—PERMANENT FORCE

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many ratings were enlisted in the permanent force navy (a) as of August 31, 1945; (b) as of February 28, 1946?

2. Of the ratings enlisted in the permanent force navy, how many were in the seaman branch (a) as of August 31, 1945; (b) as of February 28, 1946?

3. How many seamen are allowed for in the complement of the permanent force navy?

4. How many men in the said complement comprise each of the following categories (a) chief petty officers; (b) petty officers; (c) leading seamen; (d) able seamen; (e) ordinary seamen?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. Ratings in permanent force—	
as of August 31, 1945.....	3,383
as of February 28, 1946.....	3,765
2. Ratings in permanent force (seamen branch)—	
as of August 31, 1945.....	1,674
as of February 28, 1946.....	1,740
3. Seamen allowed in complement of permanent force, navy.....	3,918*
4. Comprising—	
(a) Chief petty officer.....	174*
(b) Petty officers	456*
(c) Leading seamen	548*
(d) and (e) Able seamen and ordinary seamen	2,740*

*The above figures (Nos. 3 and 4) have not been completely finalized but are accurate to within 5 per cent.

CUTTING OF MERCHANTABLE TIMBER

Mr. ZAPLITNY:

1. How many feet of lumber and/or other merchantable timber have the following firms taken out of their respective timber limits in Canada since 1899 (a) the Northern Trusts Co., Winnipeg, Manitoba; (4) Berpall Lumber Co., Milwaukee, Wisconsin; (c) The Royal Trust Co., Vancouver, British Columbia; (d) Deer Park Lumber Co., Washington, U.S.A.?

2. What amount of money was received in each case above by the Canadian government?

Mr. GLEN:

1. Feet Board Measure: (a) 13,562,435; (b) nil; (c) nil; (d) 6,878,656.

Shingles: (a) 198,500; (b) nil; (c) nil; (d) nil.

Poles lin. feet: (a) 1,390; (b) nil; (c) nil; (d) nil.

Fuelwood cords: (a) 28,234; (b) nil; (c) nil; (d) nil.

Lath: (a) 472,000; (b) nil; (c) nil; (d) nil.

2. Amount paid to the government, made up of ground rent, licence fees and royalty dues: (a) $24,381.00; (b) $510.10; (c) nil; (d) $7,688.97.

VETERANS LAND ACT—PERTH COUNTY

Mr. BRADSHAW:

1. How many applications for the purchase of farms under the Veterans Land Act in Perth county are now pending awaiting inspection?

2. How many farms have been purchased in the said county since the Act came into force?

3. What was the acreage in each farm and the price paid for each?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. Seventy.

2. Thirty-one.

3. (Below).

Farms Purchased in Perth County as of 15th April, 1946

64	acres	$3,600
50	"	4,000
100	"	4,800
95	"	3,200
49	"	800
100	"	4,300
126	"	4,800
100	"	7,700
100	"	5,000
100	"	5,000
100	"	7,600
60	"	3,200
100	"	8,000
80	"	4,000
50	"	1,200

99·5	acres	$4,800
100	"	5,500
100	"	7,000
100	"	4,500
100	"	1,500
50	"	2,000
100	"	4,800
64	"	3,000
75	"	3,000
50	"	2,800
100	"	5,200
100	"	4,000
100	"	4,800
71	"	2,500
100	"	5,200
100	"	4,800

DAIRY BUTTER

Mr. HOMUTH:

1. Has the government agencies throughout the country purchasing dairy butter?

2. What price is paid for it?

3. What allowance is made to the agents for making such purchases and/or for storage?

4. What quantity was purchased last year?

5. What quantities were purchased in each of the following months: January, February and March of 1946?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation Ltd. is authorized to purchase dairy butter throughout Canada and has appointed representatives of the trade across Canada to act as its agents in the purchase of dairy butter.

2. Agents of Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation Ltd. purchase dairy butter in good sound condition, free from culls, moulds and rancidity and of a quality suitable for use in processing food products delivered to them by retail and wholesale distributors at the following prices plus transportation cost, plus 2c per pound to cover handling and packing:

British Columbia

March 1/43-April 30/43	33½c
May 1/43-April 14/46	32 c
April 15/46 and thereafter	36 c

Alberta—Manitoba

March 1/43-April 30/43	32 c
May 1/43-April 14/46	30 c
April 15/46 and thereafter	34 c

Saskatchewan

March 1/43-April 30/43	31½c
May 1/43-April 14/46	30 c
April 15/46 and therefater	34 c

Ontario—Quebec

March 1/43-April 30/43	34 c
May 1/43-April 14/46	32 c
April 15/46 and thereafter	36 c

Prince Edward Island—Nova Scotia—New Brunswick

March 1/43-April 30/43	35 c
May 1/43-April 14/46	33 c
April 15/46 and thereafter	37 c

3. In consideration of their services in taking delivery of, paying for, repacking, storing, selling and distributing such dairy butter, agents of Commodity Prices Stabilization Corportion Ltd. are paid a commission of 2c per pound on all butter handled. This commission covers the cost of all necessary containers and repacking, storage for 60 days and all financing and carrying charges. Charges, if any, for storage for a period in excess of 60 days are for account of Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation Ltd. and are payable at the normal rate in the area in which storage occurs.

4. 207,812 lbs.

5. January, 3,032 lbs., February, 6,255 lbs., March, 5,002 lbs.

NUMBER OF DEATHS CAUSED BY BURNS

Mr. HANSELL:

1. Does the government have any method of tabulating or keeping records of the number of deaths to Canadians by burns?

2. If so, how many deaths were caused in this way during 1944 and 1945?

3. How many of these were of children, 12 years of age and under?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. Yes.

2. In 1944, 307†; in 1945, 396†.

†Authority—Provincial fire marshals' and fire commissioners' offices.

3. In 1944, 92*; in 1945, 91*.

*Authority—Available newspaper clippings.

Note—Above figures relate to deaths by fire and do not include all the deaths attributed to accidental burns in the various classifications used by the Dominion bureau of statistics.

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES, GOVERNMENT OFFICES

Mr. TOWNLEY-SMITH:

1. Who holds the following government positions at Yellowknife, Northwest Territories (a) stipendiary magistrate; (b) chairman of the board of trustees (town council); (c) do-

[Mr. Mackenzie.]

minion land agent; (d) timber berth agent; (e) legislation clerk for deeds, etc.; (f) mining recorder?

2. What are the salaries or commissions attached to the positions?

Mr. GLEN:

1. (a), (b), (c), (d), (f)—The functions indicated are performed by Mr. Fred Fraser, a qualified lawyer with extensive northern experience, who is a veteran of World War II. He is assisted throughout the year by Mr. Arthur Ames, Inspector of Mines; Mr. J. R. McElroy, departmental accountant, grade 2; Mr. L. G. Bonnyman, clerk, grade 3; three clerks, grade 2, one stenographer, grade 2; and one typist, grade 2.

(e) Probably refers to registrar of deeds under Navigable Waters Act, for which Mr. Fraser is responsible.

During the field season the duties are shared by the chief inspector of the bureau of Northwest Territories and Yukon affairs.

As chairman of the board of trustees, Yellowknife administrative district, Mr. Fraser has the assistance of the local managers of the three large mining companies in the district, viz., Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, Negus Mines Limited, and Giant Yellowknife Company, who have been appointed members of the board of trustees, and of three additional local men who are elected by the residents of the Yellowknife settlement.

In matters of townsite development the federal departments of Public Works, Transport and National Health and Welfare supply technical advice and assistance as required.

2. Salary as stipendiary magistrate is $3,600 per annum, plus a living allowance not exceeding $90 per month. Additional duties carry no remuneration.

VETERANS LAND ACT—FARM EQUIPMENT

Mr. PEARKES:

1. How many ex-servicemen have been approved as qualified to come within the terms of the Veterans Land Act, as at April 15, 1946?

2. How many land purchases have been approved as at April 15, 1946?

3. How many applications for financial assistance have been approved?

4. How many veterans have purchased farm equipment through the Veterans Land Act as at April 15, 1946?

5. Has the equipment purchased been new or second-hand?

6. What is the total amount that has been paid for new equipment?

7. What is the total amount that has been paid for second-hand equipment?

8. Of the number of applications still uncompleted, how many require farm equipment?

9. Will the Department of Veterans Affairs be required to pay the 12½ per cent increase on farm equipment authorized by the Minister of Finance on April 13, 1946?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. Figures not available as at April 15, 1946, but on March 31, 1946, they were as follows:

Full time farming	10,544
Small holdings	12,576
Commercial fishing	347
Provincial land	1,123

2. As at March 31, 1946:

Full time farming	5,132
Small holdings	3,586
Commercial fishing	90

3. As at March 31, 1946:

Full time farming	2,888
Small holdings	2,633
Commercial fishing	107

4. 1,127 engaged in full time farming received some or all of their farm equipment.

5. 79·6 per cent new; 20·4 per cent second-hand.

6. $482,467.93.

8. $123,676.54.

8. 2,111 full time farmers still have undisbursed balances for stock and equipment, the majority of whom will require farm equipment.

9. Yes, less usual special discounts.

UNRRA—CANNED FISH

Mr. FRASER:

1. What kind of canned fish has been bought by UNRRA in Canada?

2. What was paid for each kind of canned fish?

3. Was price for Atlantic and Pacific canned fish the same?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. Chicken Haddie, Flaked Fish, East and West Coast Herring, Mackerel, Shad, Pollock.

2.

	Fancy	Standard	Grade A
Chicken Haddie.	$10 00	$8 75	.....
Flaked Fish.....	9 25	8 00	.....
Herring, East...	5 90	5 25	.....
Herring, West..	....	....	$4 22
Mackerel	9 00	8 00	.....
Shad	....	6 25	.....

All the above prices one per case of 48-1's.

Sub-standard pack is purchased at a discount of 20 per cent from standard grade prices.

3. No. The price of herring differs as shown in No. 2. Herring is the only type of fish purchased on both coasts.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—BATTLE RIBBONS

Mr. LENNARD:

1. Are the members of the force of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police obliged to wear their battle ribbons when on duty?

2. If so, do they receive an allowance to cover the cost?

Mr. JEAN:

1. Yes.

2. No.

DAIRY BUTTER

Mr. HOMUTH:

1. What quantities of dairy butter were exported last year?

2. To what countries was it exported?

3. What was the price obtained?

4. What quantities of butter were exported in each of the following months: January, February and March, 1946?

5. To what countries was such butter exported?

6. What was the price received?

Mr. MacKINNON:

1. Dairy butter is not separately classified by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. It is not possible, therefore, to answer questions 1, 2 and 3.

4, 5, 6. Canadian exports, by countries, butter of all kinds during the months of January, February and March, 1946:

Country	January		February		March	
	Cwt.	Value	Cwt.	Value	Cwt.	Value
Bermuda	825	$ 38,409	8	$ 334	—	$ —
British Guiana	85	3,334	68	3,568	1,261	49,993
British Honduras	—	—	—	—	150	6,487
Barbados	547	20,349	644	25,082	600	21,750
Jamaica	404	18,099	504	18,144	—	—
Trinidad	770	27,720	850	37,195	950	37,093
British West Indies, other	34	1,439	409	19,447	122	5,361
Newfoundland	263	12,248	93	4,309	395	17,752
Colombia	—	—	—	—	1	78
St. Pierre	101	5,645	—	—	161	7,438
Totals	3,029	$127,243	2,576	$108,079	3,640	$145,952

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—MEAT INVESTIGATORS AND INSPECTORS

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough):

1. How many meat investigators and inspectors are in the employ of the wartime prices and trade board?

2. Since 1945, when meat rationing was imposed, what amount for (a) salaries; (b) fees; (c) expenses, has been paid out to date in respect of such meat investigators and inspectors?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. 83 (Supplemented by the services of the ration officials and women's advisory committees of the wartime prices and trade board, and by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in the various areas).

2. (a) $103,948.66, in respect of meat investigators and inspectors; (b) nil; (c) $30,468.41, in respect of meat investigators and inspectors.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES COUNCIL

Mr. TOWNLEY-SMITH:

1. What is the name of the council governing the northwest territories?

2. Who are the members of this council and what are their salaries?

3. How are these members chosen?

4. Where does this council sit?

5. Which members of this council are normally resident in some part of the Northwest Territories, and which are not?

Mr. GLEN:

1. The Northwest Territories Act (Chapter 142, R.S.C. 1927) provides that the governor in council may appoint for the Northwest Territories a chief executive officer to be styled and known as the commissioner of the Northwest Territories, and that the governor in council may appoint persons not exceeding six in number to be a council to aid the commissioner in the administration of the territories. The powers of the commissioner in council of the Northwest Territories are defined.

The commissioner in council is aided by administrative and technical officers of the following government departments: Department of Mines and Resources, Department of Justice, Department of Public Works, Department of Transport, Department of National Health and Welfare, Department of National Defence, Department of Labour, Department of Agriculture, Department of Fisheries, Department of Reconstruction and Supply, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Post Office Department, Department of National Revenue.

These departments are represented in the territories permanently or seasonably, as necessity may require.

2. The Northwest Territories council is composed as follows: Commissioner, Dr. Charles Camsell; deputy commissioner, Mr. R. A. Gibson; members of council, Mr. A. L. Cumming, Mr. K. R. Daly, Brigadier S. T. Wood, Mr. R. A. Hoey.

These senior civil servants receive no remuneration for their services as members of the Northwest Territories council.

3. See (1) above.

4. The seat of government is at Ottawa, where there is direct contact with the Minister of Mines and Resources, and the advice and assistance of all federal government departments is readily available. Adequate inspectional services are maintained and the members of council visit the Northwest Territories as opportunity permits.

5. No members of the Northwest Territories council are normally resident in the territories, but ready communication is maintained through government wireless services and by air mail.

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—BELLEVILLE OFFICE—PROSECUTIONS

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough):

1. How many prosecutions, through the Belleville office have been proceeded with to date for infraction of any of the regulations of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board?
2. What is the total amount of fines and costs that have been recovered?
3. (a) What is the total amount of legal fees and disbursements that have been paid to counsel and solicitors in respect of such prosecutions; (b) what amounts are still due?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. 168.
2. $4,893.00.
3. (a) $2,907.79; (b) $30.00.

Note: Two accounts are still with the Department of Justice, for approval, in accordance with government procedure.

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—INVESTIGATORS AND OTHER OFFICIALS

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough):

1. How many (a) investigators; (b) other officials, officers and staff, are now employed in the office of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board at Belleville?
2. What amount has been paid out for (a) salaries; (b) fees; (c) expenses, in respect of such employees since the Belleville office was established?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. (a) five; (b) seven.
2. (a) $29,051.94; (b) nil; (c) $4,782.84.

BANK OF CANADA

Mr. HAZEN:

1. How many people were in the employ of the Bank of Canada in 1945, and what did their total salaries for that year amount to?
2. What did it cost the Bank of Canada to manage the public debt of Canada in 1945?
3. What did it cost the Bank of Canada to render other services in 1945, and to whom were they rendered?
4. How many notes did the Bank of Canada put in circulation in 1945?
5. What did it cost the bank to put these notes in circulation and service them for 1945?
6. From what sources did the Bank of Canada obtain its revenue in 1945 and how much from each source?

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. The annual report of the governor of the Bank of Canada to the minister of Finance states that the staff of the bank numbered 1,166 at December 31, 1945.

2 and 3. Not of government record.

4. The annual report of the governor of the Bank of Canada to the Minister of Finance states that the Bank of Canada note issue as at December 31, 1945, was $1,129,099,247, an increase of $93,126,640 from the same date a year before.

5 and 6. Not of government record.

YOHO NATIONAL PARK—LEASES OR MINING RIGHTS

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East):

1. Have leases or mining rights been granted to anyone to operate within the Yoho National Park. If so, to whom?
2. When were such leases or rights granted, and when will the same expire?

Mr. GLEN:

1. Yes, as follows—

Township 27, Range 18, West 5th Meridian.

Mining Land Sale 164 to British Columbia Government by Order in Council 26/5/06.

Mining Land Sale 165 to British Columbia Government by Order in Council 26/5/06.

Township 28, Range 18, West 5th Meridian.

Mining Land Sale 16, patented 21/5/91, to Golden Mining and Smelting Company.

Mining Land Sale 25 (Monarch Claim) to British Columbia Government by Order in Council 14/2/93.

St. Etienne Fraction Mineral Claim, Lot 2813, Kootenay District (adjoining Monarch Claim)—Erskine Jones. Surveyed in 1914. No Crown Grant issued but applicant allowed to operate under licence dated October 1st, 1920.

Mineral rights in an area comprising approximately 2 square miles awarded to Amos Bliss Trites on May 1st, 1926, under special agreement for a period of 21 years.

Township 27, Range 19, West 5th Meridian.

Mining Land Sale 166, to British Columbia Government by Order in Council 26/5/06.

Mining Land Sale 1171 to British Columbia Government by Order in Council 20/9/10.

Mining Land Sale 157 to British Columbia Government by Order in Council 7/11/107.

2. The Mining Land Sales referred to in (1) were outright sales and disposed of the minerals by Crown Grant. The date of the leases is answered in No. (1). The mining rights held by Amos Bliss Trites, and now held by the Base Metals Mining Corporation, expire on May 1st, 1947. This includes St. Etienne fraction mineral claim, lot 2813, referred to in (1) above. There is also a special provision in this agreement which provides that Mr. Trites, or his assignees, shall convey to His Majesty the Monarch Mineral Claim, together with all other mineral claims for which he holds any right or title from the Government of the Province of British Columbia or the Dominion of Canada in said township upon the termination of the special Agreement above referred to.

ALTERNATIVE SERVICE OFFICES

Mr. HOMUTH:

1. What are the names of those employed in the alternative service office at Kitchener?

2. What salary is paid to each?

3. What was the travelling expenses allowed to each for the months of September, October, November and December, 1945, and January, February, March, 1946?

4. How many alternative service offices are operated in Canada?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1 and 2. Names and salaries of those employed in the alternative service office at Kitchener:

Name	Salary
Angus, Wm. G.	$3,600
Malcolm, G. A.	1,800
Peer, Mrs. M. S.	840
Peppler M. M.	1,200
Schaffer, M. G.	1,260
Symmonds, C. S.	3,000

3. Travelling expenses allowed each for the following months:

	1945			1946	
	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.
Angus, W. G.	$ 8 20	$ 6 24	$ —	$ 3 98	$ —	$ —	$ —
Malcolm, G. A.	142 00	149 71	85 90	70 46	75 44	78 16	80 93
Symmonds, C. S.	100 95	99 25	73 70	106 35	99 05	96 00	131 00

4. Eight.

Mr. HOMUTH:

1. Is G. R. Carroll acting chief alternative service officer?

2. If so, when was he appointed?

3. What is his salary?

4. What is his age?

5. What expenses has he charged from the date of his appointment to the end of March, 1946?

6. What was his former employment?

7. What is his home address?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Yes, Mr. G. R. Carroll is acting Chief Alternative Service Officer.

2. March 22, 1946.

3. $2,400 per annum.

4. Thirty years.

5. From the date of his appointment as acting Chief Alternative Service Officer to the end of March, 1946, no expenses have been charged by Mr. Carroll.

6. Naval Service 1940-1945.

7. 8 Graham avenue, Ottawa.

[Mr. Glen.]

EXHIBITION BUILDINGS TORONTO—DESTRUCTION BY FIRE

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Was the army occupying the grandstand at the Canadian National Exhibition at Toronto during the fire on Sunday last, April 14, which destroyed the grandstand?

2. What was the cause of the fire?

3. Has the government any insurance on this plant? If so, to what amount?

4. Will the government convene a court of inquiry under the army regulations to enquire into the cause of the fire and will compensation be afforded the city for the loss thereof?

5. When will all the buildings on these grounds be vacated by the forces and returned to the city?

6. Who occupied the premises underneath the stand at the time of the fire?

7. What fire apparatus and appliances had the government at the time of the fire in the C.N.E. grounds?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.

2. Not yet been determined.

3. No. However under the terms of the agreement the government reimbursed the

Canadian National Exhibition for the premiums which are paid by them on this property.

4. A court of inquiry has already been convened in accordance with Army regulations. The building in question is covered by fire insurance. See No. 3 above.

5. The army will vacate these buildings on or about 31 May, 1946.

6. Army personnel—Members of No. 2 district depot.

7. Chemical extinguishers, standpipes and the necessary hose and nozzles in all buildings on a scale of issue based on fire underwriters specifications. A fire alarm system is maintained. A fire brigade composed of six full time trained fire fighters and a fire truck complete with the necessary equipment and tools are provided for the area. A night fire patrol is also maintained.

NATIONAL SELECTIVE SERVICE MOBILIZATION REGULATIONS, 1944

Mr. JUTRAS:

As of March 31, 1946, what was the total number of designated men in Canada under the N.S.S. mobilization regulations, 1944, in the following groups (a) on postponement from military service; (b) medically examined and found unfit for military service; (c) medically examined and found fit, but not sent an order to report for military service; (d) not sent an order to report for medical examination; (e) excepted from the National Selective Service mobilization regulations, 1944; (f) not accounted for?

Mr. MITCHELL:

(a) 277,118; (b) 616,794; (c) 14,543; (d) 31,283; (e) 25,061; (f) 7,632.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. HOMUTH:

1. How many conscientious objectors are in the alternative work camps?
2. How many have been released?
3. On what grounds were they released?
4. How many of those released were made to work in agriculture?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. As of March 31, 1946—202.

2. From May 1, 1943 (commencement of alternative service operation) to March 31, 1946—2,834. (This figure includes those men who have been released from and recalled to camp for not abiding by the regulations applicable to postponed conscientious objectors outside of camps. In some cases men have been released again after having been recalled.)

3. Willingness to abide by the regulations applicable to postponed conscientious objectors outside of alternative service work camps, revocation of conscientious objector's status, and for compassionate reasons.

4. As from May 1, 1943, to March 31, 1946—2,419 were released from camp and directed to agriculture. This figure does not include those postponed conscientious objectors who have been granted farm leave from camp from time to time.

MOUNTED POLICE—RANK AND SENIORITY UPON RETURN FROM OVERSEAS SERVICE

Mr. LENNARD:

1. Do members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who served in the overseas forces enjoy the privileges of rank and seniority upon rejoining the R.C.M.P.?
2. If not, why are they not accorded such privileges?

Mr. JEAN:

1. At the outbreak of war the Minister of Justice made an appeal by letter to all ranks of the R.C.M. Police to stay at their posts, owing to the increased responsibilities of the force, and the impossibility of securing recruits, and in order to make it more difficult to leave the force, the normal means of discharge by purchase, etc., were suspended.

In order to assist the military authorities, and at the same time provide a channel for those members of the force who were anxious to join the fighting forces, No. 1 Provost Company of the First Canadian Division was organized within the force in October, 1939, and the police personnel which composed that company, together with reinforcements, were granted leave of absence without pay. All these retained rank, seniority and other privileges.

Furthermore, those who later severed their connection with the R.C.M. Police at the time of the expiration of their engagement with the R.C.M. Police and joined the armed forces of Canada and served overseas, on re-engagement in the R.C.M. Police have been reinstated in their former rank, pay, allowances and seniority, with the exception of N.C.O.'s who lose seniority only. (Seven N.C.O.'s are thus affected, having left the Force to accept commissions in the armed services).

2. In addition to the seven N.C.O.'s referred to in No. 1 above, all other members of the force who served in the armed forces in Canada only have been offered re-engagement in their former rank, pay and allowances but not seniority, in fairness to those members of the force who either joined the number one provost company or stayed with the R.C.M. Police.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

WAR ASSETS—SALES OF MACHINES TO JOHN BERTRAM COMPANY

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Has the government or War Assets Corporation sold any new machines to the John Bertram Company, Limited, of Dundas, Ontario? If so, what did these machines cost the government, and for what price were they sold to the John Bertram Company?
2. Has the government or War Assets Corporation sold any machines as scrap to the John Bertram Company, Limited, of Dundas, Ontario? If so, what did these machines cost the government, and for what price were they sold to the John Bertram Company?
3. Has the government or War Assets Corpooration sold any used machines to the John Bertram Company, Limited, of Dundas, Ontario? If so, what did these machines cost the government, and for what price were they sold to the John Bertram Company?

Mr. McILRAITH: Return tabled.

RADIO BROADCASTING—CHANNELS ASSIGNED UNDER HAVANA AGREEMENTS

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's):

1. Have the number and classification of channels assigned to Canada under the Havana agreements been readjusted or altered? If so, under what agreements and what channels are now assigned to Canada?
2. What is the frequency of each?
3. What is the minimum and maximum power of each channel?
4. How many of them are now occupied?
5. What stations occupy them?
6. What power are they using?
7. What channels are exempted from the use of minimum power?
8. What stations since 1939 have applied for an increase of power; what power was applied for, and what power increase was granted?
9. Has application been made since 1939 for the use of unoccupied channels?
10. If so, what power was applied for?
11. What is the minimum power of the unoccupied channels?
12. What stations have applied for permits to experiment or otherwise in frequency modulation, television, facsimile?
13. Have any permits been granted?

Mr. McILRAITH: Return tabled.

WAR ASSETS—MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. CHARLTON:

1. How many (1) passenger motor cars; (2) station wagons; (3) sedan delivery trucks, owned by the Department of National Defence (a) army; (b) navy; (c) air force (i) have been declared sudplus; (ii) are held for disposal by War Assets Corporation; (iii) have been disposed of by War Assets Corporation?
2. To whom were such vehicles sold and at what price?
3. Were any sold to government departments?
4. If so, to what departments and how many to each?

[Mr. Jean.]

WAR ASSETS—SALES TO EDUCATIONAL BODIES

Mr. FRASER:

1. What are the total sales by categories, by War Assets Corporation to educational bodies in Canada for vocational training and educational instructional purposes?
2. What is the type of equipment disposed of on indefinite loan by War Assets Corporation to educational institutions for vocational training and educational instructional purposes?

Mr. McILRAITH: Return tabled.

SASKATCHEWAN POST OFFICES—REVENUE

Mr. McKAY:

What was the revenue of the following post offices in Saskatchewan during the years 1938 to 1945 inclusive (a) Radville; (b) Weyburn; (c) Milestone; (d) Lanigan?

GOVERNMENT OPERATED VESSELS

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Has the government placed any contracts with shipbuilding concerns in Canada this year for the construction of vessels to be operated by the government or any of its departments?
2. If so, what companies have received such contracts, what is the size of the ships that are being built and what will they be used for?
3. Has the government taken any action toward calling for tenders for the building of other ships this year? If so, for what size ships and for what use?
4. Is the government replacing this year any obsolete vessels owned by it? If so, what obsolete vesesls will be replaced and where are they registered?

CANADIAN FORCES—LOSS OF BUILDINGS BY FIRE.

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What was the total loss by fire in the various camps and buildings in Canada occupied by the forces during the late war, brought up to date since the return tabled in 1944?
2. Where did these fires occur?
3. What was the insurance on each place?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

DEPARTMENT OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY ACT—ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. HOMUTH (for Mr. Desmond):

For a copy of all orders in council approved since September 6, 1945, under the authority of the Department of Munitions and Supply Act.

Mr. McILRAITH: Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this matter with the hon. member for Kent, Ontario (Mr. Desmond), and I understand it is his intention to ask that it be dropped. He already has the information. I talked with him just before coming to the house.

Mr. GRAYDON: Let it stand in the meantime.

Motion stands.

BUILDING MATERIAL

Mr. LOCKHART:

For a copy of all correspondence on building material which has passed between the federal government and any municipal authority from V-J day until the passing of P.C. 1184.

CONFERENCE WITH PROVINCES

PREPARATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICIAL STATEMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. I have not given notice of it, but I think the right hon. gentleman when he hears it will realize that notice was not necessary. The government is now engaged, with the provinces, in a further dominion-provincial conference, of which there have been several since last August. Will the government give consideration to putting together in one printed form, for the information of hon. members, the official statements made by this government and by the official representatives from the provinces? These would be the statements since the first conference last August, including the present one.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend's suggestion is a good one. Certainly those statements will be brought together under one cover.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

SUBSIDIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to direct another question, of which I have not given notice, to the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Finance. It has to do with dairy products subsidies. I understand that they are given by the year, and that they terminate at the end of this month, which is to-morrow. Will either of the ministers I have named make a statement to-morrow as to government policy respecting these subsidies; and will the government give consideration to the raising of the subsidies, in view of the increased cost of labour and the increased cost of other factors entering into production?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Recommendations in connection with the subsidies on milk were made to council just before I left for the Easter recess. I returned only this morning, and have not yet had an opportunity to attend council. I shall look into the matter immediately.

WHEAT

BONUS FOR SHIPMENTS OVERSEAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): May I ask a question of the appropriate minister? Has the government considered the payment to farmers of a bonus of thirty cents per bushel for wheat to be delivered immediately for shipment overseas? I understand this is already being done in the United States. Sometimes we follow the action taken in that country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Who is the appropriate minister?

Mr. COLDWELL: The Minister of Finance.

Mr. FAIR: Perhaps the Minister of Trade and Commerce could give us a reply.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the first part of the question.

Mr. FAIR: I should be very glad to repeat it.

Mr. MacKINNON: However, I believe the question opened by asking whether the government would give consideration. I shall discuss the point with my colleagues.

ALLAN CUP

WINNING OF CHAMPIONSHIP BY CALGARY STAMPEDERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. L. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask the Minister of National Defence for Air. I have not given notice of it. Is the minister aware that there now rests in the city of Calgary a Canadian championship in the form of the Allan cup?

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): I am unfortunately aware of it, but I am very glad to offer my congratulations to Calgary.

FARM PRODUCTS

REQUEST FOR PRICE INCREASES TO ABSORB INCREASED IMPLEMENT COSTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance. Will the government consider immediately increases in agricultural production prices which will enable the farmers to absorb the recent 12½ per cent increase in the prices of agricultural implements?

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I have nothing to add to the statement I made on that matter before the Easter recess.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

The house resumed from Thursday, April 11, consideration of the motion of Mr. Martin for the second reading of bill No. 7, respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I believe I moved the adjournment of the debate, and I am ready to continue. During the Easter recess I felt that I could not do better than to make the widest possible investigation as to the opinion of the average man in the great counties of Grey, Wellington, Perth, Middlesex, Kent, Essex and parts of Elgin and Peel, as well as in my own riding in Toronto and other ridings in that city, about Bill No. 7, particularly section 10.

Generally I am in agreement with the bill. I believe there are a number of sections that should pass, but I am opposed to part of section 10. I spent some time in the riding of the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin) who introduced this bill. In that part of the country, and in the other parts to which I referred, I spoke to as many people as I could, high and low and in all walks of life, and I found a substantial opposition to section 10. Many of these people said that the section was incomprehensible to them. Some had come to this country from other parts of the empire, particularly from Great Britain; they had come from a part of the world in which they had learned democracy and from which they had brought the spirit of democracy to this country. They represent by far the largest majority of Canadians, and to me it is simply monstrous to ask that they have to be here five years before they can be granted Canadian citizenship.

Mr. MARTIN: It has been that way for twenty-seven years.

Mr. MacNICOL: My hon. friend is entirely wrong. He knows that a man coming into this country from Great Britain to-day is permitted after one year to enrol and vote in our general elections whether he is a citizen or not.

Mr. MARTIN: This bill does not disturb that at all.

Mr. MacNICOL: Anything might happen after section 10 has carried. The next step will be to change the franchise act so that only citizens may vote. I am going to appeal to the minister to state when he speaks again that section 10 will be rewritten. As it is now, only a Philadelphia lawyer could understand it. Britishers should not be compelled to remain here five years before being granted Canadian citizenship. My own people have been here for four generations. Had they come only one generation ago, it would have been monstrous to ask them to remain here five years before being granted the right to citizenship. I spoke to clergymen of various denominations, to lawyers, to doctors, to business men, to garage men, to barbers, and to everyone whom I could engage in conversation. If, as the minister says, section 10 does not mean what I think it means, then it should be clarified.

I have discussed this section with several lawyers, both in and out of the house, and they tell me that they cannot understand what it really means. I suppose even a Philadelphia lawyer could not understand it. To indicate the opinion of the public with regard to section 10, I should like to quote one letter I have received. If this bill passes and persons from the British empire are forced to remain here five years before being granted Canadian citizenship, then, as I said a moment ago, the next step will be to change the franchise act to provide that only citizens may vote.

That was one cause of the South African war. The then president of the Transvaal, the late Paul Kruger, who in my judgment was a wonderful man; I have read his history many times—decided to amend the franchise act of the Transvaal to provide for several years' residence instead of what it then provided before obtaining the right to vote. That will be the next step here, and Anglo-Saxons may have to remain here five years before they have the right to vote. It is incredible that any such provision should be made part of our law. When the minister speaks I should like him to clarify this section—apparently very few people can understand it; then perhaps the bill will get through the house more rapidly.

I received a letter this morning from St. George's society in Toronto quoting a telegram which they had sent to the Prime Minister. It is dated at Toronto, April 16, 1946, and the telegram quoted therein reads as follows:

> Twelve hundred members of St. George's society of Toronto, while heartily approving the principle of establishing a Canadian citizenship, nevertheless deplore that provision of the proposed act of parliament requiring British subjects to be domiciled for five years in Can-

ada prior to enjoying the privilege of such citizenship. Such a measure cannot fail to weaken the ties of empire at a time when they need strengthening.

This opinion therefore is general, because, as my hon. friend will freely admit, many leading citizens of Toronto and Canada are members of the St. George's society.

When the minister spoke on April 2 he quoted in support of his own argument a statement which had been made in the house by the late Hon. C. H. Cahan. I was present when Mr. Cahan spoke. He was an excellent speaker, and perhaps one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in Canada. He was referring to the progress made by Canada in the sixty-four years of its life from 1867, and he went on to say, as quoted by the minister:

In connection with that development, however, if we are to assume the status of a nation within the British commonwealth, we must also assume very serious duties and responsibilities. Among the responsibilities resting upon the parliament of Canada is that of framing a clear definition of "Canadian nationals" . . .

With that I agree, but I want especially to emphasize what the late Hon. C. H. Cahan said, "within the British commonwealth". Section 10, as I understand it, will do a lot more harm to the cause of maintaining Canada within the British empire than perhaps many of us want to believe.

Mr. MARTIN: It will not change it one iota.

Mr. MacNICOL: Of course the minister has the majority behind him and has power to do what he likes, but that will not stop me from expressing my opinion.

Mr. MARTIN: I was not suggesting that. I was simply saying that section 10 does not change what the hon. member wants, and what I personally support. It does not change that situation at all.

Mr. MacNICOL: I have found from inquiries across eight or ten great counties of Ontario that many people have the same opinion that I have of section 10, and I repeat that St. George's Society, one of the leading societies of Canada, is of that opinion. We are all in the same boat; we do not understand it, so if the minister can clarify the section and can take away our fears it would go a long way towards eliminating opposition to this particular provision of the bill.

My own section of the city of Toronto is solidly Anglo-Saxon. The great majority of the people came there two or three years before the first great war. They took an ardent and active interest in the affairs of this country. They formed their own rifle associations and other groups, and when the war of 1914 broke out they did not have to be conscripted or coaxed to come to the defence of their country; they marched right up, like the men they were, and enlisted en masse. The society of which I was president, the British Imperial Association, had a great honour roll. Speaking from memory I think there were from 200 to 300 men on its honour roll who went overseas, and a great many of whom were killed in the defence of this country. I could not conceive of that breed of people coming to Canada if they thought they would have to remain five years within a part of the British empire before they could become citizens of Canada.

A gentleman told me to-day—I think it was the member for London (Mr. Manross)—about an Australian airman who had trained at an air camp in western Ontario—I had better not specify it because I did not have the hon. member's consent to say what I am about to say. This Australian airman had the good fortune to fall in love with a London girl, and perhaps has married her, but on reading over this bill he said that Australians could not be expected to come to Canada and remain here for five years before they could become Canadian citizens. Nor can we expect New Zealanders or South Africans or people from any other part of the British empire to come here if they have to wait five years before they can become Canadian citizens—unless they want very much to come here; and the more they want to come, the more we want to have them come. We do not want to discourage people from coming to Canada from other parts of the British empire. We should do everything we can to encourage them to come, because the greater the number that come the better it is for Canada and the British empire, as was demonstrated clearly in the last war. From my own section of the city of Toronto the sons of the fathers who came back to Canada from the first great war enlisted en masse in the second great war. They did not have to be conscripted or coaxed. They marched up and enlisted in regiments very shortly after the war broke out. That is the kind of people we want to come here, men who will rise up in defence of this country and the ideals for which it stands. We should not do anything to discourage them from coming to Canada.

A few days ago I read that the Ontario government has a list of selected emigrants from Great Britain, some 30,000 people, most of them war veterans, who want to come to Canada as soon as immigration opens up again. Do you think they would want to come to Canada if they had to remain here five years before they would be entitled to citizenship papers? I can hardly conceive of Bri-

tishers accepting conditions of that kind. They did not accept those conditions in South Africa. One of the main causes of the South African war was that the Kruger government extended the number of years that it would be necessary to wait before one could exercise the franchise in South Africa. I want to tell the minister as earnestly and as strongly and as seriously as I can that I myself would not come here if I knew that I should have to wait five years before enjoying full citizenship.

I ask the minister to withdraw the clause and reword it so that it will be understood. We want those 30,000 Britishers to come here from the old land, those heroes who fought perhaps at Dunkirk and elsewhere, and saved the empire. It was the men who held up their breasts at Dunkirk against the steel of mighty Germany who fought to save Canada as well as the empire, and many of them may be listed amongst the 30,000 who have applied to the Ontario government to come to Canada. I should like to see another half million of them out in the west to help build up the three fine prairie provinces and British Columbia. A good many of the people who settled the western provinces came from the old land. We want to encourage them, not discourage them.

I do not wish anybody to think that I do not want settlers to come here from other countries too. We want Ukrainians, we want Russians, we want people from France, Italy, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, Denmark and other European countries to come here and help build up this country. We should receive them with open arms. I asked a Ukrainian in Toronto on Saturday if he thought that a man coming from London, England, a man born and raised in the democracy of the old country, whence we obtained our democracy, should be put in exactly the same class with emigrants from non-democratic countries in Europe. His reply was, "I do not think so. A person coming from a country within the British empire should be able to obtain citizenship without having to wait five years." That is no reflection on any race. I love all races. This country owes a great deal, sir, to every race. They have brought their different characteristics and great qualities to this country and have helped to build it up. No one will say that those who have come from the old country have done otherwise. In all our industrial ridings a large number of the leading manufacturers were born and brought up in the old country. Without any hesitation I can name at least twenty-five in my own riding. Have they not done something to build up this country? Of course they have. I have

[Mr. MacNicol.]

in mind one man who lives not far from me in Toronto. He had four or five thousand men working for him in his plants during the war. He is a Scotsman, a marvellous man, an inventor, and his plant, by means of his genius, played a very large part in winning the war by reason of the material it produced. Does anyone think that such men will come here if they are expected to remain five years before becoming Canadian citizens?

I suggest that section 10 be rewritten so that all who run may read.

I do not like the title of the bill. We are told that it is "an act respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens." I do not like the word "aliens." Can we not use a better word? I do not like either "foreigner" or "alien." We are all God's creatures. He made us; he brought us into the world. Could we not say, an act respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of strangers, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) suggests? Or perhaps, settlers of non-British origin? We should use some word which does not imply the stigma attached to the expression one so often hears, "You are only a foreigner" or "an alien." We could all be called foreigners or aliens when we go to some other country. I suggest that the title of the bill be improved by substituting a less objectionable term.

Let me come back for a moment to my own constituency. I am thinking of a man named David Seggie, of Harvie avenue, Toronto, who had seven sons. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenzie) is looking at me, and by his expression I take it he recognizes the name as that of a Scotsman. Well, he is right. Every one of the seven sons put on the king's uniform, or rather the Canadian uniform. All of them were in the service, some overseas, others on the west coast, which is the same as serving overseas. It is a wonderful record, and I suggest that this house should establish some sort of decoration for such people. All sorts of people are getting decorations, many of them for no other reason than the fact that they have the ability to get them. Any man who has raised seven sons, any mother who has given birth to seven sons, every one of whom fought in the defence of the empire, should receive a decoration if we are to hand out decorations at all.

So in the last war there was one family in my riding in which there were seven boys in the army, and I have no doubt that other members can say the same of their own constituencies. All these people I have been talking about are from the old country. I could not for a moment imagine that men

with a record of such bravery, men with the spirit that I have indicated, should be asked to remain in this country five years before being granted Canadian citizenship, especially when they have come here with full knowledge of democracy. What is this five-year period for?

Mr. MARTIN: Sir Robert Borden put in the five-year period.

Mr. MacNICOL: That five-year period had reference to people who were charged with the commission of misdemeanours.

Mr. MARTIN: That is all this does.

Mr. MacNICOL: Sir Robert Borden's bill had nothing to do with citizenship, otherwise we would not be discussing this bill now.

Mr. MARTIN: Sir Robert Borden introduced this provision to deal with the same point.

Mr. MacNICOL: I agree with what the minister is trying to do. He wishes to remove the ambiguities in our naturalization act and in the Immigration Act and the Canadian Nationals Act. All credit to him for having that desire, but I suggest that he should rewrite section 10 so that it will not be necessary for representations to come from such a great society as St. George's society, and from many others whose understanding of the bill is the same as mine. The minister must admit that men of that calibre must be all mixed up, as I must be mixed up, if he is the only one who knows what the bill means.

Mr. MARTIN: I have had no opportunity to answer what the hon. gentleman is saying, and it is because of speeches such as the one he is now making that this impression has been created. I will answer it when my turn comes.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am glad the minister says that, because throughout the whole of this debate one member after another has referred to this point and it has gone unanswered.

Mr. MARTIN: I have repeatedly corrected every hon. member who has made the same statement.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister has not corrected me yet. He has not stated to me emphatically that in the future, if this bill passes, no measure will be introduced providing that a Britisher must be here five years before being allowed to vote.

Mr. MARTIN: That is exactly the situation as far as this government is concerned, and it always has been.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not know what the minister means.

Mr. MARTIN: As I have stated on five different occasions in this debate, there is no intention of changing the election act in any way, nor could we do so by this bill. I have stated that repeatedly.

Mr. MacNICOL: Then I will say this. Having a keen recollection of what took place in this house not long ago—I know that I cannot refer to a past debate—when a certain measure passed through this house in one afternoon, I fear what might happen on some future occasion if a new franchise bill were introduced on the same basis as the one I have in mind, and which I will not name, if it was passed through this house in an afternoon, and it debarred British people from voting unless they were here five years I would not take a chance on it.

Some hon. members have said something about a ceremony in making a person a citizen. I agree with that. I have attended ceremonies in the United States when people were being granted the right of citizenship, and I think it is something we should carefully consider. Let me quote from the "Salute to the Flag". The person seeking admission to citizenship in the United States goes before the judge, or the properly constituted authority, and takes this pledge:

> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

They have a fine ceremony. I hope that the minister will have something of this kind in mind. An empire conference is now being held in England. Australia has sent delegates. I do not know whether Canada has sent any, but I read a few days ago a statement attributed to the Prime Minister of Australia approving the sending of the delegates. The dispatch was dated Canberra, April 9, and it states that the Prime Minister had announced that the Australian cabinet had approved of Australia being represented at the British commonwealth conference to discuss the proposed legislation on one nationality operating generally in the British commonwealth countries. I am not going to make any comment on that, but I am afraid of this bill being mentioned at that conference in London. If members of the St. George's society, which includes eminent and brilliant lawyers, judges and others, cannot understand it; and it may not be understood in London, England, how can the ordinary individual be expected to understand it?

Mr. MARTIN: Was the hon. gentleman not in the house when I gave an explanation?

Mr. MacNICOL: I should like to hear the minister repeat it.

Mr. MARTIN: I have already said it on three occasions; apparently the hon. gentleman was too busy to listen. Officials of His Majesty's government have said that this bill is such an excellent one they consider it a model. The Prime Minister of Australia has said that the Canadian citizenship bill now before this house makes such an appeal to that country that they are going to take similar action.

Mr. MacNICOL: I shall be surprised if that is so, particularly after what a young Australian said in London, Ontario, last week, namely, that he could not conceive of young Australians coming to this country and remaining here five years before they became Canadians.

Mr. MARTIN: They have it in Australia.

Mr. MacNICOL: I should prefer to say what I have to say, and then I should like the minister to get on his feet and give his explanations. We shall get him nailed down to the last letter before very long, so that there will be no ambiguity in the bill. We are going to try to see that all ambiguity is taken out of section 10.

Something has been said about what St. Paul said, and I wish to dwell on that for a moment or two. Let me refer to the citizenship we now enjoy. I am a citizen of the British empire, and always hope to be. I am proud of it. I have always felt that as I am Canadian born I am a Canadian citizen. I do not require an act to make me a citizen of Canada; I am a citizen of Canada. I agree that it is perhaps necessary to have a public statement or something to indicate that we have Canadian citizenship when the assessor comes around, so that we shall not have to say we are of Scotch, Irish, English or some other extraction. I agree with that part of the bill.

Paul had a double citizenship. I do not mean Paul, the minister, although he is a British citizen and he will be a Canadian citizen when the bill goes through, if he is not one now. I said that I am a Canadian citizen.

Mr. MARTIN: I am fast developing a halo.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister will be no hero if section 10 is not changed greatly.

Mr. MARTIN: I said "halo".

[Mr. MacNicol.]

Mr. MacNICOL: I hope it will be a long time before the minister gets a halo. In chapter 21, verse 39 of the Acts of the Apostles, Paul said:

> I am a man which am a Jew of Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city; and, I beseech thee, suffer me to speak unto the people.

He said he was a citizen of no mean city.

Mr. REID: Like Toronto.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not see any joke about that.

Mr. REID: I said, "like Toronto." There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. MacNICOL: My hon. friend is a Scotsman. He ought to have a high regard for the Jews. I have.

Mr. REID: I am a Canadian.

Mr. FRASER: Not until the bill is passed.

Mr. MacNICOL: When I first came to the house and heard my hon. friend speak I could hardly understand him, his speech was so broad.

Mr. REID: That was the hon. member's fault.

Mr. MacNICOL: It was not my fault. If he had been playing the bagpipes less in those days he would have been able to speak the English language better. He does not play the bagpipes so often just now, and he is doing better.

In chapter 22, at verse 25 of the Acts of the Apostles Paul said:—and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the bible I have in my hand was lent to me by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) who reads it diligently and who among the members of this house is one of the most widely posted on the bible.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am sorry the hon. member has not a bible.

Mr. MacNICOL: I have one, but I do not keep it at the House. The hon. member for Broadview carries his around in his pocket all the time.

Mr. COLDWELL: The hon. member should have his own.

Mr. MacNICOL: I read from verse 25 of chapter 22:

> And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?
>
> Then the chief captain came and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea.
>
> And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born.

Paul was a citizen of the city of Tarsus and of the Roman province of Cilicia. He did not go back on his Roman citizenship. He was a citizen of the Roman empire. We are Canadians. Before long, I suppose, we shall be citizens of Canada legally, but it does not take away from us our right to be British citizens. We shall be British citizens as well as Canadian citizens.

I feel very strongly on this matter. The minister has not convinced me at all. I find myself in the same position as the members of St. George's Society, and of many other societies from whom I have had communications. I find myself in the same position as are the people to whom I talked during the Easter holidays. If I said I talked to a hundred people I should be understating it. If I said I talked to 250 during my tour of western Ontario last week I might be overstating it. However, I could not find one man among the lawyers, doctors, business men and educationists to whom I spoke, whose interpretation of the bill was any different from mine. Therefore a lot of clarification has to be done to make people realize that Britishers coming into Canada from any part of the empire are not compelled to remain here five years before they become Canadian citizens.

I have read the section over carefully; I have discussed it with all the lawyers on this side of the house. My hon. friend will have to admit that they are good lawyers; if I happened to get into a bad jam I do not know which one I would want to select to defend me. All of them interpret this section as I do, namely, that anyone coming into this country from any other part of the British empire would have to remain here five years before he would be entitled to become a Canadian citizen. To that I am opposed. It is a humiliation to ask a New Zealander, an Australian, a Scotsman, an Irishman, an Englishman, a Newfoundlander, or anyone from any other part of the British empire to remain here five years before Canadian citizenship papers can be taken out.

Mr. MARTIN: Australia, New Zealand and South Africa have had the same requirement for many years. All these countries have the same provision.

Mr. MacNICOL. I am not going to argue with the minister. If I told him he was wrong, it would be a nasty thing to say. But he will have to read the acts to me to prove that their provision is the same as this one.

The Anglo-Saxons who came to the riding of Davenport in 1911, 1912 and 1913—and perhaps some who came in 1910—voted in the election of 1911. When the first world war came, they enlisted en masse. I want it to be understood that no British subject shall be made to feel humiliated on coming to Canada because of being required to wait five years before becoming a Canadian citizen.

I want it clearly understood that I have the greatest love in my heart for people of all races. I have met people all over Canada of many different non-British races who have come to this country. Most of them have made good. The Secretary of State, in introducing the bill pointed out that the five year provision was to enable persons from non-democratic countries to become accustomed to our laws, languages and methods of voting. I should not think anyone from a non-British European country would be offended at having to be here five years before becoming a Canadian citizen. Members of this House of Commons have come from some of those countries and are doing great work in this house and in Canada. But why ask anyone from Britain, the mother of parliaments, the mother of democracy, from which we took all our democratic institutions, to wait five years before becoming a Canadian citizen? They know all about it now. We do not need to tell them how to vote; we do not need to tell them what are British principles. Our fathers brought them over here and handed them on to us.

Mr. R. R. KNIGHT (Saskatoon City): Generally, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, but I should like to speak to one or two points in connection with it. First I should like to say a word or two in regard to the revocation of citizenship. I believe citizenship should not be lightly granted, but that once granted it should be practically irrevocable. This measure provides for the cancellation of Canadian citizenship in certain circumstances, including the commission of certain types of crimes. The last time this matter was under discussion the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) made a great point of the fact a person of Japanese origin, and I think a Canadian citizen, had tortured some of our Canadian soldiers at Hong Kong. If Canadians commit crimes, let them be punished as Canadians. Let them be put in gaol as Canadians. If necessary let us shoot them as Canadians, but let us deal with them as Canadians. Let us accept responsibility for their upbringing and their environment.

Some would avoid such responsibility by a method of which as yet we have not had an example in this country; that is to say, by deportation. The other day I put a question on the order paper and was told that not a

single person of Japanese origin, Canadian citizen or otherwise, as yet had been deported from this country. But deportation is a dangerous policy. The force of circumstances and international conflicts make our friends of to-day our enemies to-morrow. I need not remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the Japanese, who were our deadly enemies in the war which has just come to a conclusion, were our firm friends and allies in the last war. If you make of citizenship a scrap of paper to be torn up at will, to be torn up in the panic and hatreds of war; if you deport people of one racial origin to-day, to-morrow you may be deporting people of another racial origin. What about the many fine Canadian citizens of German origin? Would this government propose to deport them? And who are our native Canadians, anyway, unless they be the Indians?—and we are not too sure about them. Let us think twice, then, before breaking our solemn word to people whom we have accepted as citizens of this country.

The second point I should like to make is that we should not be apologetic about being Canadians. In my opinion in the past we have suffered from a distinct inferiority complex. To-day in this country there are people, and even whole sections, still suffering from the same inferiority complex. It has plagued us in our arts and in our literature, and I think it extends even to our citizenship. Let us be proud of our own country. As the hon. member for Temiscouata, Mr. Pouliot is so fond of reminding us, this is the greatest country in the world. What, then, is the citizenship of which we should be so proud?. Well, as far as I am concerned it has nothing whatever to do with racial origin. I have been astonished to hear hon. members of this house boasting about the place of their birth. Could they tell us just what they had to do with it? If you were born in Canada it is a matter not for boasting but for thankfulness, particularly when we look at other countries and see how they and their people have been decimated by the flames of war. No; as I see it, citizenship should not be judged on the basis of racial origin. It is not just a racial ribbon to be worn on your coat. It means the contribution which one makes to the environment in which he finds himself. To me that is citizenship. It is the custom of my Tory friends to my right to protest their loyalty, but methinks they do protest too much.

Mr. FRASER: That is only your opinion.

Mr. KNIGHT: I am going to elaborate on that. For instance, I shall not easily forget the last session of parliament when they bit so avidly upon the bait so skilfully thrown out by the hon. member to whom I have just referred, when he taunted them about the British coat of arms being "a circus in a garden which is not well kept," which by the way is one of the best similes I know of in the English language. I am not necessarily agreeing with the opinion of the hon. member, but in view of the interruption of the hon. gentleman to my right I thought I might repeat what he said. For days after that remark was made in this house we heard speeches from almost every Tory member about racial origin, racial pride, and, forsooth, the traditions of Belleville and of Bruce county. Our Conservative friends wrap themselves at all times in the union jack; but what does the historical record show in regard to the attitude of this very party toward, for instance, allowing our English friends who are in dire need to enter our home market? Is there any loyalty to Britain there? Or how about their friends the manufacturers who at the outbreak of the war refused to manufacture war materials on the basis of cost plus a reasonable profit, and who are now straining at the leash of price ceilings in order that they might exploit the home market? I suppose my hon. friends have an answer to that one.

Mr. FRASER: Surely.

Mr. BROOKS: It is too silly to answer.

Mr. GRAYDON: You are pretty intemperate; that is all I can say.

Mr. FRASER: Ask the Minister of Labour. He is smiling. They may have been his friends.

Mr. KNIGHT: Having been so taunted I think I shall have to reply. May I say that I too was born and bred a Tory. I was born in the northern part of Ireland, which incidentally is the only place in the world, except Ontario, where a Tory government still survives. Even there Toryism is about finished. "Cataline is at the gates." Toryism is an indigestible morsel in the body politic.

Mr. GRAYDON: What happened to the C.C.F. in Ontario?

Mr. KNIGHT: If you would like some more I can give it to you. Let us go back to Ulster and the Tories. I come from that part of northern Ireland into which the English and Scottish Tories went and from which they drove the native Irish, whose lands they grabbed; and they have been grabbing everything else they could get their hands on ever since.

Mr. GRAYDON: The hon. member had better go on with his speech.

Mr. KNIGHT: Those were the days when Cromwell was riding up and down the hills of Ireland singing psalms and cutting off Irish heads in the name of the Lord.

May I now say a word about the reluctance of some people to ask British subjects to go through some form of certification for Canadian citizenship? One would think British subjects would be delighted so to do—and I speak now about my own feelings in the matter. Strange to say, I too had intended to paraphrase St. Paul, before the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) did it, because I can say that I too am a British subject, having been in Canada for almost forty years. I too look forward to the day when there will be no doubt in the mind of anyone about my position or the position of my children in Canadian society. May I suggest that perhaps my Progressive Conservative friends' disinclination to undergo such certification is not necessarily a matter of practical affairs, but rather a whim of pride of race, and a bid for a preferred position in Canadian society.

Mr. GRAYDON: Let the Liberal party speak for itself.

Mr. KNIGHT: There should be no preferred position or preferred peoples in this country. Neither should there be any preferred province or provinces; we should all be on an equal footing. While I cannot condone, still I can understand the attitude of the Progessive Conservative party. I have already told hon. members I was born and reared among them, and I am now a renegade—and proud of it.

Mr. FRASER: You certainly are.

Mr. GRAYDON: And everybody is satisfied.

Mr. KNIGHT: Let us have more of it. Speaking a moment ago the hon. member for Davenport said, "That is the kind of blood we want in this country." That talk irritates me—"the kind of blood we want in this country." Biologically speaking, of course, blood means nothing. I was much amused by a good English friend of mine who the other day was talking about his pure blood. I said to him, "Yes, that is true; but I suggest the source of the strength of the English nation may lie in its admixture of blood." Then I went over the long list who have made up the English people. While I could not recall all of them, from memory I referred to the Picts and the Scots, the ancient Britons, the Angles, the Jutes, the Saxons, the Danes. Then came the Normans, who brought with them the blood of the Gauls, the Norwegians and the Swedes. There were the Flemish weavers who helped us to develop our textile industry. Since that day, too, England has been open to the refugees from all nations.

Mr. COLDWELL: And do not forget the French Huguenots.

Mr. KNIGHT: Yes, and the French Huguenots. That is your pure English blood. I have no quarrel with English blood. It is good blood—just as good as mine.

Before resuming my seat I would ask the minister, when he rises to speak, to clarify the position of citizens of Eire who would come to this country. There are many people who do not understand the difference between Ireland as a whole, and Eire and Ulster, which are parts of it, and quite independent of each other.

If I seem to say that British citizens do not necessarily make better Canadians, do not misunderstand me. I believe they make just as good Canadians—and I say that in spite of the fact that at one time one could see in Winnipeg, as I did in 1910, signs with the words "Men wanted; no Englishmen need apply". That was what I saw when I came there and was looking for a job. I am proud there are no signs like that in this country to-day. In fact, Englishmen, and particularly in the two great wars, have proved the kind of stuff of which they are made. No one can throw that kind of slander at them. I want to make my position perfectly clear.

The hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet (Mr. Lesage) made a good point when he said that history had not yet proven that British people made better Canadians than other types did. His point was well taken. I am not so sure that my fellow compatriots from the British isles are more easily assimilated. In fact we have living examples—I was almost going to say right here in the house—of men who have boasted about their having lived in Canada for forty years, but who have not yet shown any striking aptitude for assimilation.

Since what I have said might be construed as an attack upon English-speaking Canadians, may I say to my Liberal French-speaking friends that to be good citizens we should not think too much in terms of one race or of one province. Rather we must think in terms of all the provinces, and as a collective whole. That, it seems to me, is the manner in which we must deal with this matter.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word because, like the hon. member who has immediately preceded me (Mr. Knight), I was born a British subject, in the United King-

dom, and came to this country about thirty-six years ago. I too remember the signs to which he referred—"Help wanted; no Englishmen need apply." I well remember the first job I held in this country, because after I had been in my position for three months I was told by the chairman of the school board which had hired me and asked me to renew my contract that, had they known I was an Englishman, I never would have stepped inside their school. That was in 1910. I am glad indeed to say that we have outlived that sort of thing; to-day those signs are absent.

I support the bill; I support it because it confers upon young men and women—and upon old men and women too, if they come here—the right to call themselves Canadian citizens. Even within the last two years, because I have nothing to show my Canadian citizenship I was described by a political opponent as "a foreigner". That was the description used by one of my friends of the Progressive Conservative party.

Mr. REID: I have been called a foreigner by members of the House of Commons.

Mr. COLDWELL: That may be so.

Mr. REID: Members of your party called me that.

Mr. IRVINE: Perhaps there was some excuse for that.

Mr. COLDWELL: Any man who says that kind of thing, no matter to what political party he belongs, does not deserve to get anywhere through saying it.

Mr. REID: I resented it.

Mr. COLDWELL: My understanding is that the bill asks for nothing new. If through its operation one were to lose the right to vote, it would be in an entirely different category, and I would discuss it from a different point of view. I agree with the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) that subsequently the franchise and election acts may have to be changed to conform with the bill. That is within the realm of possibility, and when it so decides it is the right of parliament to make that change. We should discuss the matter in the light of circumstances which then exist. But if any such action is ever taken I should like to see a distinction made between those who come to Canada from a country in which the institutions and language are different from ours, and those who come from countries—and I use the plural—in which there are democratic institutions analogous to our own, whether the United States, the United Kingdom, or one of the commonwealth nations.

The hon. member for Davenport went to great lengths in discussing the desirability of bringing in 30,000 British people who have applied to come to this country. I should like to see them come, but I would remind the hon. member that the government he supported between 1930 and 1935 deported over 30,000 British citizens whose only crime against this country was that they could not find jobs and were on relief. I know that to be true; the records and statistics will bear out my statement. As a member of the city council of Regina at that time I know that when we applied to the federal authorities for certain assistance we were told that some of these people had to be deported because they were public charges. As public charges they were deportable within the five years that Sir Robert Borden laid down as the length of domicile which a British citizen must have in this country before he could not be deported. Let us not forget that when we hear this bill attacked on the ground that it is doing something entirely new which is endangering the rights of British citizens in this country. Let us bear in mind that that is not so, that the situation set out in this bill is a situation which has existed for a number of years.

Mr. MARTIN: In principle from well before 1910, and the five years provisions since 1919.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is true. I think the bill, particularly section 26, should be changed. I regret that the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Jaenicke) is ill and cannot be present to-day. I agree with him when he says that this bill defines British citizenship and that we have no right to do that. I suggest to the minister that he adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Kindersley. We should consider a Canadian citizen as being a subject of His Majesty the King in the right of Canada. That would make the citizen of Canada a citizen of the British commonwealth of nations, which recognizes the same king but which recognizes also the divisibility of the crown and the sovereign as being the sovereign of each one separately of the nations that now comprise the British commonwealth. If this change were made there would be some validity in the argument raised by my hon. friend, and in that event I should like to see something placed in the bill which would give the British citizen the right to ask for and receive Canadian citizenship as a citizen of Canada in the right of His Majesty the King of Canada.

Mr. POULIOT: As a Canadian subject.

Mr. COLDWELL: As a Canadian citizen in the right of the King of Canada, that is a Canadian subject. He would be separate and distinct because the sovereign is separate and distinct. To my mind that is the way to view this. It would not for one moment affect our allegiance to a common sovereign, but it would make our citizenship what it ought to be, something distinct, something in which we can have pride as citizens of Canada.

I should like to go one step further. Anyone who comes to Canada should receive some certificate of citizenship. The length of residence need not be the same. It could be five years for those who are not used to our institutions; it could be one, two or three years for those who come from countries in which there are democratic institutions and language similar to our own. We cannot dodge the fact that there are two types of people who come to this country from other parts of the British commonwealth. There is the type of person who comes here to make Canada his home, who comes here to become a part of the great citizenship and family of Canada. This is the man who establishes his family in this country and intends to be in every respect a citizen of the country as long as he shall live. There are others who come here and stay one, two, five, ten or fifteen years but never regard this country as their homeland, and always look forward to the time when they can return home. Such a citizen has not the same loyalty to Canada as the one who makes this country his permanent home.

An hon. MEMBER: The Chinaman.

Mr. COLDWELL: I hear my hon. friend say, "the Chinaman." It is true that some Chinese have that conception, but some people who were born in the country in which I was born also have the same conception. They came to this country never expecting to stay. I know many of them who have always regarded the little isles across the sea as the place to which they are going to return, their homeland. I think we should teach all our people that if this country is good enough to make a living in, if it is good enough to establish a home in, then their loyalty should be to the country in which they live. That would not take one thing away from the broader loyalty which we feel as citizens of that great family which we call the British commonwealth, independent citizens equal with one another, owing allegiance to the same king, with the same symbol of unity. To my mind that is the dignified position in which any Canadian, Australian, New Zealander or Britisher should find himself. Those of us who have been here for many years, who have established our homes in this country, would not receive anything to show that we are citizens of this country. But those who come after us will, I am sure, appreciate some little ceremony which would give them recognition as members of this great Canadian family.

I want to support the bill because it does not, as it is now drafted, take away anything we now possess. If the change I have suggested is made, I should like to see another change made so that those who have the same institutions would not be required to put in the same length of time or apprenticeship to acquire Canadian citizenship.

I know why the five years' provision was put into effect. It was not put into effect so that we might deport someone, as my hon. friends of the Conservative party did in the days of the gloomy thirties. It was done in order to safeguard the health of our people.

Mr. MARTIN: Precisely.

Mr. COLDWELL: Immigrants should receive an examination as to mental ability and physical fitness, so thorough that we can accept them without the risk of having to deport them later on those grounds. There was some logic in having this provision when we did not have the facilities of examination that we now have.

I rose merely to express some of the things I feel as one who came to this country and who by long residence has been received into the Canadian family. I do not feel, as does the hon. member for Davenport, who was born here, that this is an insult to the people who were born elsewhere. Certainly as one of those who came here I do not consider it as an insult. My hon. friend says that as a Canadian born he feels he is a Canadian citizen. I should like to feel that I have something to show, when I am called a foreigner, that I have been here long enough to qualify as a member of the Canadian family.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to make any lengthy observations with respect to the measure which is now before the house for second reading. But I wish to make as earnest, as strong and as emphatic a plea as I can for the adoption of what I believe to be the proper procedure with respect to this bill. In discussing matters such as citizenship quite often the people of this nation are subconsciously divided when there is really no real reason for division. I have always felt

I was fortunate in being able to approach subjects of this kind without very much heat, although on many occasions subjects have been brought forward in this connection where heat seems to have been very easily generated.

It always interests me to hear people talk as if they were better Canadians than other people, but I have never found it easy to find a dividing line and say that on this side the people are all good Canadians and on that side bad Canadians. Human nature is not built that way. There are very few people in this house of Commons who have a greater affection for the old British Isles than I have and I do not think anyone need ask me to apologize for that position, which I have taken a good many times. On the other hand I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the house that I do not think that that affection should be regarded by anybody in the house as making us any less a Canadian than anybody else in Canada. I like to think that it makes us as good Canadians in any event as anybody else. I am not one of those who believe that any class or section of our people have a monopoly on good Canadianism in this country. You find good Canadianism in all sections of Canada, and I hope that we shall find that condition to continue to exist through all the years.

I have often felt that we might perhaps take a leaf out of the book of the British people themselves in developing a love of country. One of the things which struck me when I was overseas for the first time last November, December and January was the great love of country that I saw displayed everywhere I went in the British Isles, and I liked that feeling. In these days when we are spreading ourselves very thin in the international field, some may regard it as not being in the interests of world unity to express our affection too loudly for our own people and our own country, but I am not so sure that that kind of doctrine holds water. I think that the best contribution which this country can make to the commonwealth, to the empire and to the world organization is to develop a united Canada, a great country of our own, and at the same time develop a great love and affection for this land of ours.

I noticed everywhere I went in Britain that the people had a great and consuming affection for that land and I would like to see in this country no less a consuming affection for our own country and for our own people than the British have for theirs. Because, Mr. Speaker, this is a great land, great not only in its own right, but a great land to which the nations of the world are turning their eyes to-day as a country where people can live and find employment in the years that lie ahead. There is not a country in Europe where there are not thousands and scores of thousands of people who desire to emigrate to Canada. Why? Because this is regarded as one of the great lands of opportunity in the future world. If that is the view of other nations, surely it can be the view of a united Canadian people as well.

There comes to my mind at the moment an example of the type of affection I saw exhibited by the people of the old land for their own people and their own country. It was when we were leaving Southampton on one of the Clyde-built Queens, the *Mary*. There were on board at that time some 1,700 British war brides, with some 600 children, coming to rejoin on this side of the water American husbands whom they had married overseas. The scene left an indelible impression on my mind. As we left the dock at Southampton these girls lined the rails of the ship to take their last look at Britain and I have never seen as great a demonstration of affection not just for their families, their relatives and those who were close to them, but for their native land which they were leaving and which meant so much to them. I think in this country we do not do quite enough of that. We need to develop in Canada—I think we are all guilty in this respect, in most cases thoughtlessly guilty—the same kind of national pride, if you like, and I do not apologize for using that word, and the same kind of national affection for our country and for our people that has made the United Kingdom so great. You can perhaps rebuild devastated political structures; you can perhaps rebuild devastated economic structures, and these things are all-important in their place, but what is of the greatest national importance are the spiritual values in the nation itself. Those spiritual values comprise many things. One of the component parts of the spiritual values in this nation as in any other nation is the faith and confidence we have in ourselves as a nation and that love of country which has been so effective in building and maintaining and preserving other great nations of the world.

I make this appeal to the House of Commons this afternoon with great sincerity and with every emphasis at my command. I would like to see in the years that lie ahead the development in this country of a pride and an affection among ourselves for our own people and for our own country. I think in

the end that would mean a great deal and be the greatest contribution to the success of this nation and to its prestige in the empire and among the other nations of the world.

Before closing my rambling and very impromptu remarks this afternoon I would suggest to the minister that he give consideration now to the procedure to be followed in considering this bill. I regard this bill as a very important piece of legislation, so important that we cannot afford to toy with it. It is so important that we cannot afford to give it anything less than our very best attention and the most careful consideration of which this house and parliament is capable. All through the years it has been the experience of most of us who have been in parliament for any length of time that with a very important measure such as this, with many sections and great detail, the procedure that has been found most successful and effective in bringing forward the best type of legislation is to refer the bill after second reading, where the importance of the measure warrants it, to a committee of the House of Commons. You ask why? I could give many reasons, but in this particular instance there are two that are of exceptional importance. If, as I understand, it is the government's intention, unless they change it, to bring the bill before the committee of the whole, there will be no opportunity to do more than examine the minister with reference to its various provisions. He will be before the committee of the whole, assisted, and ably assisted, by his deputy, and our questions will, of course, be answered from time to time. But that is not enough on a bill such as this. This bill requires the best that this house can give it, and the committee of the whole is not, in my opinion, the best machinery available to members for the consideration of the measure. We should have the benefit of the cross-examination, if you like, or at any rate the questioning of the members of his department and those particular officials who have been working on the bill, to see after careful review by a committee, such as that on external affairs whether we can come to a conclusion which in the years to come will render it unnecessary for other governments, for this government or for any other parliament in some other session, to amend the bill in any respect. I should like to see a good job done on the bill now, and I am not satisfied that the best job can be done under the procedure to which the minister now seems so wedded.

I would suggest as my second reason, and the minister must of course be aware of this, that many points of view with respect to a matter such as this ought, in my opinion to be aired, if that is the desire, then the members of any committee that might deal with the bill ought to be given an opportunity to consider those views, so that no stone would be left unturned in seeing that this is the best measure that can be brought forward on such a vital and important national subject as citizenship and nationality.

I am going to make an appeal to the minister. I know there are reasons against this course which to him may appear valid and cogent. But we, too, have some views as well, and views that are strongly held, which dictate the course that we now propose. I am going to ask the minister to reconsider the matter, to review the whole question of the government's policy with respect to the procedure now being adopted. If the minister will reflect carefully, if the government will look into the matter from this point of view, they will see that by putting the bill before the committee of the whole instead of submitting it to a special committee they are doing less than justice to a bill to which, I submit, we cannot afford to do less than full justice, having in mind the special position it occupies in the legislation before this parliament.

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): I congratulate the hon. member for peel (Mr. Graydon) on his excellent speech. He spoke so well that I will send a copy of *Hansard* of to-day to his fine children. I cannot use the same exordium that some of my friends have used this afternoon. I cannot tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I was not born in this country because you would not believe me. It has been refreshing, however, to listen to the debate this afternoon. There were, of course, things that were said with which we may all agree and others with which all may disagree.

The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol), who is a student, has the gift of natural legal perspicacity and he has quoted St. Paul. He did not discourse on theology when he made that reference, but St. Paul was a Roman soldier and at the time he wrote the passage which my hon. friend read from a book that belongs to a mutual friend of ours, St. Paul was a citizen of the Roman empire outside Rome, outside Italy, because he was living in one of the colonies of Rome. There is another thing my hon. friend the member for Davenport has forgotten.

Mr. MacNICOL: He does not forget much.

Mr. POULIOT: No, but he has forgotten something that is very important. He has forgotten the fall of the Roman empire which occurred between the time that St. Paul wrote

that verse and this date, the 29th of April, 1946, when the hon. member read it to us. It occurred some time ago. It is a law of history that empires rise and fall. We hear no more now of Babylon; we hear no more of Persepolis; and it is surprising that Persia is talked about so much at the present time. However, it has adopted a different name.

The hon. member for Peel spoke of good Canadian citizens. There are some people in this country who are good citizens but who are not good Canadian citizens. They may say at times that they are Canadians and I will not say that they have not spiritual values and do not believe in spiritual values. But what is missing is the Canadian spirit, which should be the spirit of all Canadian members in both houses of parliament.

How many members of the Progressive Conservative party are imbued with that Canadian spirit? Whenever a member speaks of Canada, as the hon. member for Saskatoon City (Mr. Knight) did so well, everybody is puzzled. They say: "How can he speak of Canada? We are citizens of the British empire; we are citizens of the British commonwealth." Some members who are gifted and intelligent protested when the hon. member for Saskatoon City spoke. They could not understand that a member of parliament could say that he was a Canadian and that owing to that fact it did not mean that he was anti-British.

Some members do not have the Canadian spirit because they have the spirit of subservience to Britain. They deserve only one thing. They deserve the contempt of good Britishers. What the hon. member for Peel said is perfectly true, namely, that the Englishman loves his home; the Englishman loves his country. I have many friends among the British-born who love Canada more than England now that they are settled here. They are better Canadians than many people who have been born here. This is not the first time I have said that. They put to shame all the fire-eaters that we have in this house and outside this house and who represent only a handful of citizens of this country. I can speak with a little more ease and freedom than I could during the war. At that time these men who were such imperialists deserved only the contempt of those who were true to the British tradition. This I repeat because in my fan mail I receive letters from all over, letters signed by English-speaking Canadians, some of whom were born here and some others were born in the British isles or in the dominions. Your Honour would be surprised at the Canadian spirit that I find in these letters and at the condemnation of the imperialism shown by some leaders of thought. What surprises and dumbfounds me is the utter ignorance of the so-called well-read in this country. I hold in my hand a report of a lecture which was given by the president of a university in Montreal last year. He was the president of a great university; I mean great in size. It is not a university of Quebec, it is outside it. University men are presumed to be, rightly or wrongly, giants of thought. They may be compared with columns of light that dissipate all the darkness of the thinking universe. Leaving aside all artifice of literature, hyperbole, one will agree that the first duty of university men is to teach youth. On that point we must expect, especially if they are professors, that their knowledge should be at least equal to that of their average students. Without necessarily being living encyclopedias, the heads of our universities, those realms of learning, should have at least a little bit of general culture. Those were my reflections when I read the report of that lecture given by that university president on the burning subject of national unity.

We should not be ashamed of our history, and all Canadians worthy of the name should know it well. Alas, the history of Canada is a jewel-box of ignored pearls, *de faits ignorés*. An investigation made by a great daily of the city of New York has shown that all those who have degrees from United States universities totally ignore the history of their country. In all countries history is the cornerstone of patriotism, and patriotism is the only possible basis of lasting national unity or national good understanding. To appreciate to their value our liberties which have been so dearly won, no Canadian has the right to ignore the fights of the pioneers and the missionaries for the advancement of civilization and the sacrifices that our common ancestors have made for responsible government and freedom of religion.

This university president started by declaring that it should not be forgotten by those who doubt the reality or the continuance of Canadian unity that Canada is the only American country that has not been subjected to a revolution or a civil war. Did he tear the glorious pages which tell of the exploits of the heroes of 1837-38? It is very difficult to think that a man of such standing could deform and falsify history, and it is the more surprising when it comes from the head of a university. Then he went on to say:

> Canadians should be proud of the heritage of Canada and should look forward with confidence to a united Canada taking her place as one of the foremost nations of the world.

That is very fine, but how can Canada get there? Canada, he went on to say, on many occasions has taken a leading part in the British Empire, and took a leading part in formulating the Statute of Westminster which transformed the British empire into the British commonwealth of nations. That is a commonplace saying we hear on all sides. The statute of Westminster is just bunk. It was a concoction prepared by Sidney Webb, otherwise called Lord Passfield, who was a labour lord. I cannot conceive of a labour lord, but he was one. It has changed nothing in our constitution; it has just given us the illusion of autonomy, as the British government keeps the right to disallow all the legislation we pass here, even two years after its adoption. But to use the language of the president of this great university, how can Canada take her rank among the first nations of the universe as long as she has that string on her foot? Then he said:

> Second only to Great Britain in that commonwealth, this country must exercise its privileges and assume its responsibilities as one of the senior partners of the commonwealth.

Nothing is more complicated, according to this university president. Canada is one of the senior partners of the commonwealth. She comes to the first rank of nations of the universe, but in second place to Great Britain. It is very strange. One day I asked the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) what was the difference between "empire" and "commonwealth", and he replied that the two expressions were interchangeable; in other words that they had the same meaning, with the exception that "commonwealth" was more pompous than "empire."

Mr. COLDWELL: Is that what he said or what you are saying?

Mr. POULIOT: He said they were interchangeable, but they can be interchangeable only if they have the same meaning.

Mr. IRVINE: But were you quoting?

Mr. POULIOT: I was quoting the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, who said that the words "British empire" and "British commonwealth of nations" were interchangeable. Since then the universe has been divided into great and small countries. The great countries decide everything; but to console the others and to caress the vanity of our statesmen it has been said that Canada would head the small countries, the dwarf countries. What an honour! It is only the great countries, the big powers, that reach the all-important decisions, and the conclusions at which they arrive have great weight when they are considered by all the united nations.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Is the hon. member quoting the professor now or making his own statement?

Mr. POULIOT: I will tell the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) that this is a second quotation from the Prime Minister in reply to a second question I put to him. I asked about Teheran and Cairo; I asked if Canada was represented there, and he said no. I asked further if Canada had anything to do with the decisions reached by the big powers when they met together, when we were not invited to be present.

Mr. BLACKMORE: At Teheran or at some other conference?

Mr. POULIOT: All the conferences. I think I mentioned Teheran and Cairo, and he replied that what is decided by the big powers has great weight with the united nations. In fact we decide nothing. We are the trailer that follows. We are like the little porpoise that goes along following the mother porpoise.

Mr. HANSELL: Is that still a quotation?

Mr. POULIOT: No; this is not a quotation at all.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The hon. member is talking colonialism now, is he not?

Mr. POULIOT: I will come to that for my hon. friend in one moment. No; I am talking of porpoises; I am talking of fisheries. The rule to the effect that all are equal before the law does not apply to the meetings of the big powers, or even to the meetings of the united nations, because it is only those who are on the security council who have their say.

I should like that university president, who was once mentioned as a prospective leader of the Conservative party, to enumerate the privileges and responsibilities of Canada as the senior partner of the British commonwealth. We would know better what he meant. But the language of those who pose as propagandists of national unity is never clear. They are preaching in the desert, so long as the majority of the population will not admit that the duty of all Canadians is to recognize Canada as their own country, and to promote the interests of Canada before those of any other country.

Such is the only true and lasting basis of what is called national unity, but should be called national good understanding. In answer to the hon. member for Lethbridge,

I will tell him that I do not agree or disagree with the bill. In my view it is premature. I do not think those who are ready to give all our wealth to another country, without asking anything in return, should have the right to call themselves Canadian citizens.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Are there any such?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Can the hon. member name one?

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend himself.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is entirely wrong.

Mr. POULIOT: It may be wrong, but I have explained it.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I challenge the hon. member to find any evidence of that in *Hansard*.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend is ready to put his head on the block when the British empire is mentioned.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is utterly false.

Mr. POULIOT: He has a right to sacrifice himself on the altar of the country; so has the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) who objected the other day to Canada Day. They should pair. We have some of them on our side and there are some on the other side. There are some for whom I have respect, and even admiration, because they are frank and honest. The hon. member for Davenport, for instance, is honest, and I have respect and admiration for him. He will never say he is not an imperialist. He will repeat the words of Sir John A. Macdonald, "A British subject I was born; a British subject I will die." The hon. member belongs in the category of good citizens; but he cannot call himself a Canadian citizen. He cannot do that, although he does say something for which a Canadian citizen should be congratulated. He is a most difficult case; I cannot understand him.

Here is my genial friend the hon. member for Lethbridge, whom everyone likes. He is an imperialist to the core, and cannot call himself a Canadian citizen.

Mr. BLACKMORE: In your opinion.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, certainly.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Born in the United States; does **that prevent my being—**

Mr. POULIOT: No, that is not it. A man may be born in China; he may be born in Africa, and he may be a good Canadian—

Mr. BLACKMORE: Why not talk sense, instead of that nonsense you are talking?

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. POULIOT: I can speak about China, and talk sense at the same time. My hon. friend must not forget that China is the country that first put holes in buttons, and also invented gunpowder. It was the first civilized country in the world.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Has that something to do with Canadian citizenship?

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, yes, it has. I will explain that to my hon. friend.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am beginning to see through your nonsense.

Mr. POULIOT: As my hon. friend is an imperialist to the core, he is a fellow citizen of all the Asiatics in Asia who are under British domination and all the negroes in Africa who are under British domination. But for me, as a British subject, if I am a Canadian I am a fellow citizen only of those Chinese who live here, and only of those negroes who live here. That makes a great difference.

Beside that, I think of my own people, and those people include the hon. member for Lethbridge. I want him to be happy, in preference to someone who may not be living in Canada now. I know that my hon. friend has made Canada his home and that he is a good citizen. But I am very sorry I cannot call him a Canadian citizen, for the simple reason that he wants to be more imperialist than Canadian. That is not the sort of pride a real Canadian should have, a condition I regret deeply.

He should have pride in his adopted country, the country of his choice, the country in which he wishes to live with his children. One must prefer that country to any other country in the world. I do not believe in hybrid citizenship.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Did you give a son in the war for Canada?

Mr. POULIOT: My son is only eight years old, but if my hon. friend represents the Canadian attitude, probably the boys of eight will be called in the next war—and it will not take long.

However, I am not discussing citizenship with my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSELL. But you are implying that he is disloyal to Canada.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not say he is not loyal to Canada.

Mr. HANSELL: That is your implication.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member for Macleod knows very well that it is not possible to discuss this matter—and we now

have evidence of it in the present discussion. The bill is premature. If at the same time we are Canadian citizens—and the hon. member for Macleod is a good Canadian citizen; I will give him credit for that—

Mr. HANSELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. POULIOT: When we hear expressions of opinion, as we have since the beginning of this session, then in view of section 26 I say we cannot pass this bill, because it has been put there to appease those who are non-Canadians.

When I say to the hon. member for Lethbridge that he is a non-Canadian in spirit, it is true that his body is here and his mind is here, but his heart is not.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And is he different from the hon. member from Macleod?

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, yes.

Mr. BLACKMORE: In what respect?

Mr. POULIOT: Because the hon. member for Lethbridge has crossed the fence, in his love of the empire.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. member to produce from *Hansard* any evidence to support the unjustified remarks he is making. I am amazed at his outburst this afternoon, and that an hon. member should have to sit here and listen to that.

Mr. POULIOT: I will go to the library, produce and table all those copies of *Hansard* since the hon. member is a member of parliament. I do not have them at hand now, but I will table them, and my hon. friend will find in his speeches the true expression of what I have told him.

I do not say this in an offensive way. My colleagues are kind to me, and I do not wish to be unpleasant to them. However, I do not believe in this stuff, and I believe it is before us precisely to distract the attention of the people of Canada from the loan to Britain. The same is true of the flag. It is a flag which means nothing. We might better keep the union jack, to show our real colours. So long as the people of Canada have not a Canadian spirit this citizenship bill amounts to nothing. The Canadian flag amounts to nothing because it will not be a Canadian flag. It is impossible to discuss it here. There was a storm raised the other day when it was suggested that Dominion day should be changed to Canada day. I congratulate the hon. member for Matapedia-Matane (Mr. Cote) upon his move. That is something that should have been done as a routine matter but it raised a storm in this house. Hon. members were scandalized; they said it was not loyal. I am just as loyal as anybody to His Majesty the King whom I revere and respect, but I do not think I should be expected to be any more loyal than he is himself. We should not take up time in discussing this matter of a hybrid citizenship when we have more important matters to deal with. As the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) has said, let us be subjects of His Majesty the King in his capacity as King of the realm of Canada, an expression that His Majesty used himself in the senate chamber.

We do not find many people talking about the realm of Canada; it is said that we should not speak about the kingdom of Canada or the realm of Canada, but those words came from the mouth of His Majesty the King. There is an element here that rejoices in servitude, in serfdom and in slavery of mind. They are so narrow-minded that they cannot conceive of Canadianism existing as a noble sentiment.

We do not have a Canadian spirit; therefore this bill is premature. I cannot see how a man who is an imperialist can be proud of being a Canadian subject of His Majesty the King. The first thing he will deny is the divisibility of the crown; he will say that the King is King of the United Kingdom, that it is to the United Kingdom that he owes allegiance. That is true. Sometimes a member of parliament is also mayor of his municipality. When he presides at a sitting of the municipal council he does not preside in his capacity as a member of parliament; he presides at that council in his capacity as mayor of the municipality. When he sits here it is not in his capacity as mayor of his home town; he sits here as a duly elected member of parliament. That shows that a man can fulfil two different functions. According to what His Majesty said in the senate chamber he will be just as proud to bear the title King of Canada as he is to bear the title of King of any other part of the world. By the way, he is already King of Great Britain, Northern Ireland and all the British possessions overseas, which include Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman but he has spoken for over forty minutes.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Go ahead.

Mr. POULIOT: I like you very much.

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a few words on this bill. At the outset may I say that I am a Canadian in order there will be no misunderstanding on

that point. If I happen to mention England and the British empire I do not do so because I am a great imperialist, but because I have great respect and regard for both. I have enjoyed listening to this debate. It has been logical in most cases and I have marvelled at the study and research which has been carried on by hon. members. The principles of the bill have been thoroughly discussed for some time and it will not be necessary for me to take up much of the time of the house this afternoon.

Some hon. members have said that the first real Canadians came from the province of Quebec. I do not think I can agree entirely with that, but I do agree that some very fine Canadians have come from the province of Quebec. The first Canadians, if we may call them such, were the Indians who resided in this country when the first white men came. When we try to go back to the time of the arrival in Canada of the first white men I think we in the maritimes can claim that the first white Canadians settled there. In recalling our history we shall remember that the first white settlement was founded at Port Royal in Nova Scotia, the city of Quebec being founded, I believe, four or five years afterwards.

I was amazed to hear some hon. members claim that because they had been called foreigners, having come from the old country, therefore, that was an argument in support of this bill. I should like to refer them, not too seriously, to what we are called in the maritimes. Possibly the minister will contend that when this bill is passed we shall not be called these names any more. For instance, the citizens of Nova Scotia have been called blue-noses for a great many generations. We in New Brunswick are called herring-chokers and over in Prince Edward Island they are known as spud-islanders or some such appellation as that. I hope, after this bill is passed, we shall all be known as Canadians pure and simple.

My chief object in rising is to voice objection to that section which requires a British subject to be in this country for five years before he can become a Canadian citizen. It occurred to me a few weeks ago when the new governor general of this dominion arrived in this country, a man who had a very distinguished record in private life and who was one of the most outstanding generals during the last war, if he had come here as a private individual seeking entry into this country and hoping to become a citizen he would have had to wait for five years under the provisions of this bill in order to become a Canadian citizen.

[Mr. Brooks.]

Mr. MARTIN: The same situation has existed for the last twenty-seven years.

Mr. BROOKS: We have not had the bill for the last twenty-seven years.

Mr. MARTIN: Under the Immigration Act a five years' residence was necessary.

Mr. BROOKS: There were certain privileges which he would have had.

Mr. MARTIN: And which he still has.

Mr. BROOKS: But which the minister intimated this afternoon would probably be taken away.

Mr. MARTIN: I said just the opposite, that they would not be taken away.

Mr. BROOKS: I heard the minister refer to the franchise act, and my understanding of what he said was that an amendment to the franchise act would be based on Canadian citizenship, which would require five years.

Mr. MARTIN: I said the very opposite; I said there is no intention on the part of this government to change the elections act following the passage of this bill.

Mr. GRAYDON: They may do that at another session.

Mr. BROOKS: If there is no reason for changing the franchise act I do not see any reason for the provision that a British subject must be in this country for five years before he can become a Canadian citizen.

Mr. MARTIN: Sir Robert Borden was the one who decided that.

Mr. BROOKS: I can understand that there are certain reasons why people coming from foreign countries should be in this country for five years. They have not our language and it takes five years to learn the English or the French language. Many of these people have been in this country for twenty years and have not learned the English language. When I hear some Englishmen and Scotsmen who have been in this country for more than five years I realize that they will have to be in Canada for almost all eternity before they will be able to speak the English language as it is spoken here.

Again, our customs throughout the British empire are very much the same, so that people coming from other parts of the British commonwealth of nations do not have to learn the customs of the Dominion of Canada because they know them already; their own customs are the same. So that both the language and the customs arguments fall to the ground. It

is not necessary on either of these counts to compel a British subject to wait for five years for his citizenship papers in Canada.

Then we come to the possible argument requiring him to know the history of Canada.

I think the history of the commonwealth is taught in all British schools, so that people coming here from other parts of the commonwealth would have a knowledge of the history of this country.

The only argument that remains, and the minister mentioned it this afternoon, is the argument on health. The minister speaks of Sir Robert Borden, who was prime minister nearly forty years ago. Have we stood still all that time? Is it necessary to take five years to determine whether the health of a person is such as to qualify him to become a citizen of this country? That argument, too, falls to the ground on the statement of the minister himself.

Mr. MARTIN: That is not what the medical advisers say.

Mr. BROOKS: We have not heard from any medical advisers in this house. All we have is the minister's word now. It did not take five years to determine whether a man offering himself for enlistment was physically fit to join the army and fight in defence of this country. That did not take five years, nor five months. So that I do not think the health argument is a sound one on which to base this five-year provision in the bill.

Despite what the minister says, I am satisfied that this measure will become the foundation of other acts in the future, such as the franchise act. I am satisfied that it will result in taking away the right which has been enjoyed by people coming from other parts of the British commonwealth and the British empire to vote in this country one year after they arrive.

I see no logical reason, therefore, on the ground of language, customs, history or health for making this a five-year period.

Other hon. members have spoken of Canadian soldiers in the two wars. I do not believe that the passing of this bill is going to do away with all this hyphenated Canadianism. The mere passage of a bill cannot do away with that sort of thing. It goes much deeper than that. In the two wars Canadians got together, fought together, slept together, played together. In that way they learned to break down all prejudices that there were between men of different races and from different sections of this country, and that is the only way in which these prejudices can be broken down. It cannot be done merely by the passing of a bill, but by young men from all parts of Canada associating with and learning to know each other. I would suggest that the young people in our schools in one province should visit the young people attending school in another province. For instance, boys from Quebec could go to Ontario and Ontario boys go to Quebec; maritimers go west and westerners go east, and so on. In that way the young people of this dominion would learn something about conditions in the other provinces and get to know people living in other parts of the dominion. In that way in time we would have a united country. I do not believe that that can be done simply by passing a bill of this kind. The unity of the Canada of the future depends on the sympathetic understanding of all peoples comprising our population.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I think it would help a little in this house if we appointed a committee to draw up in detail a definition of what is an imperialist and probably appointed another committee to draw up a definition in detail of what constitutes a Canadian. I have sat here now for ten years trying to get some sort of idea of what is an imperialist and what is a Canadian. I thought I knew all about it ten years ago before I came into parliament, and I still believe I know about it. But there is a great disagreement among members of this house as to what constitutes an imperialist and what constitutes a Canadian. I have an idea that this is causing more disunity at the present time than any other one thing. If a person cannot support the unity and greatness of the British empire, if he has to stand on the floor of this house and advocate the destruction of the British empire—

Mr. RINFRET: Who did so?

Mr. BLACKMORE: If he has to do that in order to be a Canadian—

Mr. LESAGE: Who did so?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am not saying that anybody did so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I should like to recall to hon. members that the hon. member who has the floor should not be interrupted, and the hon. member who has the floor should address himself to the Chair.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the interruptions. This sore has been festering for quite a long time and maybe we have reached the point where it has come to a head and ought to be lanced. I resent to

the depths of my being some of the remarks made this afternoon. They were utterly unjustifiable.

Mr. POULIOT: I would ask my hon. friend a question. Would he tell Mr. Speaker whether he considers the word "imperialist" offensive?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I wish to know whether anybody can give a definition of "imperialist" that will be acceptable to the house. I do not think anybody here can give a definition of that word that would be acceptable to the house, and I doubt, after listening to the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), that anybody can give a definition of what constitutes a Canadian that will be acceptable to the house.

Mr. POULIOT: A man who helps Canada more than any other country.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member who has the floor, but I would remind him that, as I have said before, on the second reading the principle of the bill should be discussed.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing I can say, and that is that if a member cannot answer an attack which has been made upon him in debate, if one member is free to make an attack and go completely off the subject in making that attack, and then the member attacked is debarred from the right of defending himself in the same debate, certainly it is time that some change was made in the rules of the house.

Mr. POULIOT: There was no attack, and you can speak for thirty minutes more.

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I should like to voice my opposition to the section of this bill which requires a British subject to be in this country for five years before he can take out his citizenship papers. I wish to know if that holds good in Great Britain. Suppose a Canadian goes to Great Britain to live; does he have to wait for five years before he receives his citizenship papers?

Mr. MARTIN: Does he not in Australia and New Zealand?

Mr. JAQUES: I am asking the question. What is the purpose of this?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, is asking a question when there is no opportunity of replying to it specifically now that we are debating the second reading. If that is all the hon. gentleman has to say, I would suggest that he raise the question when we reach that particular section of the bill, when there will be ample opportunity to answer fully any questions regarding the section.

Mr. JAQUES: Then, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say two or three words on the remarks made by the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), who no doubt speaks for a large number of members from Quebec.

Mr. POULIOT: No.

Mr. JAQUES: Well, it sounds like that. This insistence on Canadian nationality, of which we hear so much, the insistence that we must be independent, is all right. But why are not these "Canadian nationalists" more consistent? Last session when we were discussing the Bretton Woods measure, which means nothing less than the surrender of Canadian sovereignty and therefore Canadian independence, where was their Canadianism? They all voted for it. They do not mind being under the control of Wall street or under the control of international finance. That seems to be all right. Well, I would rather be a sovereign part of the British empire. That would prove a great deal safer and more satisfactory to Canadian citizens.

Perhaps I should wait to ask the other questions I have in mind, but for the moment I will say that, with regard to the five-year provision, the only reason I can see for it is that it is perhaps planned to bring in a great many aliens—I will not be more specific than that—and unless immigrants are all treated alike, that is to say, if people from the British isles are to be citizens as soon as they get here and aliens are not, possibly the government and the Secretary of State fear they might be accused of racial discrimination. I will not be more specific than that. Perhaps the minister will answer questions when the bill is in committee.

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): In closing the debate, I am sure I express the views of every member of the house when I say that the measure, one admittedly of great importance, has been debated on all sides of the house with a considerable degree of thoroughness, both as regards the subject matter involved and in other respects; and one of the most remarkable circumstances, in my opinion, is that on all sides, from every party, there has been a unanimous expression of approval of the bill itself. That, I think, reflects the determination of this house to give expression to the common conviction and desire which all Canadians have of being able to assert in law as well as in fact that they are citizens of this country.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MARTIN: In concluding this debate it was not my intention to make any protracted statement, and perhaps in some respects it may not be necessary in the light of the fact that the measure has received such wide approval in principle from all sections of the house; but because during the course of the debate attention has been paid to two points in the bill, and because on account of the rules of the house there was no opportunity to make a full statement with regard to some of the points made by hon. gentlemen opposite, it does seem desirable to take advantage of this opportunity to correct certain misapprehensions which have been expressed during the course of the debate.

As the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) said to-day, the measure before the house is an important one. It was carefully studied by a committee of the departments of External Affairs, Justice, Immigration and the Department of the Secretary of State. I wish to pay tribute to-night to a number of men from these departments who were associated with me over many weeks in the preparation of this important measure. We had the advantage of having before us not only our own proposals but also the studies made by a former secretary of state to whom I made reference in this debate when I moved second reading.

First of all, I should like to express my gratification at the degree of unanimity and approval that has been shown in the speeches which have been made. I think it would not be too much to say that almost every hon. member has approved the principle embodied in the bill. This is of particular importance in a measure of this kind; for it might be called an organic measure, a measure that will go into and become part of the basic legal framework of Canada. The highest possible degree of general approval is always of greatest importance for such a fundamental piece of legislation.

In addition, however, there is the fact that this bill is intended to aid in creating a sense of unity and oneness in Canada, a feeling of community. A bill to create unity must not be based on disunity and disagreement. It is therefore particularly pleasing to see the measure of support which the bill has been receiving.

I do not wish to discuss the general aspects of the bill at any length at this time, but there are two parts of it which have caused some discussion and to which I would wish to make reference. The portions I have in mind are embodied in sections 10 and 26 of the bill. The parts of section 10 that have received particular attention are the requirements which are imposed by way of qualification and procedure on non-Canadian British subjects who desire to become Canadian citizens. The question in relation to section 26 is whether the bill should provide that the status of British subject continues for Canadian citizens. In my opening statement I said that this bill parallels the development of Canada as a nation. I repeat that statement.

This bill cannot and does not seek to meet extreme points of view which in some instances have been expressed in this house. There are extreme positions that can be taken in connection with these points. At one end of the scale there is the desire to reduce the qualification and procedure for non-Canadian British subjects to the minimum and to emphasize as much as possible the status of British subjects for Canadian citizens. At the other end of the scale the position is that no privileges whatever should be given to British subjects; that they should be aliens in the sight of our law and that the status of British subject should be eliminated with regard to Canadian citizens. These are extreme points of view. The present bill does not go to either extreme. For that reason it does not secure complete approval from either of the groups of opinion to which I have referred. The bill falls in between that. It assumes a middle position, and I think a reasonable position, one that enjoys, I believe, a greater measure of general support among the Canadian people than either of the more extreme positions would elicit.

First of all let me refer to the position of the non-Canadian British subjects. Particular criticism has been directed against the requirement of five years' residence, and against the procedure involved in the acquisition of a certificate. Before examining these matters, let me state categorically what I have said before by way of interjection and by way of my statement at the opening of the debate, but what has so frequently been ignored or forgotten, that the bill will not and does not remove one iota of the rights and privileges that are now enjoyed by British subjects in Canada. A British subject over twenty-one has now the right to vote. He will continue to have that right to vote after this bill is passed. A British subject is eligible for an old age pension. He will continue to be eligible for an old age pension after the bill is passed. A British subject is eligible for appointment to the civil service. He will continue to be eligible for such appointment after the bill is passed.

The rights that British subjects now have will remain in full. None is taken away by this bill or reduced in any respect. They remain precisely as they are. The bill does not affect the status of British subjects in any way; it merely regulates the method of becoming Canadian citizens.

Moreover, under the bill—and no attention has been paid to this fact—all those British subjects now in Canada who have domicile will become citizens of Canada on the passage of this bill. The wives of soldiers, the war brides who are coming and who will be coming to Canada in the next few months, will automatically become Canadian citizens under this bill. These two facts have not been emphasized.

The suggestion has been made from one extreme quarter that this bill was an attempt to violate Canada's relationship to the commonwealth. No reference was made by these hon. gentlemen to the provision of section 26 of the bill which in its precise terms are more definite than will be found in any corresponding legislation in any other part of the commonwealth. On the other hand, those who took exception to the fact that the bill provides that Canadian citizens shall be designated British subjects failed to recogize that the paramount status in the bill is the status of being able to say, "I am a Canadian citizen."

No one can envisage the future. In 1919, when Sir Robert Borden changed the provision from three years to five years, he was faced within his own party by the very sort of argument which has been used by some hon. gentlemen during this debate. The rights of British subjects were not changed by the amendments brought in by the government of Sir Robert Borden, any more than they will be changed to-day. This parliament, representing as it does the temper, the opinion and the conviction of the Canadian people, will always be guided by the character of Canada, a free nation within the British commonwealth. In some references which have been made to the bill, it has been suggested that the five-year requirement is something new, which never existed before. In actual fact it is nothing of the sort. The requirement of five years' residence as it applies to British subjects is exactly the same to-day as it has been since 1919. Thus it is simply a continuation of the existing provision.

In essence, citizenship is made up of a collection of rights and duties that pertain to a particular status. Some of the rights are internal to the state involved, and some are external. The former group are fairly clear: the right to own property, the right to vote,

the right of appointment to particular positions, the right to pension and so forth. The external rights are also fairly clear. Normally they include the right to be admitted into the country on coming to its boundaries, the right to diplomatic and consular protection and assistance, the right to a passport and so forth. As far as Canada is concerned, the internal rights, if I may call them such, are accorded to British subjects on the same basis as to Canadian citizens. As I have already emphasized, none of this will be changed with the passage of this bill. As far as the external rights are concerned, the one normally most important is the right of entry, and for almost half a century this right has been limited to Canadian citizens and other persons having their domicile here. The British subject who comes to the shores of Canada has no right of entry. If he is admitted to Canada as an immigrant and lives here for five years he becomes a Canadian citizen under the Immigration Act, and only then does he have an automatic right to come into Canada.

When this requirement of a number of years of residence was first imposed the period was two years. That was prior to 1910. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) was perhaps the only hon. member who very properly pointed out that this period was required for certain reasons, mainly health and to avoid the mischief of individuals whose records were clearly those of criminals. The period was required in order to give the immigration authorities a chance to see whether the person was desirable to have as a Canadian; whether he was sound in body and mind; whether he had criminal tendencies, and so on. Later, the two-year period was found to be too short, and in 1910, at the request of the provinces it was extended to three years. However, as I said earlier, this also was found to be inadequate and in 1919 a Conservative government under the leadership of Sir Robert Borden extended the period from three to five years, where it has remained ever since. In short, for over a quarter of a century we have required five years' residence of a British subject before granting him a right of entry.

Perhaps one more word might be said on this point. Obviously a bill such as that now before the house must be related to the Immigration Act. When we come to deal with this particular section my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen), speaking as Minister of Immigration, will relate to the house some of the difficulties being experienced by his department, and will show statistically how important this provision really is. I may say frankly that

when the bill was being discussed we had taken the position that it might be desirable to reduce the period, but that met with objections on the part of the officers of the department of immigration. They are by no means, by their own traditions, men who can be said to be inimical to the interests of the British commonwealth. Every hon. member knows from what part of the world came the commissioner of immigration, who has to administer this measure. Everyone, of course, knows the origin of the Minister of Mines and Resources, if there should be any doubt about my own sincerity in the matter. But from the point of view of administration, having in mind the desirability that we should not be saddled with people who had criminal records, people who were of criminal tendencies or people who had mental difficulties not ascertained or ascertainable at the time of entry; having in mind that provincial institutions were being called upon to take care of many of these people, it was felt desirable that we should not be saddled within one or two or three years with the burden of maintaining them, when for the greater part of their lives they had resided elsewhere.

I think the relevance of what I have said will be apparent, for it completes the picture with regard to British subjects and makes it clear that their rights have not been changed in the present bill. The rights that British subjects have enjoyed, as British subjects, will continue to be theirs; they do not have to be Canadian citizens in order to secure them. On the other hand, the right of entry, which hitherto they have been able to obtain after five years of residence, will continue to be theirs after five years of residence. The time element is nothing new; it is no change whatsoever. It does not alter the position of a British subject; it merely perpetuates a situation which has prevailed in this country for over a quarter of a century.

During the debate the question was asked: "Why should it be necessary to give a certificate of citizenship to a non-Canadian British subject?" Well, I could understand that attitude on the part of someone who perhaps has had no experience in the administration of the immigration department, or the administration of the Department of the Secretary of State, or the administration of the Department of External Affairs, or to a lesser extent, the administration of the Department of Justice. But let me give the house one case that came to my attention only after six o'clock this afternoon. A few days ago the daughter of a well known missionary of the United Church, who had been in China for over twenty-three years, proceeded to the United States to attend university. She had never lived in this country. Her father had been born in the United Kingdom and had come to Canada, where he was ordained in the United church ministry and almost immediately thereafter went to China. Under the laws of China that girl is a citizen of that country. She is not a citizen of the United Kingdom, but she is a citizen of Canada. She was on her way to a particular university in the United States, but in the middle of the night an immigration officer instructed her to get up and prepare to answer certain questions. Later, she was put off the train because she could not prove to that officer that she was a citizen of Canada. She had nothing by way of documentary proof to show that she was not, even in her own mind, a citizen of China. Will anyone say that under those circumstances we should perpetuate that kind of injustice? As my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources will show later on, the immigration department is full of cases of that sort, clearly indicating that in the interests of justice itself to thousands of individuals it is wholly desirable that they should have documentary proof of the citizenship which the existing law or which this measure will give them.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is that not the case we had up a year or so ago?

Mr. MARTIN: No; that is a case which occurred last Thursday, I believe, and came to my attention only this afternoon.

Mr. HAZEN: Would we not have a conflict of laws there? Could she not be a citizen of China?

Mr. MARTIN: My hon. friend is quite right. She could be a citizen of China. There are cases where people are citizens of no less than seven countries. My attention has been called to a case before the war of a citizen of another country who, under the laws of eleven different countries, was a citizen of those countries.

We cannot deal with the kind of status determined by other countries, except by our own law to do all we can to avoid two things, namely to avoid statelessness and dual nationality, or nationality of several kinds.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): That is what the underling in the United States did.

Mr. MARTIN: I am just reciting that as an instance.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): But that is what you are stating.

Mr. MARTIN: I am just reciting that as one case in perhaps more than many hundreds, to show the desirability of being able to provide documentary proof of citizenship. It affords some protection.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): But this measure does not consider that situation.

Mr. MARTIN: Well, my hon. friend has likely given more attention to this matter than I have.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I do not know whether I have given it more attention, but if the minister would tell me where that has application in this measure, I should like to know.

Mr. POULIOT: There is the difference between St. Paul and St. Paul's.

Mr. MARTIN: The second general matter with which I wish to deal is the provision in the bill for the maintenance of the status of British subject. From the remarks of certain hon. members it is apparent that there is a large measure of misunderstanding as to the reason for having the sections which deal with the status of British subject. I think it has been generally felt that the principle involved in sections 26 and 28 is of such importance that the bill cannot be properly dealt with on second reading without referring to them in some detail.

Section 26 states that a Canadian citizen is a British subject. What does this mean? Does it mean that a Canadian citizen is a subject of Great Britain? It most certainly does not. No one needs to tell hon. members of the Canadian parliament that the independence of Canada is complete. Canadians are subject to the authority of no government outside Canada. No matter what they may be called, they are as Canadians subject to no other country. There is no possible room for doubt on this point.

Does the section means that we are demanding special favours for Canadians? Are we calling them British subjects in order to require of other countries of the commonwealth that they be given special treatment? Some hon. members have suggested that that is so. In reality, it is not so. The government of the United Kingdom is not obliged to give any special treatment to all persons who happen to bear the generic name "British subject". It can differentiate among them as much as it wishes, and give as many or as few rights and privileges as it sees fit. The government of Australia can treat Australian-British subjects in one way and Canadian-British subjects in another. It can differentiate between Canadian-British subjects and South African-British subjects. It can do precisely as it wishes, no matter what term of description we may use. The same is true for all other governments of the commonwealth. Each one is completely free to give or deny rights to British subjects as a whole or to any part of that broad group. Such differentiation and distinction has been a fact for years, and it will continue to be a fact.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I ask one simple question—and I assure the minister I am trying to be helpful? I just wrote down what the minister said, that a Canadian subject is a British subject. I wonder under what authority he is entitled to say that.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. member has said that it is a simple question. Is there any doubt that this parliament has the right to determine the character and status of its people?

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): None whatsoever. I was speaking extra-territorially, in conformity with the bill, I would assume.

Mr. MARTIN: I will come to that later.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I am sorry I interrupted.

Mr. MARTIN: It is all right.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I was not being facetious.

Mr. MARTIN: As a result, it is clear that when we say "A Canadian citizen is a British subject", we ask no recognition from anyone for any particular implications as flowing from the title. Whatever rights or privileges another country gives to Canadian citizens will depend on their law—not on ours. Nothing we may do can in any way limit their full and free capacity to treat our citizens on whatever basis they see fit in so far as their law is concerned.

There is a third possibility as to the meaning of the section. Is it necessary to ensure that a Canadian citizen is a subject of His Majesty the King? Again the answer is no. It is, of course, beyond doubt that a Canadian citizen is and will be a subject of the king, but that does not depend in any way upon the force of this section. There is no magic in the appellation "British subject", and a Canadian citizen would as surely and as loyally owe allegiance to the crown whether we called him "British subject" or not. Loyalty does not depend on a name, and it would be a rash man who would suggest that a Canadian would be less loyal as a "Canadian citizen" than he would be as a "British subject". The

fact of allegiance exists. The spirit of loyalty is beyond doubt. Section 26 could go without affecting our loyalty or the fact of our allegiance in any way.

Those, then, are three possibilities that do not apply. Section 26 does not mean subjection to Great Britain. It does not constitute a demand for special treatment. It is not essential to maintain our loyalty to the crown.

What then does section 26 mean when it says that "a Canadian citizen is a British subject?" It means nothing more or less than that we are retaining a term which has been used traditionally to designate a particular group of people in the world who share a peculiar association, of which association we have been and are a part. There is a definite practical reason for retaining the term, but before coming to that I wish to deal with some more general considerations.

Some people have questioned whether the retention of this term does not conflict with one purpose of the bill, which is to foster a sense of Canadianism. I do not think that it does or that it hinders us in any way. Because the name "British subject" implies no inflexible rights and duties we are able to retain it and still be completely free to legislate as we wish. It does not impose anything on us or deny anything from us. Moreover, there is, I think, a positive value in retaining this symbol of our association in the British commonwealth of nations. The commonwealth has been and is a great force for good in the world, and there is much to be said for preserving some of the evidences of association that do not conflict or interfere in any way with the essentials of our separate personality and status. The government is of the opinion that this house and the people of Canada will, on the whole, agree that the term should be retained.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): The symbolism, you mean.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. From the practical point of view, however, there is an important reason for retaining the term "British subject". While it is not a term that has any specific meaning in terms of rights and duties, it has acquired the character of a technical legal term that has become so firmly embedded in our law, particularly our statute law, both provincial and dominion, that it cannot be swept away without an extensive revision of the law.

Many dominion statutes and also many provincial statutes make reference to "British subjects." It is necessary for the operation of these statutes that this term be defined in our Canadian law. If the term "British subject" were to be dropped from the bill the result would be great confusion and uncertainty as to the application of many existing statutes. In questions of interpretation, if the meaning of the term "British subject" were not set forth as is now done in the bill, the courts would probably find it necessary to refer to the definition of "British subject" as it was recognized by the law prior to the enactment of a statutory definition. Under the common law there was no naturalization and, in general, only persons born to the status were British subjects. This would mean that, practically speaking, only persons born in His Majesty's territories and allegiance would be British subjects. A person naturalized as a Canadian citizen would probably not be a British subject. In the same way, if we change the bill to say that "a Canadian citizen is a subject of His Majesty," rather than have the present section which says that "a Canadian citizen is a British subject," there again arises in cases of the interpretation of the statutes the question whether this is the equivalent of making Canadian citizens British subjects for the purposes of our law.

The application of statutes in which reference is made to British subjects would be exceedingly difficult. Either the term "subject of His Majesty" would be construed to mean a British subject, in which case we might as well use that term and be done with it, or it would not be so construed, in which case the application of a large number of statutes would be materially altered, with a result which we cannot prophesy.

What it amounts to is this: If we do not provide for Canadian citizenship also having the status of British subjects, it will necessitate the reexamination of a large number of statutes by us, and more particularly by provincial governments. I include in that not only the provinces of Quebec and Ontario but every one of our nine provinces. There would certainly have to be extensive amendments made to many acts. So much for section 26.

Section 28 can be dealt with very briefly. It will be noted that what it does is to say that certain non-Canadians are to have the status of British subjects in Canada. The reasons for including this section are of the same order as those for including section 26. The broad argument as a symbol of association is the same, and the practical legal consideration is almost identical. If section 28 were not included there would again be the danger of confusion as to the meaning of our present statute law. Until the law is changed there would be considerable difficulty and confusion.

So far as the consequences of section 28 are concerned, in terms of rights, duties and privileges for non-Canadian British subjects, these obviously depend upon the terms and provisions of Canadian law. If we use the term "British subject" often in our statutes, section 28 may mean a great deal. If we use the term rarely, the section may mean relatively little. It all depends upon the state of our law.

The house has given this measure its wide approval and endorsation, largely because we are determined, all of us, regardless of our political convictions, to create as the paramount status of our country that of Canadian citizenship, enjoying at the same time the common status of British subject; for we must not forget that we are a free nation within the Commonwealth. We must no fail to recognize the danger of the implications which are involved in the two extremes to which I referred in the course of my remarks to-night.

This bill has won not only the approval of this house in principle, but because I promised the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) that I would do so to-night, I may say that it has won the approval of the government of Australia. The Ottawa *Journal* of April 9 contained a report that Prime Minister Chifley had announced that the Australian government had approved the principles embodied in the Canadian citizenship bill and proposed to set up an act along the same lines. That represents on the part of Australia, no less than on our part, a simple desire to create within that country, as in this country, a feeling that all the people belong to the country. In the case of Canada they belong to a country which in the light of its history and achievements has the right to be able to give to its citizens the designation which the people in every other country of the world save ourselves thus far, except for the limited purposes of the Immigration Act, have enjoyed.

During the debate the hon. member for Outremont (Mr. Rinfret) in an extremely able speech suggested that we should try to avoid hyphens, that we should try to avoid differences of race and religion. I can only say that this bill seeks to do that very thing. It will not do for hon. gentlemen to suggest that one group is less loyal to the commonwealth than another group, as has been suggested during the debate this afternoon. I take second place to no one in this house in my loyalty to the king and to the institutions of the British commonwealth, and I am sure that that is true of every hon. member in this house. Instead of trying for one purpose or another to create divisions in this country, instead of trying to create strawmen only to knock them down, if we would seek to emphasize the common benefits of being members of the Canadian family we would be subscribing to the creating of a healthier condition in this country.

What we are trying to do basically by this bill, in the light of the development of Canada to-day as a nation, is to give to her citizens the right to be able to use a common designation which will apply to all whether they live on the Pacific or the Atlantic coast, whether they are French, English, Irish or Scandinavian or what you will, to give them a right to be able to say proudly, "We are citizens of Canada, we owe loyalty to a common king." I submit with great respect that by no stretch of the imagination can that be construed as a violation of the freedom which we enjoy as a people.

I referred to the desirability, instead of trying to pit one group against another, instead of trying to measure loyalty to Canada or to the crown, of considering an example which I think is a notable one in this country. I refer to what has been done by the university of western Ontario, a non-denominational university in my part of the country. I am sure the hon. member for London (Mr. Manross) will subscribe wholeheartedly to what I am going to say because he is as familiar with this work as I am. A number of years ago Doctor Sherwood Fox, a Canadian of Anglo-Saxon origin, whose love for Canada, by his own record, I think is as great as that of any man in this country, sought to give to the students of that university an understanding of Quebec by creating a summer school at Trois Pistoles, which I believe is in the riding of my distinguished colleague, the hon. member for Temiscouata.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Bennett took it away from me.

Mr. MARTIN: That was done to instruct English-speaking Canadians in the culture and language of French Canada. That is the kind of thing we should be doing instead of constantly measuring our loyalty, the loyalty of one group as compared with another; instead of saying, "I am more loyal than you are; my whole record shows it." I believe that the example of Doctor Fox in western Ontario is an example that all of us in this house without exception might well seek to emulate. I understand that at the present time a group in the province of Quebec are seeking to establish a school in Ontario to which their students can go and have the same opportunities of subscribing to desirable outside influences. Those are the things which we as members of this house should seek to empha-

size instead of for one purpose or another trying to use devices that can only divide, that cannot bring us more closely together.

I join with what has been said by other hon. gentlemen in paying a tribute, not only to those who have come into our Canadian family as British subjects but to those who have come from other parts of the world, some of whom are in this house. I could not avoid feeling impressed when I heard the speech of the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll), a man whom I have known for a long time. He comes from my own city. He was born in Russia; he came to Canada as a young lad and sold papers on the streets. His mother and father undertook the most menial tasks in the city of Windsor in order to give their children an opportunity to get along. That man is now a member of this House of Commons and was a former member of the government of Ontario. We should be proud of such people and their achievements. We should be proud of these people who are seeking to enter our Canadian family, whether they come from Yugoslavia or any other country. If we look upon them as being entitled to citizenship, then we should accord them all the privileges without creating unnecessarily divisions as between them and other potential Canadian citizens. It is only with that spirit that we shall build the kind of national fibre that everyone in this house really wants.

The hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks) said to-day that this bill by itself will not make true citizens. He went on to praise the bill and commended it to the house. I agree with him that it will not make citizens, but it will remove some of the confusion and anomalies that exist in the Canadian Nationals Act, and in the Immigration Act, and inadequacies in the Naturalization Act. It will give legal emphasis to something which in our schools, in our homes and in our churches, throughout the whole of our national life, we can do if we really want to.

A week ago in a Canadian newspaper I came across the following; and while I am not given to quoting poetry I wish to quote this to the house to-night because of the lesson given in its words, and particularly having in mind their author. This poem was written by Percy J. Philip, a member of the Press Gallery who was president of the gallery last year. He has put into words something that I know will kindle the hearts of every member of this house. He has written:

> To Canada our fathers came
> And gave this unknown land its name
> This Canada of ours;
> God grant that we will never let
> That name be tarnished or forget
> The joy of building mightier yet
> This Canada of ours.
>
> Out of the rivalry and strife
> Of older peoples came to life
> This Canada of ours;
> They fought for what they thought was good;
> God, in His mercy, understood
> And formed into a brotherhood
> This Canada of ours.
>
> In strength together we will stand,
> Defending our beloved land,
> This Canada of ours;
> And never shall it cease to be,
> A nation where all men are free
> In unity from sea to sea
> This Canada of ours.

Those words, put into writing by a distinguished journalist, now a resident in this country, a former resident of the United Kingdom who for twenty years served a great newspaper in France, subscribe to what I know we in this house and our children and our children's children will come to regard as the standard by which real Canadianism will be judged.

My final words in moving the second reading of this bill are these. Fortune has placed this country in the position where its people do not all speak the same language and do not all adore God at the same altar. Our task is to mould all these elements into one community without destroying the richness of any of those cultural sources from which many of our people have sprung. No one, I think, has gripped the need of meeting this problem of the Canadian mosaic better than a great former prime minister of this country, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who said, speaking to a group of students at the university of Toronto of the necessity of trying to have groups in Canada understand one another; "Three years ago I visited in England one of those models of gothic architecture which the hands of genius guided by an unerring faith had moulded into a harmonious whole. This cathedral was made of oak, of granite and of marble. It is the image of the nation I want to see Canada become. I want the marble to remain the marble; I want the oak to remain the oak; I want the granite to remain the granite; and out of these elements I would build a nation great among the nations of the world."

Mr. HAZEN: May I ask the Secretary of State a question? Speaking in this debate I asked him if the provisions of this bill had been submitted to the other members of the commonwealth, and in reply he said that the answer was yes and that he would give greater detail later on. I think the minister might give that detail now.

Mr. MARTIN: I will do so in committee.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. MARTIN: I move, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider said bill.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put may I say that I thought the minister intended to make some reference to the suggestion I made earlier this afternoon with respect to the procedure to be adopted in considering this bill. I suggested that we might have much more effective and satisfactory results if the bill were sent to such a committee as the external affairs committee. I should like to have a statement from the minister on that point.

Mr. MARTIN: I am very sorry; I had fully intended replying to the suggestion of my hon. friend. The government has thought it desirable to proceed with the bill in committee of the whole, where there will be ample opportunity for any hon. member to put any question he desires. To send the bill to a committee would mean that it would come back here and there would be a repetition of the whole matter. We feel, in the light of all the circumstances, that it would be better to proceed with the bill in committee of the whole.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee. Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that this bill was not sent to the committee on external affairs, where witnesses could have been called and examined.

Mr. POULIOT: Call a phrenologist.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): The hon. member for Temiscouata is always close to his constituents. He likes to have his constituents heard from. Perhaps some of his constituents would like to come here and meet a committee of this house.

Mr. POULIOT: They would not be interested in the committee if the hon. member was on it.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I am sorry I did not hear the hon. member. However, that is all right.

The minister in the course of his remarks spoke about people being interested in national unity. I do not know of any man or any two men in Canada who have done more to bring about national unity in Canada than my old friend Stephen Leacock and René Du Roure, professor of French at McGill university.

[Mr. Martin.]

Mr. POULIOT: And Doctor Shields.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): We hear a lot of talk about other people, but we all know what Stephen Leacock tried to do, and if my hon. friends want to read something instructive with reference to national unity in Canada, and all the difficulties relating thereto, it might be well for them to get the last book that Leacock wrote. It is well worth while.

I wish to ask the minister a couple of questions. When we are conferring British citizenship on Canadian citizens, we do confer the same privilege upon all citizens of the British empire, so far as the empire as a whole is concerned, in relation to Canadian citizenship. As regards the five years' residence, the minister said that it was the same as it was in 1910. But times have changed since then and people are going from one part of the empire to another. This is taking place in all parts of the British empire, and I do not see why a man in one part of the empire should be treated the same as people outside the empire.

The main reason I rose was to make this statement. One would have thought there were only one or two classes of people in Canada who really desire to have Canadian citizenship; but as a matter of fact, for quite a long time, we have had "new Canadians" as well as old Canadians. We have had Italians, loyal Germans, Ukrainians, Polish people, Russians. All these people came to this country a long while ago and they wish to have Canadian citizenship. They wish to be Canadians. For that reason I am anxious to see this bill passed. I am supporting the bill. What I wish to see, however, is that citizenship does not become a mere formality, that people will simply go and obtain citizenship without any trouble at all. There should be a decent ceremony in connection with the granting of citizenship, and people should be taught to be really good Canadian citizens. I wish to see prospective citizens made aware of the obligations which will devolve upon them in relation to the privileges which they will enjoy as a result of being Canadian citizens. I want to see them properly instructed so that they may get a reasonable idea of the history of this country and of the great traditions of their forefathers. There are great traditions so far as the great French race in Canada is concerned; there are great traditions so far as the great English race in Canada is concerned; there are great traditions so far as the German races, the Ukrainian races and others are concerned; and all that history, all that sort of thing, the good being carefully sifted from the bad, should be taught prospective citizens. They should be told what mistakes have been

made in history. Inly in that way shall we get something worth while out of our Canadian citizenship.

I do not agree with the idea of simply making people Canadian citizens without proper instruction. That will result in nothing worth while. We must have a unified educational system in Canada, a system which will teach people to be good Canadian citizens and which will teach them the best that we have in Canada.

We have to get rid of all the old festering sores that we have had between the races in this country. We must get rid of all the bad things and teach people that the brotherhood of man in Canada will mean something to them and that being a Canadian citizen will be worth while.

I am certainly in favour of this bill, but I think that any British subject in the commonwealth of nations, with laws similar to our own, should be allowed to become a Canadian citizen without any fuss or feathers so long as he has become a British citizen in some other part of the commonwealth. I have nothing more to say except this. We must teach the traditions pertaining to all the good which we have acquired in the past, or this bill will not prove of any value.

Mr. FLEMING: I believe I was the first in the course of the debate on the second reading to put to the Secretary of State a question as to the relationship between this bill and the elections act in the definition of requirements in connection with the franchise. This afternoon when the question was raised again the Secretary of State indicated that in his opinion he had answered the question several times but I did not gather that in the earlier part of the debate. To-night he referred to the subject in his concluding remarks before the bill received second reading.

I think it is quite clear to all members that there is something anomalous about citizenship with all the rights and privileges pertaining to that status while it is possible for someone who does not hold citizenship to have the full right of the franchise. The Secretary of State as I followed his remarks indicated that it is not the present intention of the government to introduce a bill to amend the elections act in order to confine the franchise to those who after the final enactment of this measure will be Canadian citizens.

I would ask the Secretary of State—because it is an important question and is bound to have an influence on the views of members with regard to later sections of the bill when we come to them—if he is not prepared to make a further statement in this respect. I am not asking for a reiteration of what has already been stated. I am asking if the Secretary of State is not prepared to say on behalf of the government not simply that they do not intend to introduce an amendment to the election act but that they are giving their pledge to the house that so long as this government is in power, there will be no amendment to the elections act seeking to confine the franchise to those who will be citizens under this bill if it is adopted. That clarification is due the house. I am not at the moment suggesting to the minister what course he ought to take, but, with great respect, I suggest that the house is entitled to the clearest possible statement on that matter.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. gentleman does not want us to be Canadian citizens *honoris causa* but Canadian citizens *de facto*. Is that what he means?

Mr. FLEMING: If the hon. member followed my remarks he must have noted that I made it clear that at the moment I am not suggesting to the Secretary of State what his answer ought to be. I want the fullest clarification of the government's position in this respect. I also pointed out that it would be anomalous if the franchise were not confined to citizens where the status of citizenship is defined by statute of parliament.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank the hon. gentleman. The point taken by the hon. member for Eglinton was very well taken and it was subtle. He wants to lead the minister into a trap, but my duty is to warn the minister to be very careful about questions put to him by the hon. gentleman. He tries to get him on slippery ground. Here is the piece of legislation that is before us. It is fine; it is laudable. We are all proud to be Canadian citizens. That is all right. It is *honoris causa*. It is like an honorary degree in law.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): The hon. member is an assistant to the Secretary of State.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member will never debunk me, though he boasts of debunking others. I like him just as much as I like the hon. member for Lethbridge. This is all very interesting. There are grocers. The grocery trade is an honourable trade. It is like grocers who are appointed doctors of law *honoris causa*. They are very useful in spite of the fact the food does not grow on their shelves. The trade is useful to all of us, and when the trade goes down we all complain

about it. They may be doctors of law. Any rich man who makes an endowment to a university is given a doctor of law degree *honoris causa*. I wonder whether we are going to be Canadian citizens *honoris causa*. That is my point. If we are Canadian citizens *honoris causa* we should be given a diploma to keep in our living rooms. Each Canadian citizen will keep that diploma with the seal of the Secretary of State upon it in his drawing-room or living-room, and those who are more modest, in the room that serves as a dining-room kitchenette. It will be there and it will be something to hide the pipe-hole; that is all. If we are Canadian citizens *de facto*, if the gracious thing that is proposed to us has a meaning, then necessarily the elections act will have to be amended so that it will mean something to be a Canadian citizen and a British subject at the same time. As the bill stands now, if the elections act is amended to permit Canadian citizens only to vote, then there should be another amendment to permit only British subjects to vote, and these two amendments will mean nothing. There will be no change in the law because these two changes will make the law no different from what it is now. Therefore what is the use of arguing? What is the use of the minister answering the able question put to him by the hon. member for Eglinton, who has split the hair so fine that no barber could do it any better, not even a Philadelphia lawyer? My hon. friend is bright enough to agree with me that as the bill stands now, which I hold in my hand; in fact I hold a copy in each hand—

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Is that dual nationality?

Mr. POULIOT: He asked the question to embarrass the minister.

Mr. FLEMING: No, no.

Mr. POULIOT: I will not impute motives to my hon. friend. It was to assist the minister. It is very interesting. The hon. gentleman sits behind the fence, and when I wondered whether it was a suggestion that he had made to the minister he said No. He said, "I want information." His feeling and mine are the same. We want information about it.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): That is a neat way of getting it.

Mr. GRAYDON: When do we get it?

Mr. POULIOT: I want the right kind of information, and I want to give the minister time to think about the answer so that he answers with his usual wisdom. Let me ask the hon. gentleman who occupies the seat that I occupied when Mr. Bennett was in full bloom to be fair with the committee. I challenge him to suggest to the minister that he amend the elections act. He will not do that. If the minister amends the elections act in accordance with section 26 of this bill, then it will be a double amendment which will mean nothing. The hon. gentleman has had enough experience in law and in parliament to know very well that that amendment would change nothing in the elections act because it would be twofold.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I should like to say something to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman asked a question of the hon. member for Eglinton. The answer did not come from the minister but from my dear old friend, the hon. member for Temiscouata. It is very easy for him to get elected. He has been working for a long time for all the constituents in his riding who are all Canadians of French origin.

Mr. POULIOT: No; I have Scotch, Irish and English people.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): It is quite different in my riding. I rose to speak for some of my constituents who are neither Anglo-Saxon nor French. Those are the people who want Canadian citizenship more than anything else. They are fine people.

Mr. POULIOT: Indeed they are.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Fortunately for me they elected me to the House of Commons. Had they not voted for me I would not have been elected. What we are worried about is this. Is there to be some change in the franchise act to take care of the situation? I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question through you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POULIOT: Ask it directly; no red tape.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Has the hon. gentleman done his duty as a Canadian toward educating these people from his part of the country, non-Anglo-Saxons and non-French Canadians, as far as their duty as citizens is concerned? That is part of the duty of each one of us. What we try to do in Ontario and in my riding is to make these people welcome when they come there, and make them feel that they are citizens. That is one of the reasons why we want to have something that will give them citizenship in this country. We want to welcome them there. The more people we get in this country of the type that I have in my riding who vote for me—I think

they vote for me—the better. I have many fine Ukrainians, Germans, Polish and Slavic people in my riding. These are the people that my hon. friend does not have in his riding. When they come to my riding in Toronto I want them to feel that they are welcome. This bill meets with my approval.

Mr. POULIOT: Just one word in answer to what the hon. gentleman has said. He asked me a question, and I should like to answer him right away.

Mr. FULTON: Give the minister a chance.

Mr. POULIOT: He will have his chance in a moment, but an hon. gentleman on that side of the house asked me a question. He asked me if I tried to educate the people of Ontario.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): No; I did not ask the hon. member about the people of Ontario; I asked him about the people of his own riding. We do not need education.

Mr. POULIOT: I want to answer the hon. gentleman seriously. I can tell him that I have a thousand more friends in the province of Ontario than he has in the province of Quebec. In the second place—

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I am not talking about the province of Ontario. I am asking about the people who come from foreign countries to my hon. friend's own riding.

Mr. POULIOT: I want to speak to the hon. member very seriously, and it will not be personal. I will remind him that in 1933 and 1934 I spoke for Mitch Hepburn in thirty-five counties of Ontario. I spoke with the Secretary of State; I spoke with his predecessor. I spoke in many places. I spoke in Toronto in French thirteen days before the election of 1935, and I told them that Quebec would be solidly Liberal.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Occasionally the hon. member is right.

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, yes; but I was right in advance, and it carried weight. I wanted to inform the people of Ontario, not to educate them. What I regret with regard to the people of Ontario is not that they are not educated but that they are wrongly informed, which is altogether different; and there is no discrimination in that.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Has this anything to do with section 1?

Mr. POULIOT: I went there to inform them; and if I had gone to inform the constituents of my hon. friend, probably they would have been much less generous to him than they were. He was elected by such a small margin that he must be very complimentary to his constituents. I can only say about them that they are most indulgent. They are very fine people, but they are forgetful; they are charitable, and they are not always very proud.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not say that in a bad sense, but with the best possible meaning of the word. Down home I do not educate my constituents; I inform them.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Chairman, would you page Gilbert and Sullivan and let us get on with this.

Mr. POULIOT: I would ask the hon. gentleman, who reminds me of a character we have all seen in the movies, the sea captain who played with Greta Garbo in her first picture, to let us finish this discussion. Afterward he can debunk someone, according to his own expression, though by the way that is something he has never done. In addition, I would tell the hon. member for Calgary West that he is a newcomer in this house, and that police court manners in this chamber are not interesting. But I will tell him that in spite of his white hair he can learn a lot, and with his intelligence I am surprised that he has not learned more quickly. I hope he will learn quicker in future, and then he will have an opportunity to educate St. Paul's.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Please, teacher, won't you help me?

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, no, unless I am asked. Then I would be willing to do so, and I would do so very quickly. Now, sir, do you see the conceit of a member who says that he educates his people, meaning that they have no education? I strongly protest. It is an insult to all the constituents of the hon. member to say that he has educated them. In future, when he speaks English I hope he will be careful to use expressions that will not reflect upon his constituents, who have been so kind to him. In their name I protest most vehemently against the insult he has thrown in their faces, by saying he was educating them.

Mr. FLEMING: If my question has not been forgotten, and if the minister has had time to consider his answer, might the question be answered?

Mr. MARTIN: Apparently the hon. gentleman is quite worried. I hope he is not going to suggest that there should be a change in the

elections act, because his anxiety has been rather disturbing. I hope that is not what he is going to propose, that we should change the elections act.

Mr. FLEMING: I have not proposed anything yet. I want to know what the minister proposes.

Mr. MARTIN: But the hon. member is so anxious, in spite of the fact that on six different occasions in this debate I have indicated, first, that this bill has nothing to do with the elections act and, second, that there is no intention on the part of this government to change the elections act. The persistence of my hon friend's question suggests to my mind that perhaps he is going to urge that we should change it. He points out an anomaly. Admittedly it is an anomaly, but it is no more anomalous now than it has been for the past twenty-seven years. Section 2 of the existing Immigration Act is the only legislation, except for the definition in the Canadian Nationals Act, which defines a certain class of Canadian citizens as citizens. Non-Canadian British subjects who came to Canada under the Immigration Act were allowed, under the elections act, to vote after they had been here for a year, and after they had resided in a given electoral district for two months continuously. They did not acquire citizenship under the Immigration Act until the end of five years. So that if there is an anomaly, and I say there is—as my hon. friend knows, he and I studied constitutional law from the same source, though apparently with different results and different measures of success—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MARTIN: I am not saying that in an unkindly way, because my hon. friend was an outstanding student, and he certainly excelled me. But obviously he has forgotten many of the things he studied so ably. The fact is that the British commonwealth itself presents many anomalies which in the light of pure constitutional theory are sometimes hard to understand or fully appreciate. There is the further fact that in the case of Cunningham versus Tomey Homma, 1903 Appeal Cases, page 151—my hon. friend, being a good lawyer, might want to look up that case—Lord Haldane observed:

> The term "political rights" used in the Canadian Naturalization Act is, as Walken J. very justly says, a very wide phrase, and their lordships concur in his observation that, whatever it means, it cannot be held to give necessarily a right to the suffrage in all or any of the provinces.

This had reference to a provincial elections act.

> In the history of this country the right to the franchise has been granted and withheld on a great number of grounds, conspicuously upon grounds of religious faith, yet no one has ever suggested that a person excluded from the franchise was not under allegiance to the sovereign.
>
> Could it be suggested that the province of British Columbia . . .

It had reference to a case in that province.

> . . . could not exclude an alien from the franchise in that province? Yet, if the mere mention of alienage in the enactment could make the law ultra vires, such a construction of s. 91, sub-s. 25, would involve that absurdity.

So that assuming that for the time being we overlook the operation of the Dominion Elections Act, under this decision and under other decisions subsequently the matter of the franchise in each province is a matter for that province, in so far as it affects provincial elections. Therefore, assuming something were done here which will not be done, you would have the anomaly of provincial laws giving to people who lived here for only one year the right to vote, when they would not enjoy that right under the federal statute in the hypothetical situation envisaged. So that I can only repeat the statement I have already made, that if there is an anomaly, it is one of the anomalies inherent in the constitutional set-up of this country and of the commonwealth itself.

While the hon. member for Temiscouata was making his contribution to-night—and I always enjoy listening to him, derive a great deal of benefit from what he says and, if he will permit my saying so, much pleasure—I had in mind the fact that I ought not to overlook the observations made by the hon. member for St. Paul's. I would simply remind him that in Australia, one of the important free countries within the commonwealth, there, as here, they have a provision whereby citizens for certain limited purposes are designated as such after having lived in the country—as in this country—for five years. They are, however, allowed to vote at the end of a year—again, as in this country. That may be anomalous, as it may be here—and has been since 1919, also for three years since 1910 and for two years before 1910. But that is the fact.

With regard to instructions to new citizens, perhaps the hon. member for St. Paul's was not in the house when I made my statement on second reading, at which time I indicated what it is intended to do in that regard, and what had been done thus far. I mentioned I had gone to a number of these ceremonies to try, perhaps not through my own presence, but more because of the office I hold, to lend some additional prestige to those ceremonies, and to make them somewhat more impressive

for the applicants. I told the house of having attended a ceremony in Toronto, one presided over by Judge Parker, who has taken a great deal of interest in these matters.

I have also told the house that I believe there is much to be gained by making these ceremonies more impressive hereafter than they have been. It is also desirable that we should place in the hands of potential Canadian citizens of all groups—because the knowledge of potential Canadian citizens from all groups varies—in an exemplary and not in any compulsory way much of the information we regard as essential to good citizenship in this country.

When we come to the section dealing with ceremonies I shall deal with that in more detail, but I mention it now so that the hon. member for St. Paul's will not think I had spent too much time on the hon. member for Temiscouata and the hon. member for Eglinton.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Shall the section carry?

Mr. HAZEN: No. On second reading of the bill I referred to the preparatory conference attended by the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe in 1929, and to the recommendations which were brought in by that conference and which were later placed before the house for approval. When I spoke on second reading of this bill I asked the Secretary of State if he would tell us if the provisions of this measure had been submitted to the other members of the commonwealth; if so, when were they submitted and what were their answers? The Secretary of State then said that he would give a fuller explanation of what took place and, using his own words, replied, "Yes, I shall give greater details later on." Is he now in a position to give us those details? We are now on the first section of the bill and I should like to know what took place.

Mr. MARTIN: It is true that I did promise to explain in greater detail, not because I did not want to do so earlier, but because I had no opportunity. When he was speaking I offered to do so, but because he did not wish to have his time taken, he suggested that my reply be made later. So that if an explanation has not been forthcoming earlier it has not been my fault.

As the hon. member has said, at the imperial conference of 1929 it was agreed that there should be consultation with regard to any change in the common status. In the first place, there is no change in the common status provision. In the second place, the bill we now have before the house was sent to all the parties to that conference.

In addition, last January officials of the Department of External Affairs had discussions with officials of His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom; and as a result of those discussions I am in a position to say that they regard this bill as a model one. Likewise the bill went to Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. As I indicated to the house this afternoon, when I quoted the statement of the Prime Minister of Australia, they regard our bill as a model one, and propose to adopt its provisions. I do not think I can add anything further, unless the hon. member wants something more specific.

Mr. COLDWELL: Did it go to Eire?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: When was the bill sent to Australia, New Zealand and South Africa? The Secretary of State has said a reply was received from Australia. Was any reply received from New Zealand or from South Africa; if so, when?

Mr. MARTIN: The first intimation extended to all parties was in a telegram of September 27. A copy of the bill was sent on October 12.

Mr. HAZEN: The other question is: Were replies received from the governments of New Zealand and South Africa; if so, what were they?

Mr. MARTIN: There were no replies.

Mr. HAZEN: The minister did not get their consent to it, then?

Mr. MARTIN: Surely my hon. friend does not contend that this free parliament has to get their consent.

An hon. MEMBER: Since when?

Mr. HAZEN: I should like to quote what Doctor E. H. Coleman, who sits before the minister to-night, said when he appeared before a committee of the house on June 15, 1943. As reported at page 734 of *Hansard*, he said:

> But the point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that we are bound—perhaps not legally, but morally at least—not to make any fundamental changes in the act without consultation with the other dominions, which includes the United Kingdom.

Mr. MARTIN: That is right; and that consultation has taken place.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): It was a Unitarian show, was it? You just wrote them, and got no reply. So you said, "Silence gives consent." Is that the argument being used?

An hon. MEMBER: That is right.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): And he does not need your help from back there.

Mr. MARTIN: I have explained to the hon. member that first of all an intimation of the provisions of the bill was sent by telegram and, second, the bill was sent on October 12. In other words, when we let other parties know, some of them saw fit to make comment, while others, for reasons of their own, had no comment to make.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Who made it and what? That is what we are trying to find out.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman must learn to be courteous if he expects a courteous reply.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I am awfully sorry. If I do not seem to be courteous it may be merely my western ways. However, the minister is being a little difficult himself, so do not let us get excited.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman is a new member and as time goes on he will learn that sometimes friendship can be abused. I know he does not want that to happen.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Certainly not. Now, please teacher, adopt your own ethics and we shall get along all right.

Mr. HAZEN: There is another question I should like to put to the minister.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Will the minister be kind enough to tell me what addition is made by this bill to what we already had in our statutes? The purpose of this bill is to create a Canadian nationality, but we already have an act, of which I have a copy before me, entitled, "an act to define Canadian nationals and to provide for the renunciation of Canadian nationality." That act was passed in 1921. At the end of the act will be found a declaration of renunciation of Canadian nationality. We cannot renounce what we do not have. We already have in this country a Canadian nationality and I should like to know if anything is added by this bill. What is the difference between a Canadian national under the act of 1921 and a Canadian citizen under this bill?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman asks what is done by this bill that is not done by the existing law. First of all, what is the existing law? There are three relevant acts. First, there is the Naturalization Act. My hon. friend nods and I hope he does not mean that I should push on, because I do want him to see the difference. Under that act imperial naturalization certificates were extended to applicants. It had an extra-territorial effect. That is the Naturalization Act, of which the act of 1914 was an amendment. The Naturalization Act simply provided for the issuance of naturalization certificates to non-British subjects, people who sought entry into Canada through the Immigration Act.

Then there was the Canadian Nationals Act introduced into this house by the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Doherty. It is true that that act did seek to define for a specific purpose what we call a Canadian national.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): It was creating a Canadian nationality.

Mr. MARTIN: My hon. friend says that it was creating a Canadian nationality, but with great respect I say that it was not. What the act in its specific terms did was to give a definition of "Canadian citizenship" by reference. By reference to what? By reference to the Immigration Act, about which I shall have something to say in a moment.

We had become signatories to the peace treaties; we were members of the league of nations; we had adhered to the statute of the permanent court of international justice. Because there was no such designation in the the Immigration Act of a national the government of the day felt that in order to overcome what seemed to be a legal difficulty there should be an act called the Canadian Nationals Act which had as its purpose the enabling of Canadians to hold certain designated offices under some of the organizations set up by the treaties of peace. That was the purpose of that act. Speaking in the house, the then Minister of Justice indicated that it was intended to be nothing else. He was faced with the sort of questions that we have been faced with in this debate, that by trying to create a Canadian nationality we were breaking up the commonwealth and so on. In order that he would not be faced with that difficulty in the light of public opinion in this country twenty-seven years ago he brought in that act for those limited purposes. The important thing about the Canadian Nationals Act is that it really had no definition at all except for one minor purpose. Its definition of "citizenship" was a definition by reference to section 2 of the Immigration Act.

The anomalous position created as a result of the act of 1919 was that the only designation of citizenship in this country was to be found in the Immigration Act. No country in the world has ever defined its citizens by a similar measure. The result is that until this bill becomes law the only class of people

who receive the legal designation of citizen are those people who come into Canada from the outside. In other words, the hon. member for Temiscouata, myself, and other hon. members in this house; my genial friend, the hon. member for Calgary West, for whom I have great affection, and many others in Canada are not now entitled to the legal designation of Canadian citizen. This bill will go one step farther than the provisions of the Immigration Act and the restricted meaning of the Canadian Nationals Act. As a result, all who are in fact citizens of Canada will achieve this status by law.

Another thing this bill will do is to remove another anomaly that can exist under the Canadian Nationals Act and the Immigration Act. A person who has never lived in Canada, who may live in Europe, who is the son or daughter of a Canadian national may under the provisions of the Canadian Nationals Act be granted a passport and yet under the provisions of the Immigration Act be denied entry into Canada. Imagine such a thing as a Canadian national being denied entry to his own country! That was the anomalous situation which created all kinds of confusion and it is one of the things which will be a matter of history when this bill becomes law.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): It has existed for twenty-seven years.

Mr. MARTIN: For twenty-seven years.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Time for a change.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): When the minister spoke in the house on October 22 he said:

> Despite what one often hears to the contrary, there has been a Canadian nationality.

As I understand it, this bill does not create a Canadian nationality because we had it before. We cannot create what we already have. As I stated before, there is a schedule in the Canadian Nationals Act which provides for the renunciation of Canadian nationality. We cannot renounce what we do not have. I want this cleared up. I contend that this bill does not create a Canadian nationality. As the minister says, it is a codification of many statutes. I agree with that statement, but it does not create a Canadian nationality because we already have that.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not want to get into a metaphysical argument with my hon. friend as to what nationality means. I can only say to him what I have already said, perhaps too often, and accentuate it a little by pointing out that the first point to be considered in reading together the two sections of the Canadian Nationals Act and the Immigration Act is that the present Canadian law provides for two distinct classes of person who would come under the definition of "Canadian." A person may be a Canadian national and a Canadian citizen. That is the law as it now stands and, as the hon. member for Calgary West has said, the time has come when we should change it.

The Canadian Nationals Act confines the class of Canadian citizens to persons born in Canada who have not become aliens and to naturalized subjects of His Majesty with Canadian domicile and to those who have been naturalized under the laws of Canada and who have not subsequently become aliens. The same act defines "Canadian domicile" to mean a landing in Canada within the meaning of the act. Listen to this:

> The wife of a Canadian citizen unless landed in Canada or born in Canada and the children of a Canadian citizen unless landed in Canada or born in Canada are thus excluded from the category of Canadian citizens although such wife and children are Canadian nationals within the meaning of the second act. For example, A is a Canadian citizen and a Canadian national under the two acts. He has a wife B and several minor children. These are not citizens unless born or landed in Canada. The whole family are Canadian nationals under the act . . .

Which my hon. friend says creates Canadian nationality. And so on. I might read thousands of cases where a real injustice has been perpetrated because of the confusion.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Is this bill extending Canadian nationality?

Mr. MARTIN: There was a limited definition of a Canadian citizen; there is now. We are here clarifying ambiguities, removing confusion and extending citizenship to a point where we make the paramount status of a Canadian that of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. FULTON: Following up this point as to consultation with the other dominions, the minister has said that this bill will make no fundamental change in the status of a British subject. I would refer him to the Naturalization Act, which is, I understand, a uniform act throughout all the member countries of the British commonwealth. By section 11 of that act as it now stands the Secretary of State of Canada can by certificate of naturalization create a British subject for Canada, and the same may be done by the Secretary of State or the corresponding minister of all other empire countries. That act was passed in 1914, and it provided that after the act was adopted by all member countries of the commonwealth they should have the power

to create British subjects for their own country and for all other countries of the commonwealth. That act is to be revoked by the present measure before the house. I would ask the minister to explain how he can say that this act makes no fundamental change in the status of a British subject when that is the effect of this bill. One may say that a Canadian citizen will be a British subject, but if we revoke the Naturalization Act I submit that he is not a British subject in the other countries of the empire; and that is a fundamental change made in the status of a British subject.

Mr. MARTIN: When we come to section 28 I think I can show that it is not a change in result but in method.

Mr. HAZEN: Under our present act a woman marrying a British subject becomes a British subject. But under the proposed legislation that is not the case. Surely that is a fundamental change. I think the Secretary of State was playing with words a little when he replied to me a moment or two ago.

I should like to refer again to the preparatory conference that was held in 1929. At that conference certain recommendations were made. A resolution was brought into this house by the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe to approve those recommendations, some of which will be found on page 713 of *Hansard* of this year. In 1930 the imperia conference was held. That conference app oved those recommendations, and the conclu ions which the conference reached were cor ained in a certain memorandum. The secon conclusion is this, and I quote from page 713 of *Hansard* of this year:

> That, if any changes are desired in the existing requirements for the common status, provision should be made for the maintenance of the common status, and the changes should only be introduced (in accordance with present practice) after consultation and agreement among the several members of the commonwealth.

It will be noted that it says not only after consultation but after consultation and agreement among the several members of the commonwealth. It is quite apparent from what the Minister of State said to me a moment or two ago that there has not been consultation and agreement among the several members of the commonwealth, and while perhaps it may not be absolutely legally necessary for that to be done, yet there is, I submit, a moral responsibility on the government to have not only consultation but an agreement with the other members of the commonwealth. It is quite apparent that that was not done. It seems to me that that step should have been taken before this bill was introduced into this house, and the Secretary of State and the government have slipped up in that respect.

Mr. MARTIN: I can quite appreciate my hon. friend's anxiety.

Mr. HAZEN: It is not anxiety.

Mr. MARTIN: Let us say his persistence, but the fact is that we sent a telegram to each of the responsible parties advising them of the principles of our bill and we sent them the bill itself on October 12 last. The hon. gentleman will appreciate that there are many things done, many exchanges, many acts by the various dominions. For instance, Australia has passed an act dealing with the status of women, providing for separate status. Australia did not advise Canada of that; Australia decided not to. South Africa made changes; South Africa did not consult Canada. All this was done since the conference of 1929. Consultation and agreement between the dominions do not mean that you have to have an airtight agreement such as you would have perhaps between Canada and a country outside the commonwealth. There is not that barrier between the countries of the commonwealth that exists between ourselves and certain other national groups, and consultation and agreement between the dominions have come to mean not an agreement under seal or anything of that sort but exactly what we have done. We have notified all the parties. One of them has had discussions with us and has mentioned that it regards the bill as a model one. We have also had intimations of the views of Australia in statements from their Prime Minister. I might point out that the United Kingdom amended their act in 1942 or 1943 and they followed exactly the practice that we followed here. They asked us by cablegram if we had any objection, and that is the course we have followed here. My hon. friend may be assured not only that the government has not slipped but that every precaution has been taken to live up to the constitutional practice in this matter.

Mr. POULIOT: Somebody one day was showing movies, but one thing had been forgotten. They forgot to turn the lights on inside the projector. I am reminded of that by this bill. What is it? It says:

> This act may be cited as the Canadian citizenship act.

What is citizenship? No one knows. It is not mentioned there. The title of the act reads:

> An act respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens.

This is evidently in accord with the various acts that are more or less brought together in this draft legislation. Well and good. But how can anyone discuss a draft like this unless he knows what he is talking about? No one can know what he is talking about unless the most important words, the words that form the basis of the legislation, are defined. There is an obvious reason for that. According to a decision of the privy council, the most magnificent speeches that are delivered in the house cannot be produced in court. The law speaks for itself, except that we have to consider jurisprudence. Let us consider the trouble to which a judge will be put the first time he has to interpret this piece of legislation where we do not find the definitions that are of the utmost importance, the guiding stars, the pillars of light, which we need in order to understand the new enactment. I urge the minister, therefore, to remove the fear of all difficulty, all misunderstanding, all quarrels and all litigation by defining "citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens." It may be said, "Go to the dictionary and see what Webster says."

Mr. MARTIN: Oh, no.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not say that the minister would say that. The minister is a man of too much legal science and experience to speak in that way to his colleagues. I am delighted and reassured by the fact that he has said no to that possible suggestion. The bill was brought down last year and was set aside and we have it again this year. We must make it a good bill or drop it *pro tempore*. Is the minister willing to define those four words that we find in the title of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN: The words "Canadian citizen" are defined in sections 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10.

Mr. POULIOT: Just one moment. It is wrongly drafted and I do not put the blame on the minister.

Mr. MARTIN: It is my fault, if there is a fault.

Mr. POULIOT: No. The definitions should be in the interpretation section. We should not have to run through the bill to find definitions; they should be at the beginning. The corner-stone is not in the attic; it is down below. I would ask the minister to make some amendment. I will not bother about it, but I hope he will amend the bill for the sake of those who wish to take advantage of this legislation. The legislation should be clear. We have had enough discussion and the bill itself must be made clear. There must be no misunderstanding whatever. I thank the minister for what he has said, but a layman cannot go through the bill or understand it without having all the definitions together. That is a warning to all those who draft legislation. Our legislation is putrid; it is half-baked. We have reached the stage where a minor clerk can hand out anything to the Canadian people from his desk or over the telephone There must be a change and everyone must have respect for legislation. This is a thing I have insisted on for a long time. We are not ready to sponsor legislation if it is not decently drafted. If it is not properly drafted it should be left in the keg for some time to mature and improve like good wine.

Mr. FULTON: I was struck by the Secretary of State's definition of "consultation" and it cleared up in my mind some points as to the way things are decided within the cabinet and, perhaps, the consultation which goes on between, say, the wartime prices and trade board and the Minister of Finance before a decision is announced. That definition of "consultation" will, I think, clear up for many of us a good many of the anomalies we have found in announcements of government policy and the interpretation they receive by various ministers. I do not know whether the Secretary of State consulted his own previous statement before he made the statement this evening as to the anomalies which exist at present in the elections act and which will exist as a result of this bill, but he has frequently, indeed constantly, sought to refute the suggestion that after the passing of this measure the right to vote will be in no way dependent upon becoming a Canadian citizen. However, he said that the object of the bill is to define and establish the rights and duties of citizenship and to create in the minds of all of us a clear understanding of the great privileges which are involved in becoming a Canadian citizen. I would refer him to his words, which he uttered on moving the second reading of the bill, as reported at page 503 of *Hansard*:

> Under this bill we are seeking to establish clearly a basic and definite Canadian citizenship which will be the fundamental status upon which the rights and privileges of Canadians will depend.

I ask the Secretary of State this question: Is there any more fundamental right, any greater right, or one more inherent in citizenship than the right to vote? Is there any privilege which a Canadian citizen could value more than the privilege of casting his vote on election day, despite what the hon. member for Temiscouata says? If that is so, and I doubt whether the minister would deny it, then it seems to me it must logically follow that if

the right is not in the elections act it must depend upon becoming a Canadian citizen. The minister said it is not his intention—

Mr. MARTIN: I said it was not the intention of the government.

Mr. FULTON: —to change the elections act. Is he prepared to retract the words I have read to him or to give them some explanation? At the moment I cannot reconcile his earlier words with the statement that it is not intended to change the elections act.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman has placed an interpretation upon previous words of mine. That is his privilege. I do not think there is any difficulty at all. It is a difficulty which I am sure exists at the moment largely in his own mind. If there is an anomaly, and I do not deny that there is, it is an anomaly that has existed for twenty-seven years. It has been a definition of "Canadian citizenship" in the Immigration Act of this country. Under that act non-British subjects who have come to Canada and have been here for a year can vote at the end of that time under the Dominion Elections Act, although they do not acquire Canadian domicile under section 2 of the Immigration Act until they have been here for five years. That was an anomaly if you like. It was also perhaps anomalous—my hon. friend was not in the house when I referred to the case where the Lord Chancellor pointed out that the franchise is not necessarily—

Mr. FULTON: I was here.

Mr. MARTIN: I think he goes so far as to say it is not necessarily an inherent right or corollary or ancillary to the designation of citizenship. I may say that we have individuals in this country who will be citizens of Canada under this bill, but who will not be allowed to vote. They are judges and other officials. In the district of Columbia in the United States citizens of the United States are debarred from voting. These are anomalies, but they do not destroy the fundamental situation to which I have referred. If my hon. friend has words that I have used recently on another occasion I would want to look at them, and perhaps to-morrow or the next day I shall say whether the high refinement he mentions is or is not justified by the language.

Mr. FLEMING: In dealing earlier with the communications between this government and the governments of the other nations of the commonwealth, the Secretary of State did not mention specifically, as I recall it, Ireland. He is probably aware that it is suggested, and perhaps more than suggested, that certain sections of the bill had been drafted not merely in consultation with the government of Ireland or Eire, but at its request and that certain provisions had accordingly been inserted. Would the Secretary of State clear up that point because it is a matter of interest to the house in the light of information given thus far?

Mr. MARTIN: I can only say that no section of this bill was put in at the instigation of anyone outside the constituted authorities of the government of this country.

Mr. FLEMING: That statement in the paper was quite wrong?

Mr. MARTIN: To what statement is the hon. member referring?

Mr. FLEMING: I am referring to the Winnipeg *Free Press*. There was an article there on the subject.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I wish to make one comment on the point raised by the hon. member for St. John-Albert which, in my opinion, the Secretary of State brushed aside too lightly. I should like to come back to what was said by the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, when he spoke about consultation and agreement. I do not suppose any of us will accuse Mr. Lapointe of derogating from the rights of anybody in this country. I would think that these two words which he used and which I think were clearly used in connection with this particular thing we are talking about were not used lightly. The minister says that we did have consultation. I am, like my seatmate, a new member here and probably I do not understand these high matters. All I have to say is that if this were a business transaction nothing that has been said would suggest that we have had the kind of consultation which business friends would have with each other. I will admit that a good deal depends on what was in the cable which was sent. If the cable was a full disclosure drawing attention to these points which I think are points of substance, then maybe I would find it satisfactory, and no answer having been received, probably it would cover the matter. It does seem to me that in the troubled state of the world at the present time this is a poor time to be showing anything but the greatest courtesy to those with whom we are associated. I come back to these words, used, I think, not lightly by Mr. Lapointe, and I wish to say that to me it seems like playing with words to say that we have had anything that can properly be called consultation.

Mr. REID: May I bring to the minister's attention a situation which still confronts those from Great Britain who are living in Canada, and will confront them after this bill passes. At the present time there are in this country well over one million persons who were born in the British isles. If they want to go across the line the United States immigration officer asks them where they were born. If they say, "Canada", they are passed through. If they say "Great Britain" they are stopped. They are looked upon as British subjects. After the bill passes, people from the British isles will receive, I believe, a certificate if they ask for it, just the same as others will. Therefore we shall have an anomaly there. Let us suppose that two people are going across the line. One has a certificate and the other has not. Then they may visit the old country. On the way back they will be challenged coming in. It will probably be no good for them to say: "I was in Canada long before the new bill went through." They will probably have to show their birth certificate and the date of entry even though they have been out of Canada for only one year.

Mr. COLDWELL: A passport would settle that so far as coming in is concerned.

Mr. REID: They may not require a passport after the severe regulations are done away with, because prior to the war one could visit the old country without a passport. That condition may prevail again when this bill is passed. I am going to suggest to the minister—and I should like his comment —that a certificate be given to all those who came here from the British isles prior to the bill being passed. I know that to-day anyone on the continent of Europe who could show a Canadian citizenship paper would be looked upon as having something equal to a passage to heaven. That is how precious anything Canadian would seem in the eyes of those on the continent. I ask the minister to give serious consideration to the granting of a certificate to the million or more Britishers who are in this country, and who were here prior to the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN: I am grateful to the hon. member for raising that point, because it affords me an opportunity to give some information on that, and perhaps I can do it now. I wrote a letter to-day to a prominent citizen of this country who is in exactly the class that my hon. friend mentions. Under the bill all British subjects domiciled in Canada will, upon the passage of this bill, become Canadian citizens. The question is asked, what provision is made for giving them certificates so that they can avoid the sometimes humiliating situations in which they find themselves? Perhaps at this point I might answer an inquiry that has been raised in the newspapers as to how a British person who has already been in Canada for five years or more would acquire a certificate if he wanted to get one. Such a person who has been here for five years or more would be a Canadian citizen automatically as soon as the bill comes into force. No naturalization procedure, nor any certificate will be necessary. However, many of these people will undoubtedly want to get certificates simply to have them as a matter of proof, and the bill provides for such situations.

Under section 11 (a) of the bill a certificate can be issued to quiet any doubt as to whether a person has the status of Canadian citizen. This does not require the whole naturalization procedure to be gone through all over again if the minister is satisfied that the person's claim is valid. In addition, under section 39 (i) regulations may be made as to "the manner of proof of Canadian citizenship and the granting of special certificates for such purpose". Under these regulations provision will certainly be made for British subjects who have become Canadian citizens without getting certificates but who later wish to acquire them.

Mr. HAZEN: Will the minister place on record the contents of the cables that were sent to other members of the British Commonwealth with regard to the provisions of this bill, or the reasons why he should not do so?

Mr. MARTIN: So far as I am personally concerned there is no objection, but the hon. gentleman knows that these are privileged documents. Consent of the other parties will have to be obtained. I shall make inquiries at once as to whether that consent is available from the other parties. If so, I see no reason for not tabling them.

Mr. COLDWELL: I have just one question. This afternoon the point was raised by an hon. member as to what the status of a citizen of Eire is in connection with the commonwealth at this time, and in particular with regard to this bill. That question has not been answered; it is an interesting one.

Mr. MARTIN: Does the hon. gentleman wish to deal with that now or when we come to the appropriate section?

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not mind.

Mr. MARTIN: Perhaps it would be better to leave it; there is a section later under which that comes up. I am prepared to deal with it now or at that time, but it is an involved discussion. I am prepared for it, but I think it comes more appropriately under section 28.

Mr. COLDWELL: As long as the minister does not overlook it at that point.

Mr. MARTIN: If I do I know I shall be reminded.

Mr. COLDWELL: We shall not forget it.

Section agreed to.

On Section 2—Interpretation.

Mr. FLEMING: I should like to ask the minister a question with regard to paragraph (g) at the top of page 2, which gives a definition to "country of the British commonwealth." I am concerned particularly with the possible extension of the list of countries included in the first schedule to the act. Paragraph (g) reads:

> "country of the British commonwealth" means for the purposes of this act a country listed in the first schedule to this act or a country declared for the purposes of this act to be a country of the British commonwealth of nations by proclamation issued under this act, and includes, in the case of any such country, all colonies, dependencies or territories thereof.

I take it that if dominion status were accorded to India, for instance, the purpose of this section is to clothe the governor in council with power to include India within the number of countries embraced in the first schedule to the bill. There may be a question of draftsmanship raised here as well as the question of principle in regard to clothing the governor in council with very wide power to extend the list of member nations of the commonwealth set out in the first schedule. Is the Secretary of State satisfied that power has been clearly reserved in other sections of the bill to deal with this matter by proclamation? He will notice the words:

> . . . or a country declared for the purposes of this act to be a country of the British commonwealth of nations by proclamation issued under this act . . .

I wonder if the minister is satisfied, if the intention of this paragraph is to permit the inclusion of other countries which may acquire dominion status, that there is power elsewhere in the bill to accomplish that purpose by proclamation.

Mr. MARTIN: I can only say I am quite satisfied from discussions with the proper departments, External Affairs and Justice, that there is no doubt about our right under this section. My hon. friend will note that the phrase "country of the British commonwealth" is a term that has been carried over. There was no item in the definition of the old act, but the first schedule was the same in principle as the one in this bill. The first schedule to the old act was drawn up in 1914 and never changed. It is now brought up to date to cover the countries of the commonwealth.

Mr. COLDWELL: What about India?

Mr. FLEMING: If my hon. friend will permit me I want to be quite clear on this question as a matter of draftsmanship, and I am not raising this question lightly. I should think there would have to be found elsewhere in the bill some definite provision clothing the governor in council with power to do by proclamation what is referred to here. At the moment apparently the only provision in the act for such inclusion by proclamation is in these definitions, which seem to me insufficient for the purpose, so that I raise that question.

Mr. MARTIN: The difficulty is that now we are anticipating the other sections, but section 39 provides:

> The governor in council may make regulations generally for carrying into effect the purposes and provisions of this act . . .

That is the enabling section.

Mr. FULTON: This is a specific power, and it does not appear there.

Mr. MARTIN: That is the section under which this will be done. With regard to the point made by the hon. member for Rosetown Biggar—

Mr. COLDWELL: What point?

Mr. MARTIN: In reference to India—I am glad he asked that question, because there has been some misapprehension in certain sections of the press on this very subject. A citizen of India or a resident in the colonies depends for his nationality status upon the common law of England and upon the United Kingdom British nationality and status of aliens act. The United Kingdom is one of the countries listed in the first schedule of this bill, and section 2 (g) states that when reference is made in the bill to a country of the British commonwealth it means a country listed in the schedule and includes, in the case of any such country, all colonies, dependencies or territories thereof. It is quite clear, therefore, that a person in the colonial empire or in India who is covered by the United Kingdom act and who is a British subject under that act will be recognized as a British subject under this bill. The hon. gentleman is likely

referring to an editorial which appeared in *Saturday Night*. I can only say that the observations in that connection are clearly not in accordance with the fact, because the statement in the editorial that the intention of the present bill is to exclude East Indians from the status of British subject is clearly erroneous.

Mr. COLDWELL: Why not make it clear in our own bill? Why depend upon a British act to clarify the definition of "a British subject." Why should we refer to the United Kingdom and make the United Kingdom inclusive of a great dependency like India, for example?

Mr. MARTIN: There is a good historical reason. The list of countries included in the schedule are countries having their own nationality acts, and this arrangement not only is the result of several conferences but is conceived from the point of view of draftsmanship to be the effective way of dealing with the situation. My hon. friend will appreciate that this is a complicated measure. We gave consideration to that point, and after great consideration we thought this was the best and most effective way of dealing with it. When we come to another section I will show why that is so.

Mr. COLDWELL: The reason I have difficulty in my own mind in approving this particular method of dealing with it is this. Here we are setting up an act dealing particularly with Canadian citizenship. We are looking forward to establishing something which has been implicit for a long time, so they say, but which has never had statute law to support it.

Mr. MARTIN: Implicit for limited purposes.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, for limited purposes. If we are doing that, then should we not go the whole distance and decide ourselves under this, our own bill, who shall be regarded as British subjects for the purposes of our own legislation?

Mr. MARTIN: That is specifically what we have done. These other countries have no acts of their own.

Mr. COLDWELL: Why refer to an act of the United Kingdom?

Mr. MARTIN: Because we are dealing with the question of common status. Perhaps on reflection my hon. friend will see that I am right, if he will think the matter over.

Mr. COLDWELL: I shall be glad to think it over.

Mr. MARTIN: I suggest that my hon. friend do so.

Mr. COLDWELL: But the minister says it is a complicated matter, and one's thoughts are not always clear on complicated matters.

Mr. LESAGE: I only wish to contradict the hon. member for Temiscouata, who said there was in the bill no definition of a Canadian citizen. In my opinion there is a definition in too many words. It is covered by sections 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9. It takes five sections to cover the definition.

Mr. POULIOT: Not a definition; a description.

Mr. LESAGE: The only true definition—and my colleague is right—that we can find is in section 2 (a), which says:

"Canadian citizen" means a person who is a Canadian citizen under this act.

Mr. MacNICOL: Surely that is clear.

Mr. LESAGE: If hon. members of the committee will follow me, I might as well say, "'Apple tree' means a tree which is an apple tree in Canada." That is exactly the sort of definition we have here. It is completely useless and, to use the words sometimes used by the hon. member for Temiscouata, it is ridiculous. So that I move, seconded by the hon. member for Outremont:

That subsection (a) be removed and that the following subsections (b) to (n) inclusive be relettered (a) to (m) inclusive.

I say that subsection (a) should be removed; it does not mean a thing. After all, it costs money to print these bills.

Mr. MARTIN: All I can say is I agree with what my hon. friend says. However, he probably knows there is before the judicial committee a case which deals with this matter. This is a matter of drafting, and I have to rely upon the drafting officials, and the law officers of the crown. They have said that while there were definitions of a particular status by way of description in sections 4, 5, 9 and 10, in the interpretation section there should be some reference. The purpose of paragraph (a) is to satisfy that exigency of draftsmanship as conceived by the judicial committee in that particular case.

Mr. LESAGE: Could we not say: a "Canadian citizen, under this measure, is defined by sections 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9." That would mean something. But what we have here is ridiculous, where it simply states that a Canadian citizen means a person who is a Canadian citizen under this act. If the privy council

has rendered a decision of that kind, then I am one who would want abolition of appeals to the privy council.

(Translation):

To elaborate on what I was saying a few moments ago, let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that we have for many years made a laughing stock of ourselves. There are ridiculous things in our statutes; this is a striking example of the sheerest absurdity, and we are going to leave it in our legislation.

Mr. POULIOT: I appreciate what has been said about sections 4, 5, 9 and 10, but that is not what I want. What I want is a definition of "citizenship", and there is none in the bill. What I want is a definition of nationality, and there is none in the bill. What I want is a definition of naturalization, and there is none in the bill. What I want is a definition of "status of aliens," and there is none in the bill. I think it is necessary to have these definitions. If it is not too late to-morrow, with the assistance of my able colleagues we may try to draft something to be offered at that time. In the meantime I should hope that the section might stand, to give us an opportunity to have those definitions.

Mr. MARTIN: One other very important reason, which I omitted to point out, is that there is a definition of "Canadian citizenship" under existing law, in the Immigration Act. This bill simply says that "Canadian citizen" means a person who is a Canadian citizen under this act.

Mr. LESAGE: How does it read?

Mr. MARTIN: It defines "Canadian citizenship." At a later time the minister in charge will introduce a bill to amend section 2 of the Immigration Act. But at the present time that section is still law.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): One of the purposes of the bill, it is said, is to clarify the definition of "Canadian citizenship". If one refers to the Immigration Act he will find a definition of "Canadian citizen" which is much clearer than the one before us in this bill; because if one wishes to find the definition of "Canadian citizen", as set out in this bill, he must read practically the whole of it. In the Immigration Act one finds a clear definition.

Mr. LESAGE: Read it.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I will read it. It states:

"Canadian citizen" means

(i) a person born in Canada who has not become an alien;

(ii) a British subject who has Canadian domicile; or

(iii) a person naturalized under the laws of Canada who has not subsequently become an alien or lost Canadian domicile.

Mr. LESAGE: A man is a man who is not dead.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): A man is a man, and a woman is a woman.

Mr. MARTIN: The definition my hon. friend has just read from section 2 of the Immigration Act is not a full definition. It does not deal with the hundreds of situations which will arise, where we shall have to determine whether or not a person is a citizen.. The reason we bring in this provision lies in the very inadequacy of the definition in the Immigration Act.

I do not wish to deal with the sections we have not yet reached, but I must point out that section 4 deals with one group of people who, on the passage of this measure, become Canadian citizens. Other citizens are in the same category. But the Immigration Act does not deal with them, and because it does not we have this section. So that I cannot agree with my hon. friend when he states that the Immigration Act contains a satisfactory definition. It is simply a general statement which, when one comes to apply it to a specific case, does not help at all.

Mr. LESAGE: A definition by contrast is not a definition, and a definition by similitude is not a definition. Can we not say that "a Canadian citizen" is defined by sections 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9 of the bill? That would mean something.

Mr. HAZEN: That is limiting.

Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: Why refer to them, then? You refer only to those sections which relate to the definition of "Canadian citizen." Therefore you do not need to specify.

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. POULIOT: Canadian citizen is a composite, taking all of us together.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I refer to the first name in the first schedule, namely the United Kingdom. What does that include? I understand it is now known as the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. If so, should not "Northern Ireland" come after, "United Kingdom?" Then, does it include the Shetland islands, the Orkney islands, the Channel islands and the Isle of Man.

Mr. MARTIN: I have to rely upon the officials who give me this information when they tell me that in this classifiation we are using the proper drafting term.

Mr. MacNICOL: Then what does "Ireland" include?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar asked that question a while ago. My suggestion is that when we come to section 28 I shall deal with that in greater detail.

Mr. FLEMING: There may be times when persistence is not a virtue. However, I come back to the point I raised earlier, which was offered in the hope of assisting the minister. With great respect may I say that if the minister is relying upon section 39 to provide the necessary powers to extend the list of countries within the first schedule, then, in my humble estimation, the powers conferred by section 39 are not adequate for the purpose. That section empowers the governor in council to make regulations generally for carrying into effect the purposes and provisions of the bill. There is nothing in section 39 which expressly or by implication clothes the governor in council with power to extend the list of countries in the first schedule by proclamation. I suggest that this, being a matter of draftsmanship, might have further consideration. I suggest that there is some inadequacy in the draftsmanship.

Mr. MARTIN: I can only say that the Department of Justice advises us that the section is satisfactory. However, section 39 will not be reached to-night, and I shall give the matter further consideration.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Shall section 2 carry?

Mr. POULIOT: Stand.

Mr. MacNICOL: I have a further question: What about Jamaica?

Mr. POULIOT: We shall have to teach the newcomer. What is Canadian citizenship? That is what they will ask us and we shall tell them to look at the bill. They will find that under the bill it means a person who is a Canadian citizen. They will have to read the whole bill to understand what it means, and when they have reached the end they will have forgotten the beginning. I do not wish to be unpleasant; far from it.

Mr. MARTIN: You are not unpleasant.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you. The bill should contain a meaning. Some hon. members have spoken of immigrants from Europe and other countries to the east. The legislation should be clear. A description is not a definition. Before defining "Canadian citizenship" the word "citizenship" must be defined. There are different meanings of this word to be found in Webster's dictionary, in the Century dictionary published by the Encyclopaedia Britannica and in many other fine and complete dictionaries. We shall have to make our choice.

The great trouble is that we take definitions for granted without having them in a bill. It cannot be done like that and it is not good drafting to do it. I hold in my hand the Concise Oxford dictionary that is placed on the table for the use of hon. members. I should like to quote the definition of "citizen" that is given. I intend to give the definition contained in this dictionary, but if I go to the library and get Webster's I know I shall find another definition. Then there will be another definition in the Century dictionary, another one in the French encyclopaedia and so on. When we must refer to several sections of the bill to get the meaning of this word it simply means that a lot of embarrassment will be created for the people who must administer this legislation. Here is the definition of "citizen":

> Burgess, freeman, of city; townsman; civilian; member, native or naturalized, of a state (usu. of; c. of the world, cosmopolitan); inhabitant of. Hence citizenhood, citizenship.

Then there is the medieval meaning of citesein, and so on. That is not clear.

Mr. GRAYDON: The bill is an improvement on that.

Mr. POULIOT: Inasmuch as it is a repetition of the same word. I am not saying that we have been supplied with the best dictionary that there is. There are others more complete, but I am using this one because I have it at hand. I am sure my hon. friends realize the difficulty of the man on the street who wants to know what citizenship means and who looks at the dictionary. He finds "cosmopolitan", *Cosmopolitan* magazine. Here is the definition of nationality:

> Being national, national quality; patriotic sentiment; one's nation (what is his n.?); a nation (men of all nn.); existence as a nation; race forming part of one or more political nations (-ity).

Mr. MacNICOL: What does that mean?

Mr. POULIOT: It must be an abbreviation for some profane language. Will every man in Canada have to have a copy of this Oxford dictionary in order to understand this? Then here is the definition of "naturalize":

> Naturalize. Admit (alien) to citizenship; adopt (foreign word, custom & c.); introduce (animal, plant) into another country; become naturalized; free from conventions, make natural; free from the miraculous, place on naturalistic basis; pursue natural history. Hence naturalization.

Then there is the French "naturaliser". If hon. members are satisfied with that, they are easy to please. Let us see the definition of "status". I am not wasting time; I am just showing the trouble that every good Canadian, whether he is a citizen or not, will have when he goes to his dictionary to look up the meaning of "status". This is a new word referring to an autonomous nation under the Statute of Westminster. The definition given here is:

> Social position, rank, relation to others, relative importance, (his s. is a matter of doubt, their s. is wholly different, his s. among novelists); (Law) person's relation to others as fixed by law; position of affairs, esp. s. (in) quo, unchanged position.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Chairman, while the hon. member for Temiscouata is mumbling to himself might we not proceed with the bill? I wonder whether it matters a great deal whether the term "citizenship" is defined any more than it is here? My hon. friend has been talking about the man on the street wanting to know what is a Canadian citizen. I doubt whether any man on the street wants any definition of it. A man comes to Canada from some other country. He finds that he is not able to partake of all that is involved in citizenship; perhaps he finds that he cannot vote or that there is some other legal technicality to his disadvantage after he has begun his life in this country, and so he decides to become a Canadian citizen. He does not look through the bill to see what a Canadian citizen is because his own common sense tells him that he is not one; so he makes application. I think we are straining at a lot of little gnats that do not amount to a great deal. My hon. friend has now a bigger dictionary and it appears that he is going to read definitions out of that dictionary until eleven o'clock. Then, when he gets through with that dictionary I am sure that there is a bigger one somewhere, and if we go on in that way we shall never get through with this bill. I do not think the definition matters a great deal.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Does the minister not think it may be confusing to leave the definition of "domicile" as it is now in paragraph (j)? The common law definition of "domicile" has nothing to do with duration of time at all. Therefore I suggest, in order to avoid any possible confusion, that the words "for the purposes of this act" be introduced after the first word "domicile" in paragraph (j). I suggest that the introduction of these words would remove any possibility of confusion.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. MARTIN: I am prepared to accept that amendment. The words were in there originally, but the Justice Department thought they were not necessary.

Mr. FLEMING: They will do no harm in there.

Mr. MARTIN: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I move accordingly, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment (Mr. Mackenzie) agreed to.

Mr. MacNICOL: I would refer to paragraph (i), which reads:

> (i) "disability" means the incapacity of a minor, a lunatic or an idiot.

And then "minor" is defined in paragraph (l). I object to the inclusion of "minor" with lunatics and idiots.

Mr. MARTIN: This simply means that a minor, a person who has not reached the age of twenty-one, cannot apply for citizenship. They can acquire it through the father or the mother.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does not paragraph (l) cover minor sufficiently?

Mr. MARTIN: That merely defines one of the groups who are classed as a disabled group.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not like that definition of the word "minor". We have just had a war in which young persons, eighteen, nineteen and twenty years of age have borne arms for this country, and yet under this bill they are disabled from becoming citizens of the country.

Mr. FULTON: If they have borne arms they are eligible.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is true of those who have already borne arms, but I was thinking of minors who in the future might be made liable to bear arms. It seems to me that persons who are liable to bear arms ought not to be put under a disability under this bill. That is the point I was making. In some provinces in Canada, in Saskatchewan and Alberta, persons may vote before they are twenty-one years of age, at eighteen years in Saskatchewan and nineteen in Alberta. Yet under this bill they are disabled.

Mr. MARTIN: This would not affect the act in Saskatchewan.

Mr. COLDWELL: I know it would not but I say that in this bill I do not like the inclusion of a minor, who is a person under twenty-one years of age, in the same class with lunatics or idiots. I do not like that at

all. When we may appeal to young men under twenty-one years of age to bear arms and when young men under twenty-one may already vote in two provinces, they should not be categorized in this way. I think that definition should be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. MARTIN: I may agree with everything the hon. member has said but until the governing acts are changed, this will have to stay in law. We have made provision in section 10 whereby they may make their applications at the age of eighteen. I have gone as far as I could and I hope that in the not too distant future we shall go farther.

Mr. MacNICOL: But is not the hon. member right in what he says that a minor who may be called upon to carry arms should not be classed with lunatics and idiots?

Mr. MARTIN: I have said that I agree, but I have pointed out that we cannot go any farther in this bill because of the governing acts. I have gone as far as I could by changing section 10 to enable them to make application at the age of eighteen.

Mr. COLDWELL: Nothing in this bill would prevent this house, when we come to amending the franchise act, from extending it to a person eighteen years old, because many of us are in favour of enfranchising minors who may be called upon to bear arms. Yet they are only eighteen-year old children under this act.

Mr. MARTIN: Quite right.

Mr. HAZEN: In what sections of the bill is the word "disability" found?

Mr. MARTIN: In section 13.

Section as amended agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

The house again in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I simply wish to call two items: reconstruction, 604, and justice, 96. There are three departments now in supply and these are two more. I move that the items stand.

Items stand.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Tuesday, April 30, 1946

The house met at three o'clock.

UNITED NATIONS

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION—CANADIAN AND OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS—MOTOR VEHICLES

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, on April 21 I made a statement concerning Canada's contribution to UNRRA since its commencement. At that time the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) asked if I would give the house a statement showing the number of automobiles and trucks which have been apportioned to each country.

At UNRRA headquarters in Washington the needs of the various recipient countries are considered, allocations are made of goods which are most urgently required, and orders placed among the contributing countries best able to supply.

At the request of UNRRA the Canadian Export Board has purchased, with Canadian funds, 3,888 trucks at an estimated cost of $6,756,357. In addition UNRRA has purchased with free funds 7,347 trucks and 22 ambulances at a cost of $13,282,221, or a total of 11,235 trucks.

In view of the tremendous destruction of the transportation systems in Europe and China, and the need to get supplies to distressed areas immediately, UNRRA urged that trucks be shipped as quickly as possible. I understand the actual allocation made by UNRRA was as follows: China 3,761; Yugoslavia, 2,204; Poland, 1,774; Czechoslovakia, 1,471; Greece, 1,229; Albania, 234; Italy, 50; Philippines, 2. The balance of 510 have not yet been allocated. The great majority of these were of course, military type trucks.

Mr. FRASER: Did they buy any of those from War Assets Corporation?

Mr. MacKINNON: No, I do not think so.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to ask a question in connection with UNRRA. I am not sure whether the minister has tabled information he promised before the Easter recess with respect to the contributions of the various nations under the UNRRA agreement.

Mr. MacKINNON: I do not remember making any such promise, although I remember the hon. member's asking the question. I believe however the information is being tabled by the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. GRAYDON: I should like to be clear on the point, because when the question was asked the minister did not demur, and I took it for granted that some member of the government would answer. It is an important matter, and it was my understanding the government had given its undertaking that it would be done.

Mr. MacKINNON: I am informed the Department of External Affairs has the information in the course of preparation, and that it will be given to the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I believe I can promise that that will be done.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

SUBSIDIES

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I should like to reply to a question asked yesterday by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) respecting milk subsidies. An order in council was passed to-day making the subsidies continuous as of midnight to-night on the same basis as for the past year.

Mr. HOMUTH: For how long?

Mr. GARDINER: The order in council reads that it shall be for the year beginning April 1, 1946.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): The minister has referred to subsidies on milk. My question of yesterday was wider than that; it referred to dairy products. Has the government taken action with respect to other dairy products?

Mr. GARDINER: The subsidies on dairy products are on milk. That is, there is a subsidy of so much on milk entering into cheese production, a subsidy of so much on butterfat entering into butter production, and a subsidy of so much on whole milk and canned milk, thereby covering the whole list of dairy products. It is that which has been dealt with in the order in council. It covers the whole list.

Mr. BRACKEN: And the subsidies are the same as in the past.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, the subsidies on production are the same as in the past.

PRIVATE BILLS

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN OF CANADA

Mr. W. E. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce) moved the first reading of bill No. 30 (from the senate) to amend the act incorporating the National Council of Women of Canada.

[Mr. MacKinnon.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, the National Council of Women of Canada was incorporated in 1914, and in the past thirty-two years, by expanding its activities, has advanced the objects of that association. It now wishes to bring its act of incorporation up to date, to agree with the practices which have been invoked for some time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 37, for the relief of Marie Evelyn Dormer.—Mr. Boucher.

Bill No. 48, for the relief of Margaret Ruth Weir Allan.—Mr. Boucher.

OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT

REQUEST FOR POSTPONEMENT OF TRIAL OF MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. J. BENTLEY (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Justice. In view of the desire of Canadians for a fair and democratic trial of a Canadian member of parliament accused of a serious offence, and the desirability of the accused's having legal counsel agreeable to himself—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is not supposed to make a statement or to give information to the house when asking a question. If he has a question it should be brief and to the point.

Mr. BENTLEY: —will the minister consider setting the date of the trial at a time when Mr. D. N. Pritt, K.C., a member of parliament of Great Britain, can be present to represent the accused Canadian member of parliament?

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I thank the hon. member for having given me notice of his intention to ask this question. The member of parliament referred to in the question having been committed for trial, the attorney general for the province in which the committal took place now has full legal control of the case. All the federal minister of justice could do, if he were so inclined, would be to ask the provincial minister if he would agree to a postponement. I must say, however, that I am not disposed to interfere with the course of the proceedings before the courts. Moreover I do not feel that the presence of Mr. Pritt is necessary to

ensure that the accused will get a fair, or even a democratic, trial—if that is anything different from a fair trial. I understand that the accused is represented by Mr. Joseph Cohen, K.C., of Montreal, and Mr. Valmore Bienvenue, K.C., of Quebec, a former speaker of the legislative assembly of Quebec. They both came to see me some days ago about this matter. They are both eminent members of the bar of the province of Quebec. Mr. Pritt might not be allowed to appear in court for the accused and no federal authority could give him that right. The practice of law before the provincial courts is something that is exclusively within provincial jurisdiction.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAYS

RESTORATION OF PENSION RIGHTS OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Is he now prepared to report on the investigation into the restoration of pension rights for certain employees of the Canadian Pacific railway?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The report of the industrial relations officer has been received and has been referred for study to the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. A further announcement will be made when a reply is received.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I would remind the minister that that report was made last December. They are taking a long time.

Mr. MITCHELL: It does not matter if it was made five months ago last December; that is my answer to the question.

PARIS CONFERENCE

PRESS REPORT AS TO COMMONWEALTH REPRESENTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. MAXIME RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to a report which appeared in the New York *Times* of April 27, referring to the Foreign Ministers' conference now being held in Paris. It reads as follows:

> It must always be kept in mind that Mr. Bevin in Paris is talking not only for Great Britain but for the whole British commonwealth.

Is that correct?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I do not know that I got my hon. friend's question, but I think it was to the effect that he wished to know whether the secretary of state for foreign affairs of the United Kingdom was representing all parts of the British commonwealth at the council of foreign ministers in Paris.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): All the commonwealth.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My understanding is that the secretary of state for foreign affairs of the United Kingdom is representing the United Kingdom and the United Kingdom only.

WHEAT

BONUS FOR SHIPMENTS OVERSEAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce what progress he has made with his colleagues in connection with the thirty cent bonus on wheat for immediate delivery for shipment overseas?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I have not had an opportunity as yet to take this up with my colleagues.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

The house resumed from Monday, April 29, consideration in committee of bill No. 7, respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens—Mr. Martin—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose last night it was considering section 3.

On section 3—Declaration of Canadian citizenship an adequate statement of national status.

Mr. DORION: Section 3 reads:

> Where, under any act of the parliament of Canada, or an order or a regulation made under such act, a person is required to state or declare his national status—

A person might be asked to declare his national status, for instance, in connection with provincial legislation. I do not think this section covers all the ground. For example, in Quebec we have legislation dealing with Canadian nationals, which will be affected by this bill. In order to cover all cases I think there should be added after the words "of Canada" in the first line the words "or of any provincial legislature." That would make the section cover all legislation regarding Canadian citizenship in all the provinces, I move an amendment accordingly.

Mr. MARTIN: The amendment which the hon. gentleman is now proposing to the committee is one which I considered earlier. There is some difficulty in accepting it because provincial legislation coming within one of the enumerated sections of the British North America Act giving exclusive jurisdiction to the provinces is a matter which the courts might easily construe as one within the competence of this parliament. There is some point in what the hon. member has in mind, but I suggest that there is another way of meeting it. We could delete from the section as it now stands the words, "under any act of the parliament of Canada or an order or a regulation made under such act."

Mr. DORION: I think that would be much better.

Mr. MARTIN: I think it meets the point, and I move accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DORION: There is another amendment I should like to move. The section continues:

—any person who is a Canadian citizen under this act may state or declare himself to be a Canadian citizen—

That word of three letters "may" makes the section useless; it merely gives permission to somebody to declare himself a Canadian citizen. The word "may" is permissive; I think it should be changed to "shall". If somebody may state that he is a Canadian citizen, he may also state that he is something else. If we are to have Canadian citizenship we must have it complete. Therefore I move:

That the word "may" in the fourth line of section 3 be struck out and the word "shall" substituted therefor.

Mr. LALONDE: I recall that this very point was discussed in the debates on conscription and the National Resources Mobilization Act. Some members objected then to the use of the word "may", but the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe made it clear that in our parliamentary language "may" does not imply a sense of latitude but rather the responsibility of obligation, exactly the same as if the word "must" were used. I have no objection to the proposed change but I have always understood that in drafting our legislation "may" has exactly the same meaning as "must".

Mr. DORION: I disagree with the hon. member for Labelle, and in support of my contention I quote from a well known authority, Maxwell on the Interpretation of Statutes, eighth edition, where at page 216 I find this:

Following the decision of the House of Lords in the preceding case, it was said that from the nature of the English language the word "may" can never mean "must," that it is only potential, and when it is employed there is another question to be decided, viz., whether there is anything that makes it the duty of the person on whom the power is conferred to exercise that power. If not, the exercise is discretionary. But when the power is coupled with a duty of the person to whom it is given to exercise it, then it is imperative.

Further on:

So, whenever a statute confers an authority to do a judicial act in a certain case, it is imperative on those so authorized to exercise the authority when the case arises and its exercise is duly applied for by a party interested and having a right to make the application, and the exercise depends, not on the discretion of the courts or judges, but upon proof of the particular case out of which the power arises.

In cases in which the donee of the power has only his own interests or convenience to consult, the word "may" is plainly permissive only, and a mere privilege or licence is conferred which he may exercise or not at pleasure.

I think that gives the exact meaning of the word "may", and that is why I moved the amendment.

Mr. FLEMING: I do not at all follow the argument of the hon. member for Labelle that "may" is the equivalent of "shall". If it were, we should need to revise half our statutes. The two words do not mean the same thing at all.

The section as it stands leaves it within the power of any Canadian citizen under the act, where under any existing statute or regulation he is required to state his national status, to say that he is a Canadian citizen or to reply in some other way. At the present time, if he were called upon to state his national status, his answer would be: I am a British subject resident in Canada. This section does not give him power to say either, "I am a Canadian citizen," or "I am a British subject resident in Canada." The purpose of the act being to give to British subjects resident in Canada the official status of a Canadian citizen, there would appear to be much merit in the proposal for amendment of this section, unless the minister can give some good reason why the change should not be made.

I offer this observation.

An amendment should also be considered with reference to the words "national status". We had a good deal of discussion last night about the desirability of introducing definitions into the act. The words "national status" are not defined. What do we mean by national status? To what is the scope of this section confined? When the national registration came into effect some four years ago every person in Canada over sixteen years of age was required to indicate his racial lineage. Had this measure been then in effect, those who were Canadian citizens

would have wished to answer that they were Canadian citizens. Racial lineage, after all, was something not at all germane to the purpose of the national registration at that time. It seems to me to indicate the necessity for some broadening of the provisions of the section. If we are to confine the scope of the section simply to national status in a narrow sense, we shall not give to the term "Canadian citizen" its full significance. One can think also of questions arising in connection with the census. There has been undue emphasis, it seems to me, in the questions put to residents of Canada, on racial lineage. There may be good reasons from a statistical or other point of view why racial lineage should be given as an answer to a question in connection with the census. But as this section stands it is too narrow in its scope. We are giving too narrow a significance to the term "Canadian citizen" and to the status of Canadian citizenship if we confine the section to questions of national status as applied to any individual resident in Canada. There is need for broadening the scope of the section or for introduction into the bill of some definition of national status which will give a more appropriate signification than ordinarily attaches to the term.

Mr. LALONDE: I have no objection to the amendment proposed, but my contention was that in our parliamentary language "may" and "must" have the same meaning. I have every respect for the opinion quoted by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay, and I am sorry that I have not before me the opinions of the high legal authorities cited by the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe at the time of the discussion I mentioned. But if the Secretary of State has no objection to making the change proposed, I shall not take up any more of the time of the committee.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I remember very well the discussion to which the hon. member for Labelle has referred. When private individuals are enjoined by the word "may", it is permissive but as applied to the governor in council, or a department or an official of government, whether provincial or federal, "may" is not permissive but obligatory. On the basis of Maxwell and the interpretations referred to by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay, "may" is always permissive when it refers to the individual.

With regard to the matter referred to by the hon. member for Eglinton, I should like to ascertain from the minister how he defines "national status" under this section, what definition the draftsman had in mind. "Status" might be legal condition, or legal position—these are the only definitions I can think of at the moment, but no doubt the Secretary of State will be able to give us the last word in the interpretation of this expression. If I understand it aright it does not cover the situation which arises from the census. Under the census—I have the forms here—every person, regardless of the number of generations he and his forbears have been in this country, is required to set out, first, his nationality or citizenship, and second, his racial origin. The hon. member for Eglinton says he thinks that to ask for racial origin for census purposes may have some value. But I cannot see it; because according to instructions given by the appropriate officers during the last census, if a woman of French origin marries a man of English origin she thereupon ceases to register as of French origin and becomes of English origin. I have the instructions here. If we are able to change our racial origin by the simple expedient of marriage, the statistics become valueless. As a matter of fact we have carried this question of racial origin so far that, if the Duke of Windsor had been in Canada when the last census took place and had had domicile by reason of his ranch in Alberta, he would have been required to register as a German in Canada while he would be English in the United Kingdom. A person coming back to Canada, regardless of the number of generations his people have been in this country, is required to register his paternal ancestry with the immigration authorities upon entering the dominion. Most hospitals in Canada require a person, on entering the hospital, first to give his citizenship and then his racial origin, as though there would be a difference in treatment according to his racial origin. In the United States that has been done away with, except as to colour or race. Racial origin is asked for only of a person who has been naturalized. "Race" is asked for as signifying the white race or the various coloured races; otherwise no information in regard to race is required.

If we allow this section to remain as it is, using the words "national status," the census authorities will be able to ask at the next census a question on racial origin, I suggest that, in order to clarify this matter once and for all, there be added to the words "national origin," the words "or racial origin." In other words, any person required to declare his national status or racial origin will be able to answer except so far as colour is concerned, or so far as naturalized citizens are concerned, by describing himself as "Canadian citizen". If this amendment were accepted it would clarify the section, and the amendment of the

hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay would make it mandatory for Canadians to register as Canadians.

The CHAIRMAN: There is already one amendment before the committee.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have not offered an amendment; I have just suggested the acceptance of this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay moves that the word "may" in the fourth line of section 3 be struck out and the word "shall" substituted therefor.

Mr. MARTIN: This argument is, of course, the argument which went on in the drafting of the bill. I have always held the view which the hon. member has, but some draftsmen take the view of the hon. member for Labelle. In the light of the discussion the government will be pleased to accept the suggestion made by the hon. member.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: May I now move, seconded by the hon. member for Kamloops:

That section 3 be amended by adding after the word "status" in line 35, the following words, "or racial origin."

Mr. LESAGE: I went to the United States last week. The immigration officer asked me what was my nationality. I said "Canadian citizen". He inscribed "Canadian citizen", but he said, "What is your racial origin?" I said, "White". He put down "White", and he was satisfied. But I had to give both. I do not think that when the racial origin is asked for it is sufficient to answer "Canadian citizen". I may be a negro and be a Canadian citizen, and my racial origin is "black"; I may be a Chinaman and be a Canadian citizen, and my racial origin is "yellow". There are not many racial origins. It is untrue to say that I am of the French race. I am of French descent; some others are of English or of Scottish descent. There are not a great number of races; there are white, black, yellow, red, brown.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is the hon. member sure it is "white?" The Chinese believe it is "pink".

Mr. LESAGE: It may be.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. MARTIN: No. There is a good deal of merit in what has been said by the hon. members for Eglinton and Lake Centre. The hon. member for Lake Centre, as he has demonstrated on many occasions in this house, is a good lawyer, and he knows perfectly well that it is not possible to envisage every kind of situation. What we are seeking to do is, as he stated, to avoid the carte blanche imposition of such questionnaires as he has referred to and others which I know about, as well, in the administration of my department. By "national status" we simply mean the sort of thing that has to do with the country to which the person owes his allegiance. I do not think the section should be amended to take care of the particular suggestions he has in mind; not that I am not fully appreciative of the points which he makes. But, having in mind the provisions of the other acts we have looked at and the experience of other countries, I think it would be better to leave the situation just as it is. I should have no objection to adding this—and I make it as a suggestion without undertaking to add it or to suggest that it should be added, but merely to argue the point. In order to have it conform to one of the latter sections, we might say "is required to state or declare his citizenship, nationality, or national status". That would help a little, but would not meet the point of the member for Lake Centre, but that is the extent to which I think we should go.

Mr. REID: In municipal and provincial elections many persons have been challenged at the poll on the ground of citizenship. I refer to those who come from European countries and have been granted naturalization. Under this bill, when a man appears to cast his vote, in a provincial election, and is asked by the presiding officer to produce his naturalization papers, exactly what will be his status?

Mr. MARTIN: No act of this parliament can affect the operation of a provincial act dealing with elections. That is one of the prerogatives given to the provinces. If, however, anyone is asked what his national status is, he will say in reply, pursuant to the passage of this section, that he is a Canadian citizen.

Mr. REID: Has the minister discussed this bill with the United States authorities? How will the United States treat citizens under the act if this bill becomes law?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman has asked a question to which I am glad to reply. When the bill was prepared we thought it desirable to have the advantage of as many minds as possible. Officials of my department invited persons who have to do with the administration of the naturalization act and

the citizenship act of the United States to give us the benefit of some of their experiences, and we also profited by the experience of others in other parts of the commonwealth. While I have no right to say what the United States will do by way of its laws, I have every assurance that our wishes in this matter will hereafter be fully respected.

Mr. McMASTER: I have often heard politicians on the hustings make statements which they do not believe to be true and do not intend to abide by, but when it comes to enacting law, surely we must mean what we say. If the bill is amended as suggested, this might result. A man comes, say from Poland, and after four years of intensive education, which the learned Secretary of State has said he will get, he has learned enough English and enough about our laws to become a Canadian citizen. How can he say that his racial origin is Canadian, seeing that he is only a naturalized Canadian citizen anyway? We should not say something which even an act of parliament cannot make true.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman has expressed what I should have stated. It is a fuller answer than I gave to the member for Lake Centre. I agree with much that he says.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not think it is any kind of answer, with due respect to both hon. gentlemen. There is no difference to-day in national status in this country by reason of this legislation. That was stated by the Secretary of State. People who were Canadian citizens before this bill was introduced are still Canadian citizens. Canadian citizen was accepted as a description of Canadians before this bill was introduced.

Mr. MARTIN: Only for a limited purpose.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: For what limited purpose?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman was not here last night.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I read what the minister said.

Mr. MARTIN: Section 2 of the immigration act did define citizenship for a limited group of persons. Citizenship under the immigration act was a definition of citizenship for those who came to Canada from outside. This bill goes beyond that and touches people who were born here, and British subjects who have acquired domicile here and will become citizens automatically on the passing of the bill. It covers a whole series of individuals who are not affected by section 2 of the immigration act.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I fully realize that. A Canadian nationality was accepted by departments of government. You could register as a Canadian when you enlisted in the army, provided you were born in this country. Does the minister negative that suggestion? I see him bowing his head in a way which indicates that he does not agree.

Mr. MARTIN: Do you object to my bowing my head?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: After last night's experience and after reading *Hansard* it is difficult to know whether the minister wants any suggestions or wants any help in connection with the bill. I read what he said last night and it did not indicate that cooperation which he asked the house to give him in putting through the measure.

Mr. POULIOT: He thanked me for what I did for him.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, well; I read the hon. gentleman's contribution—

Mr. POULIOT: I did very little, and he appreciated it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Has the minister had any conversations with those in charge of the census which would indicate that from now on they will not ask native-born Canadians their racial origin at the time of registration? Because unless that assurance is given, this section is meaningless and the hopes of many people across the country as to what will result from the passing of the measure will be denied. If the minister has the assurance that that is going to follow, I do not care whether it says national status or what it says. If however he has not that assurance, then we shall be placing before the people of the country a bill translated into law which will lead them to believe that there will be a new citizenship without regard to racial origin, while at the same time retaining the one thing that has caused more difficulty than any other in attaining Canadian unity. The minister waved aside the suggestion when I raised it at first and said that it had been answered by the hon. member for High Park. I do not think it was answered. The minister is being praised across the country for doing away with a condition which holds back unity in Canada, and now when an opportunity is given to clarify the situation, since there is no definition of national status, he says: I cannot accept that at all, because apparently it would be going too far. My hon. friend mentioned the question of race a while ago. That is what I have in mind. If under the census the question of race is asked, as in the

United States, then the various coloured races may so describe themselves, the Japanese and Chinese being required to describe themselves accordingly. But if under the guise of leading the people of this country to believe that a new Canadian nationality is to be established we continue by the back door to accentuate racial origin, then the act will be meaningless.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman has just come back from his holiday, as we all have, and I want him to know that the very pleasant relations which have always prevailed between us continue, in spite of the recess. If I appeared to give another impression, certainly that was not my intention. One of the most encouraging things to me about this bill has been that right from the outset the hon. gentleman, with whom I took the liberty of talking about this matter, spoke of it in such high terms and gave me such support that I would not want that situation to be changed; and I assure him that is exactly the spirit in which I am continuing. Last night I had thought that I displayed very good humour, and I am sorry if that was not so. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that I share with him to the full the desirability of avoiding this business of origins, as he has indicated. Not only have I discussed this matter with the bureau of statistics and the minister under whose jurisdiction that comes; the new census, or for that matter any census, before it is carried out, must be approved by the executive arm of government, so I can tell the hon. gentleman that hereafter the sort of thing he complains about regarding national status, and I think very properly, will not happen.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): Does that apply to the quinquennial census to be taken this year in the west?

Mr. MARTIN: It applies to every census after the passage of this bill in so far as national status is concerned.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): There will be one starting in June.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: As the discussion on this section has proceeded I am bound to say it has given me a certain measure of disquiet. I had assumed that this section had been carefully considered in relation to the problem we are now discussing; that is, the relationship of citizenship to racial origin. I entirely agree with what has been said as to the desirability of eliminating, as far as possible, considerations of racial origin, where these have been inimical to the development of a sense of national unity. I appreciate the suggestion of the Secretary of State that when it comes to inserting such words as "or racial origin" it may be a little difficult to say how far such an amendment might extend, but I had hoped consideration would have been given to that already. We have been told that very careful thought has been devoted to the draftsmanship and the principles of this bill. Census has been discussed. Census is an important question in relation to the matter we are now discussing, but I am not at all sure that it is the whole question. Other situations affecting racial origin could properly be dealt with on the basis of giving an answer in terms of citizenship.

I take it the purpose of this bill is to direct the thought of the people to Canadian citizenship rather than to matters of racial origin. Canadian citizenship is something we are all to have in common, something that will be a binding force in Canada, because it puts us all on a common footing and surely that is what we want. If we do not do it in this bill, I do not know where we are going to do it in relation to carrying that matter of citizenship, the thing we have in common, into those situations where we have not things in common, namely, questions of racial origin.

I suggest that further consideration be given to this section, and that it be held over in the meantime. We may be some time on the other sections. In the interval further consideration can be given to the relationship of section 3, as it now stands, to situations in which a citizen may be required to declare his racial origin. I do not think we should pass the section in the limited form in which it now appears. The words "national status" may have a narrow significance; and if they have, this bill if passed would fall far short of our hopes. If there are complications which the Secretary of State feels cannot be adequately foreseen at the moment in connection with the introduction of such words as "or racial origin" then I earnestly call upon him to postpone consideration of this section until it can be given further consideration. If we do not do something about putting aside considerations of racial origin in this measure, I do not know where we are going to do it. This section must be the place in which it is done. If we cannot foresee all the permutations and combinations which might then arise, I earnestly suggest that the section be held over for further consideration, if the minister will agree to do so.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think we should entirely do away with this question of racial origin, though I cannot see far enough ahead definitely to say so. I am of Scotch descent and I am proud of it, but I cannot think of any race whose people need be ashamed of their origin. They can all be proud of it; and I do not believe any member of any race who is not proud of that race will ever make a good Canadian.

Mr. FULTON: Carrying on from where the hon. member for High Park left off, I agree with him one hundred per cent; but what we are trying to do here is to make every Canadian proud of his Canadian citizenship. I think perhaps the trouble is that hon. members are not fully aware of what the hon. member for Lake Centre had in mind when he brought up this question of racial origin. If in the returns that we are required to make we perpetuate the racial origin, as that term is now understood, then we are making it impossible to be proud of being Canadian citizens and of being Canadians. I have here a page from the instructions to the census takers, issued at the time of the last census. The hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet brought to the attention of the house the fact that when he went into the United States the other day they asked his racial origin. He replied "white", and that was accepted. If that were all that was implied in connection with racial origin I should say it would be satisfactory. But the heading on page 44 of these instructions to census takers is, "Column 25—racial origin." If you look at the census form, column 25 is subjoined to column 24. Column 24 is headed "Nationality or citizenship", and column 25 is headed "Racial origin". Then on page 44 the instructions go on to say:

(1) What is racial origin? The word "race" signifies "descendants of a common ancestor."

(a) It is imperative to understand that a person's racial origin and nationality very often are different, for instance, the Canadian nationality comprises many different racial origins, e.g., English, French, Irish, Scottish, Welsh, Italian, German, et cetera.

That is what the hon. member for Lake Centre is talking about when he speaks about racial origin and the desirability of doing away with that in our census regulations.

(b) The name of a country from which a person came to Canada gives no indication of that person's racial origin, e.g., a person may have come to Canada from Austria, but may be Polish or German or Italian, et cetera . . .

(c) The word "Canadian" does not denote a racial origin, but a nationality; the same applies to the word "American."

Then I see this in paragraph 2:

(2) What determines racial origin? As a general rule a person's racial origin is to be traced through his father, e.g., if a person's father is English and his mother French the racial origin shall be entered as English, while a person whose father is French and whose mother is English shall be entered as French, and similarly for other combinations.

Racial origin, as so far understood in our departmental instructions, is taken to mean the country of origin of a person's father. We do not want that perpetuated. From now on a person is a Canadian, and if his father was a Canadian his racial origin is Canadian. If the hon. member for Eglinton is agreeable I do not think the matter should be left over. It should be settled now. If the minister will consider the point of view to which I have just referred, I believe he will agree that it is not sufficient to say that departmental instructions will be altered. We would like to see the alterations written into the act itself, and to help him do away with the distinction as to race in our new Canadian citizenship.

Mr. LESAGE: One very easy way would be to correct the census regulations so that they will give the true definition of racial origin, in contrast with the country of origin of ancestors. There is a difference between the country of origin of ancestors, and racial origin. That should be in the census regulations, and not in Canadian citizenship law.

Mr. FULTON: Why?

Mr. LESAGE: That is the law dealing with nationality. It does not deal with racial origin, or with racial origin of forefathers. We are now talking about citizenship, and if there is a question on the census form dealing with racial origin, and if such definition of racial origin is not correct, it should be changed there. We have no business to change it in a law dealing with citizenship.

Mr. FULTON: That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not think the hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet has read the section, because section 3 says:

Where, under any act of the parliament of Canada—

Mr. LESAGE: No.

Mr. MARTIN: The words from "under" to "such act" have been deleted.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Regardless of the omission, there is no difference in the import. It says that where under an order or a regulation made—

Mr. LESAGE: No, no.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: This is what it says:

Where a person is required to state or declare his national status—

That does not alter the circumstances at all.

Mr. FLEMING: It broadens it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes, as the hon. member for Eglinton points out, it actually broadens it, because it makes it more general, and does not restrict it to an act of parliament or an order or a regulation. It covers every possible contingency.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, all this discussion reminds me of the German theories respecting the Aryan race, which they say is superior to all other races. What do we care about the race of a man if he is a good citizen? A man may be born of parents who are in gaol, and still be an excellent citizen. He may suffer because of his parentage, but still be a good citizen—not always, of course, because there are some cases of heredity. But we must consider this matter from a different point of view, because we are supposed to show a democratic spirit. Here we are discussing this matter along exactly the same lines as were followed by Hitler's general staff, when they were organizing Hitler Germany.

There are some races to whom people in some parts of Canada object. Some of the people in British Columbia do not like the Japanese, and this is a controversial question in that part of Canada. In eastern Canada some other people are not interested in living with people from continental Europe. That, too, is a controversial matter. I am wondering if the best possible way to find new citizens would not be to consider their turn of mind, their disposition or inclination to help us make something out of this country. To my mind this is a vital and crucial point, although I respect the views of those who have discussed the matter of racial origin.

I would refer to my hon. friend from Vegreville, who is not of British or of French stock. But he is proud of his race, and his nationality is Canadian—period. He is a good Canadian, and the type of desirable citizen we need in this country. He is not the only one; there are many others. I wonder if he has any objection to the discussions of racial origin which inevitably result in discrimination. And those discussions of racial issues are carried on by whom? It is done by the master race, which has the privilege of telling all other races, "You do not belong to our master race." That is the German attitude. It can be said in English; it can be said in French; it can be said in Ukrainian; it can be said in Russian—it can be said in any other language. But as a democrat I do not care for it. I believe the time spent in discussing anyone's racial merits is lost time.

The best speech made in this debate was made by the hon. member for Saskatoon City, when he discussed the intermingling and mixing of races. I have been in Europe, and have known many people in England. There were a very few who thought that at the time of the coronation their only equals were the bombastic Germans. Blomberg was there, with his big chest, and was considered their equal by some of the English. But that was not the mentality or the opinion of the majority of the English people who were there. There is however a group of individuals who recognize the master race. There is a German point of view and there is an English point of view in some heads in England—and unfortunately in some heads in Canada, too.

This, precisely, is the main obstacle to national unity—the attitude of superiority on the part of men who think they are better than others, or who think that because they were born of certain parentage they are of better stock. This reminds me of the foolishness of the English clergyman who, writing a geneology of the present king, stated that King David was his ancestor, and that he was a cousin of our Lord. This was distributed at the time of the coronation, and I believe all hon. members who were there received a copy of it. Well, that may be so; but we are now in the twentieth century, and far from King David. We have to live with our contemporaries and we must make the best of it. Opinions are free, and of course matters connected with racial origin may be discussed. All hon. members have the same rights, and they may enter into the discussion if they wish. But I find that the basis of that discussion is wrong, and that it is dangerous and explosive. It will create animosity throughout the country. When one man says, "I am a big man and you are a little man," conditions are not good. If he is a big man because he belongs to a certain race, and the other fellow, who in fact may be greater than he is, is a minor fellow because he belongs to another race, then we have friction and trouble which may end in civil war. Very often such things are not said here in the house but they are written in papers which are circulated among the ignorant in an effort to create prejudices.

This sort of thing is seldom done in the old country. Even the leaders of the Orangemen, whom I have known and who were members of this parliament, would not do this sort of thing. One of these men whom I knew intimately wrote me a letter in French in his own handwriting. I knew him very well and I was about to convert him. Neither of them ever quoted in this house anything

that had been written in their favour. They would have been ashamed to repeat in this House of Commons what had been written by their scribes in their own papers.

Since last evening I have discovered that science can be very weighty, and I did not attempt to bring with me the large Webster's dictionary which a friend of mine was kind enough to send over to me last evening. I shall try to make a contribution to this debate by putting on *Hansard* some of the definitions which I found in Webster's dictionary, and I think they will astound hon. members. When you put them all together it gives you a *vue d'ensemble* of the whole matter of citizenship, of nationhood and so on. The first definition is of "nation", and it reads as follows:

Nation: (2) People connected by supposed ties of blood generally manifested by community of language, religion and customs, and by a sense of common interest and inter-relation; thus, the Jews and the Gypsies are often called nations.

3. Popularly, any group of people having like institutions and customs and a sense of social homogeneity and mutual interest. Most nations are formed of agglomerations of tribes or peoples either of a common ethnic stock or of different stocks fused by long intercourse of single language or closely related dialects, a common religion, a common tradition and history, and a common sense of right and wrong, and a more or less compact territory, or typically characteristic;

That reminds me of the speech made in Boston by the former minister for air when he said that we should have one language. The definition continues:

—but one or more of these elements may be lacking and yet leave a group that from its community of interest and desire to lead a common life is called a nation.

Is it not agreeable to hon. members that they should consider seriously these definitions from Webster's?

4. Loosely, the body of inhabitants of a country united under a single independent government; a state.

7. One tribe of a group of Indian tribes; as, the Six Nations.

The next definition is of "nationality", and it reads as follows:

Nationality: 2. State, quality, or fact of belonging to, or being connected with a nation or state as by nativity or allegiance; as, nationality acquired by birth may be lost through naturalization in another country.

Nationality and citizenship may be different. The definition of "citizen" is as follows:

Citizen: 1. An inhabitant of a city or town, esp. one who enjoys its freedom and privileges as free man or burgess.

2. A member of a state; a person, native or naturalized, of either sex, who owes allegiance to a government, and is entitled to reciprocal protection from it;—opposed to alien.

Between the word citizen, answering in meaning to the Latin civis and the Greek polites, and the word subject, there is a fundamental distinction in meaning. Subject implies a master or lord to whom the subject owes a personal allegiance; citizen does not, but implies membership of, and the tie of loyalty to, a state, with the reciprocal right to the enjoyment of the privileges and protection flowing from these. A citizen as such is entitled to the protection of life, liberty, and property at home and abroad, but is not necessarily vested with the suffrage or other political rights. In the construction of statutes, citizen is sometimes made to include corporation.

That is very interesting. According to the definition of "citizen" given by Webster, it is a man who is endowed with civilian rights of a private character rather than public rights. The word has different meanings and the definition is not clear. The definitions I have given probably do not satisfy the minds of the hon. gentlemen who are honouring me by listening to me at the present time. The definition of "subject" is as follows:

Subject: 2. Under the power or dominion of another; specif., in international law owing allegiance to, or being a subject of a particular sovereign or state; as, Jamaica is subject to Great Britain. "Esau was never subject to Jacob." (Locke)

And then "alien":

Alien: 1. A person of another family, race, or nation; a foreigner, stranger.

2. One owing allegiance to another state, a foreign born resident of a country in which he does not possess the privileges of a citizen; also, loosely, a foreign born citizen.

And then "naturalization" and "naturalized":

Naturalization: 1. An act or process of naturalizing or state of being naturalized.

Naturalized: 2 (a) to confer the rights and privileges of a native subject or citizen on; to make as if native; to adopt (as an alien) into a state and place in the condition of a native subject or citizen.

Those are the definitions that I found in Webster's. I draw the attention of the committee to the fact that a distinction is made between the word "citizen", which is used often in connection with republics, and the word "subject", which is used mostly in connection with the inhabitants of kingdoms or possessions of a kingdom. We are a long way from the middle ages, but there are still many people who are subjects of a king. A subtle distinctions drawn between these two expressions, and I suggest to my colleagues that they have a look at them and endeavour to discuss this matter with an open mind and in the best possible spirit.

Some hon. members may be surprised at our insisting upon a definition, but there is a reason. I want this bill to satisfy my own mind and expectations. My idea of citizen-

ship is very lofty. I agree to a certain extent with the hon. member for Vaudreuil-Soulanges, who is sponsoring legislation to come before us later to make more impressive the ceremony of adjudicating upon certificates of citizenship. If there is no definition of citizenship in the bill, if we do not agree to work together to draft a satisfactory definition of citizenship, there will be 244 definitions of it offered by the members of this committee. I say 244 instead of 245 because of the unavoidable absence of the former member for Parkdale, Doctor Bruce. Here we are and each member may have his own definition, and more than one; he may offer two; he may offer three; he may offer four, so that we may be confronted with a volume of definitions, so much so that nobody will understand any of them. What is this great privilege which we confer, for instance, upon some person coming to us from Czechoslovakia who has never heard before of democracy and citizenship, or upon some brave man from the steppes of Russia who never had an opportunity to vote for several candidates in the few elections held in his own country? Et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

One has only to look at what is going on in the west where there are so many people of different races. They are doing well. They work together. They show a fine spirit of unison in promoting the interests of this country. Yet the western provinces are the least English and perhaps the least French of all the provinces of Canada. This shows that people may come to us from all over the world and join together with the common and definite purpose of making good here and of serving this country as good Canadians. That is our ambition for them.

What will be the immigration policy of this government, I do not know, and I am not interested in that at the present time. What I am now interested in is in finding ways and means of impressing those who come here from other countries that it is a great privilege to be a Canadian citizen because Canada is the finest country in the world. That must be impressed upon them, and they must be told in very clear language what citizenship is, so that they can abide by the law. If there is a good definition of citizenship in the act it will serve a good purpose because then there will be no ambiguity about it. The newcomer will be told: Here is your duty according to the law. Those who have been living in totalitarian countries do not care much about kings. They do not care much about some of the institutions which many Canadians cherish. But they do respect the law, and if we want them to act as good Canadian citizens they must know what the law is and they must abide by it.

I must tell you, Mr. Chairman, that during the past fifteen years I have not been enthusiastic about all the pieces of legislation that have been submitted to us. Some were wrong, and others which were good were wrongly drafted. This is the first opportunity I have to make good a piece of legislation which can better serve the definite purpose of uniting Canada than any lectures given by university professors or highly paid speakers who go round addressing the various clubs.

I have taken this matter to heart and discussed it with the hon. members for Charlevoix-Saguenay, and Jacques Cartier, and there is one definition of a Canadian citizen which has been arrived at. It is this. A Canadian citizen is a person who has a combination of public rights and duties. Another and more complete definition of citizenship would be a combination of public rights and duties of persons domiciled in Canada. Perhaps that is not complete, but it will serve as a basis for discussion, a much better basis than the discussion of racial origin, and it is very close to that which was given by the leader of the C.C.F. group. It refers to a Canadian subject. There is a shade of difference between a Canadian subject and a Canadian citizen, because in the definition of Canadian subject the link between the subject and the king appears. A Canadian subject would be one who by birth or by naturalization is a subject of His Majesty the King of Canada. That is another definition though it probably will not be agreed to by all the members. Opinions are free. The members who do not agree to it may have suggestions of their own to offer. We live in a free country, but the rule in a free country is the rule of the majority, and I do not see why an imposing majority of Canadians at heart should cater to a small and noisy minority of Canadians of different opinions, which may be respectable just the same. We are all here to decide what the act shall be. It may be unpleasant to some of us, but as we are here we have to submit to the rule of the majority. I did it so often myself that I understand it very well. I submitted to it even when I disagreed with everybody. It is the law of the country, and the only thing to do is to try to improve the law by making some suggestions. At the present time my contention is not at all that I am infallible in offering these definitions; it is a contribution to the discussion, and I invite most cordially my colleagues of all

shades of opinion to make their discussion to the same effect, instead of discussing racial origins; it will serve a much better purpose. I hope in all earnestness for the good of the country that this will be done, and I hope the minister will be broad enough to accept the suggestion which will be supported by a majority of the members of parliament. It will be sent to the senate. Perhaps it will pass there; perhaps it will not. But the effect of getting together to find a formula will be an example of national unity to the people of Canada. How many times the people complain that nothing is done in the House of Commons. The other day my hon. friend the ex-leader of the opposition spoke of spiritual values. A clear enunciation in a limpid definition of "citizenship" will do more for national unity than one might suppose at first sight. The question has been considered seriously, I think, and I hope it will bear fruit.

Mr. McMASTER: This discussion has arisen, perhaps, unexpectedly. I would call the attention of the Secretary of State to the Statistics Act, chapter 190 of the revised statutes of Canada, in which provision is made for a census to be taken in June, 1931, and every tenth year thereafter. In section 19, provision is made as follows:

> Each census of population and agriculture shall be so taken as to ascertain with the utmost possible accuracy for the various territorial divisions of Canada, or of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta as the case may be,
>
> (a) their population and the classification thereof, as regards name, age, sex, conjugal condition, relation to head of household, nationality, race, education. . . .

So that the particular forms used by the census enumerators have the authority of statute. Again, I wish to say, because I have been opposed to this bill from the beginning as being unnecessary, that in the instructions given to the enumerators they were told that there was a Canadian citizenship. That is why I think this bill is not necessary to provide a Canadian citizenship—but for some other reason, which we shall probably discuss further.

Mr. CASE: A great deal of emphasis seems to be placed upon the census feature in relation to the bill. I take it that the object of Canadian citizenship is to seek to have Canadian citizens recognized under international law as Canadian citizens and to give them a greater sense of appreciation of their own country. I fail to see what objection there can be to declaring racial origin or national status. I look upon the census as a statistical record, and the more information it contains the better it will be for record purposes. I do not see that the provision is objectionable from the point of view that is being emphasized here to-day. As a matter of fact, almost everyone, surely, must be proud of his racial origin, and it is declared with the object of having the record that much more complete.

Mr. REID: I should like to say a word on this matter; I am inspired to do so by the remarks made by the hon. member for High Park.

A great deal has been said this afternoon regarding races and racial origins. But let us consider what we are intending to do; let us keep in mind as well the people in this country; for it is advisable, to my way of thinking, that we should take note of this amendment and be careful about letting it go through. There are in this country some thirty-six different races. I suppose someone will say that all are of the same race because all came from Adam, but hon. members know what I mean when I say that there are in Canada people from thirty-six different countries, and I can see nothing wrong, nothing detrimental to the idea of Canadian citizenship, that a man from Japan or China or Scotland should be asked to state from what country he comes. As a matter of fact, when one speaks of racial prejudice what do we actually find in this country? We find people whose ancestors came from Scotland or England or Germany, two, four, or five generations back who are more proud of the lands of their forefathers than even I, who come from Scotland. It is a well known fact, and it need no longer be concealed, that Great Britain during the recent war wished to move in on the south of Ireland. Britain would have had possession of the south of Ireland but for one thing—the great numbers of people in the United States whose forefathers came from the south of Ireland. Every second policeman in New York is an Irishman, and the political influence of these people, the second, third and fourth generations of Irishmen in the United States, had more effect on policy relating to the south of Ireland than any other factor. Great Britain was afraid to move in and take charge of the south of Ireland, as she should have done, for the safety of the country, at that time.

Consider, too, what Great Britain does. Those of us who come from the British isles know that, whether we are Scottish, English, Northern Irish, or Welsh, the births of the children are not registered as British, but Scottish children are registered as Scots, English children as English, Irish children as Irish, and Welsh children as Welsh. Has that caused any great discord in the British

isles? I know there are those who would control one's even getting up to speak about racial origin, but have we no trust in the people? I come from a land where a man can stand on the street corner and talk about the churches, criticize the Roman Catholic church, denounce the Pope, talk about the Jews, or anything else under the sun, in full freedom. Does it arouse any animosity in the minds of the people of Great Britain? Where has there been fairer treatment for all nationalities than in Great Britain? Where has the Jew found surer rest for his feet and greater peace than in Great Britain? Yet you can go to the street corners or the parks and hear now, as for the last fifty years, people denouncing the Jews and talking against many other people; no one prevents them.

I am one of those who have faith in the people, and I am surprised at any member from British Columbia taking any other stand. Particularly I am surprised that the hon. member for Kamloops supports this amendment, in view of the stand he took regarding the Japanese. In my opinion there is no undue interference in the present procedure; we must have some guide or record regarding the thirty-six different peoples represented in this country.

Mr. MARTIN: I wish to rise for just one moment. The hon. member for Temiscouata raised the point which he discussed last night and since that time he has put a great deal of research on the matter. I would not want that research to go without some comment from me. He is to be commended for once again showing great industry, and the suggestions he has made will receive the fullest consideration at my hands. I want him to know that his words have been listened to with close attention and will receive further close study by me. Once again the hon. member has shown his capacity for deep research, and I commend him for it.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank the minister very much for his kind words, and I will say that the Prime Minister must be congratulated upon having appointed him to the cabinet at the same time as the Minister of Transport was appointed. Both of them are doing very well; and I shall have something finer to tell the minister if he accepts the suggestion of any member of the committee who will come with a good definition of "citizenship" to give a real backbone to the bill.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): An immigrant, on going to the United States, within twenty-four hours of landing can say with justifiable pride "I am an American". An immigrant coming to this country has little chance to say, "I am a Canadian". That is going to stop and I hope that we shall all be known as Canadians. One of the most divisive forces we have is insistence on racial origin. I see no reason and no necessity for it at all. We are told that it is necessary for the purposes of the census. I doubt that. I have friends in western Canada who are of the third or fourth generation and who are still, as far as the census is concerned, referred to as Germans, Ukrainians, Scots and so on. They are Canadians. The steady insistence by governments as well as by business on this aspect of racial origin is, I think, detrimental to what we wish to see prevail in Canada, namely, genuine unity. I hope the minister will accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Lake Centre and add the three words "or racial origin" to this clause.

Mr. RICHARD (Gloucester): Is this discussion really necessary? Must we on this section go into the question of national status or racial origin? It seems to me that the section as it reads is clear enough. A man is asked what his national status is and he must state whether he is a Canadian citizen or not. It has no reference to racial origin. If there are other acts or regulations under which a man is asked what his racial origin is and he replies "Canadian citizen" he is not complying with that particular act or regulation. He is not answering the question there asked. That is all. As the section stands, it serves a purpose. A man in Canada is asked whether he is a Canadian subject; he is asked about his national status, and he need not go into the question of racial origin, because if he does so he is going into another sphere altogether. The clause should remain as it stands.

As to differentiating between racial origins, I am proud to be a Canadian citizen, but I am also proud to be of French origin, and I do not think we should drop that distinction altogether. For certain purposes we should retain it. There is no reason why, for the purposes of the census, our population should not be divided according to racial origin. I do not think there is any harm in that, nor do I believe it makes a man less a Canadian citizen simply because we divide the population according to racial origin purely for purposes of the census. I do not think the bill needs any amendment in that regard because the section is quite clear. For other purposes, so far as other acts are concerned, people can be guided by the provisions therein set out.

Amendment (Mr. Diefenbaker) negatived on division.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Born before the commencement of the act.

Mr. MacNICOL: What about Indians who have left their tribes and have established themselves like the rest of us, or Indians who have served in His Majesty's forces? Are they automatically Canadian citizens by virtue of the fact that they were born here?

Mr. MARTIN: They are Canadian citizens. If an Indian was born in Canada he is a Canadian citizen. The section is clear.

Mr. COLDWELL: What about the Six Nations Indians around Brantford? Are they regarded as Canadians? I believe they have some international status which enables them to cross the boundary with their own passports.

Mr. MARTIN: If they were born in Canada, then under the act they are Canadian citizens. There are two principles by which most countries determine citizenship, law of blood and law of the place of birth. We have a combination of both principles.

Section agreed to.

Section 5 agreed to.

On section 6—Conditions for retention of Canadian citizenship by persons born outside of Canada.

Mr. REID: Some explanation should be given of this section. When I spoke before I took exception to the fact that a child born outside the country is made a naturalized Canadian merely because either of its parents happened to have been born on a Canadian ship. It is certainly carrying national status pretty far when we confer it upon a child, making that child equal with a person born in Canada. I should ilke to see us adopt some regulation such as they have in the United States with regard to children born outside that country. After all, we are conferring Canadian nationality upon a child born in another country simply because one of its parents was born on a Canadian ship, and as I say, that is going too far. Let me read the provision that exists in the United States:

> A person born outside the United States and its outlying possessions of parents one of whom is a citizen of the United States who, prior to the birth of such person, has had ten years' residence in the United States or one of its outlying possessions, at least five of which were after attaining the age of sixteen years, the other being an alien; provided—

And here is the point I wish to emphasize.

> —that in order to retain such citizenship the child must reside in the United States or its outlying possessions for a period or periods totalling five years between the ages of thirteen and twenty-one years.

They stipulate there that a child cannot attain American citizenship at birth but must have had some residence, at some period, in the United States before it reaches the age of twenty-one. We should be careful in extending citizenship. I would ask the minister the reasons for extending citizenship as far as this bill goes.

Mr. MARTIN: The principle involved in the section to which the hon. member has referred is not a new one. It was in the old naturalization act even before 1914. In the act as it now stands it is found in section 3, subsection 5, so that it is not new. The principle is one that is recognized by most countries. I would refer to the "Consolidation of Nationality Laws", prepared by Hudson, which is recognized as the best English text on nationality laws, wherein the principle is discussed. The hon. member will find that in almost all countries which were represented at the Hague conference of 1930, the principle is accepted. It is accepted in all the dominions, and we consider the principle is too important to drop. The reason for it, in theory, I think is sound. The desire is, as far as possible, to keep the members of a family within the same national status group, without in any way imposing nationality upon them. It seems desirable that minor children, until such time as they have attained their majority, should have the nationality or the national status of their parents. As to the use of the words "Canadian ship", the hon. member will note that in paragraph (b) of the interpretation section that is defined to mean a ship of Canadian registry, which is a slight change. I can only repeat that the rule is an effort to keep members of the same family within the same national group as far as that is possible, without compulsion and without interfering with their rights, until they attain their majority. When we come to discuss subsequent sections of the bill it will be apparent that this does not mean that nationality acquired in this way cannot be rejected or withdrawn by the parties concerned. One of the main reasons for the section, and one of the most difficult things to administer in this kind of act, is the question of statelessness. In the Department of the Secretary of State and in the department of my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources we have thousands of pitiable cases of statelessness among children, and I should think this would

be the most undesirable time to try to change this principle, particularly in view of conditions in Europe.

Mr. REID: Suppose a child was born in China, whose father had been born on a ship of Canadian registry. Is there no time limit in a case of that kind? Naturally China would confer citizenship on that child, owing to the fact that it was born in that country. Would that child retain Canadian nationality all the days of its life? Is there no time limit?

Mr. MARTIN: There is a time limit of two years in regard to registration. The birth must be registered within two years.

Section agreed to.

Section 7 agreed to.

On section 8—Child born after the death of his father.

Mr. COLDWELL: There is just one point in connection with this section. It seemed to us in discussing this matter, that something else should be added in connection with giving this status to a child. At the moment a person born on board a foreign ship in Canadian territorial waters would be considered to have been born in Canada. Is that not right?

Mr. MARTIN: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would mind repeating that question; I am sorry, I was otherwise engaged.

Mr. COLDWELL: A child born on board a ship in Canadian territorial waters—

Mr. MARTIN. A ship of Canadian registry?

Mr. COLDWELL: No, of foreign registry. Technically it would be born in Canada. There is nothing in the bill, it seemed to us when we were going through it, to cover that point. Should there not be something in the bill which would state that a child born on board a foreign ship in Canadian territorial waters should not be regarded as a Canadian citizen? It is quite conceivable that at some future time, under certain conditions that might exist, a child so born in Canadian territorial waters on a foreign ship might claim to be Canadian when it would not serve the interests of this country to recognize that person as of Canadian nationality. I raise that point because when we were going through the bill we thought it was not covered.

Mr. MARTIN: It is very funny that our minds should be working in the same direction.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is not very funny.

Mr. MARTIN: No, it is not, because up to a point the hon. gentleman and I have the same type of liberalism. We cannot agree on everything, but one thing on which we do agree is that the hon. member for Peel is a very genial member; as to that there is no argument. What the hon. gentleman has said really applies to section 5. The point is interesting and not without some merit. I have in my hand an amendment which I have been thinking about, but according to the officers of the immigration department such cases are very rare. I think there have been two in about sixty years, and it would be perhaps the wrong thing to include a principle which seems to strike particularly at what Hudson says in his treatise. In view of the fact that the cases are very rare, perhaps I should not proceed with what I have been toying with to cover the particular case. Sometimes more is to be gained by dealing with broader questions than by trying to cover many things which in themselves are important but which in their context may not be so important. I think I had better leave it that way.

Mr. DORION: I believe there is a time limit missing from this section. As it reads now, if a child is born five years after the death of his father he is deemed to have been born before his father's death. I suggest to the minister that in our civil code we have a section which settles the question. I believe this section should be amended along the lines of section 218 of the civil code, which says:

> A child born on or after the one hundred and eightieth day after the marriage was solemnized or within three hundred days after its dissolution is held to have been conceived during marriage.

So that in this section I think after the word "father" should be added, "but within three hundred days after such death." That would mean something, I think.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman has raised a point which I am afraid is away beyond my imagination. I do not see how a person could be the child of a father when that child is born five years after the father's death, though there may be something in medical science with which the Minister of Veterans Affairs has not yet made me acquainted. I believe the section is satisfactory as it stands.

Mr. DORION: I move that amendment, Mr. Chairman, because I think it is necessary.

Mr. MARTIN: Perhaps I had better explain why the section is there. As the committee will note, this is a new section. In the comments made about this bill in the "American Journal of International Law" some months ago it will be noted that this section was praised as an advanced section in

nationality legislation. Incidentally, I am sure hon. members would profit from reading the article in that journal, because it comments on some of the outstanding features of this bill.

This section is new, and it is important because in certain cases where the father is a Canadian citizen but the mother is not the child is not deprived of his Canadian status merely because of the prenatal death of his father. It could be particularly important in times such as the war from which we have just emerged, when large numbers of Canadians were abroad on hazardous duties. The reason for the section is to give a posthumous child the status of his brothers and sisters born during the lifetime of his father. All the provincial statutes dealing with inheritance contain provisions placing the posthumous child on the same basis as children born during the father's lifetime. The mother may not necessarily be a Canadian citizen, since she may never have come to this country. On the other hand, by section 4(b) we are conferring Canadian citizenship upon the children of a father if the father was a natural-born Canadian. This will cover the situation of a Canadian soldier stationed, for example, in Belgium or Holland, and contracting marriage with a woman in one of those countries. Under the bill, while the father was alive, the child would be a natural-born Canadian citizen.

Mr. HACKETT: May I ask a question? All that has been suggested is—

Mr. MARTIN: May I finish this point, and state the reasons for the section. It would clearly be an injustice if, should the father be accidentally killed or die, a child born two days or a few months after his death would not enjoy the same status as other children. That is the purpose of the section.

Mr. HACKETT: What the hon. member has suggested is that in the first line of section 8 there should be added after the word "born" the words "within 300 days".

Mr. MARTIN: What is the point of that? Surely that is covered.

Mr. HACKETT: The point is to fix the date within which legitimacy is beyond question.

Mr. MARTIN: This section has nothing to do with legitimacy or illegitimacy.

Mr. HACKETT: I think it has a great deal to do with it.

Mr. MARTIN: No, it has not.

Mr. HACKETT: If a child were born out of wedlock it would not qualify here. The suggestion of the hon. member is one which would make it quite clear that a child born "within 300 days after the death of its father" would not be put to proof of nationality.

Mr. DORION: How long after the death of its father would a child be deemed to be born before the death of its father?

Mr. LESAGE: That is provincial law.

Mr. DORION: What would be the time for the purpose of this bill?

Mr. LESAGE: There are laws in the provinces concerning affiliation. We do not have to deal with that. All section 8 says is that where a child is born after the death of his father certain things shall take place. The question of knowing whether the man was or was not the father is one of affiliation, and that is a provincial matter. We have nothing to do with it. He either is or is not the father. To determine whether he is or is not is the duty of the provinces under provincial law.

Amendment (Mr. Dorion) negatived.

Section 8 agreed to.

On section 9—On commencement of the act.

Mr. FLEMING: I suggest that some clarification is required in subsection 1 at line 20. Section 9 (1) says:

> A person other than a natural-born Canadian citizen is a Canadian citizen if he . . .

Then we find paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), with nothing to link them. The Secretary of State will notice that at the end of paragraph (a) there is only a semi-colon, that at the end of paragraph (b) appears another semi-colon and the words "or, in the case of a woman". Is subsection 1 to be read as though these were conjunctive clauses? It seems to me there should be inserted after the semi-colon the word "and" or the word "or"; or if it is intended to cover it both ways, the words "and/or" should appear. A similar change may have to be made after paragraph (b).

This is a point of real importance, it seems to me, namely whether a person becomes a Canadian citizen technically if he complies with (a) or with (b), and does not have to comply with both.

Mr. MARTIN: Does the hon. member suggest that we should insert the word "or" between paragraphs (a) and (b)?

Mr. FLEMING: It has to be "or" or "and", depending on whether the minister intends that the stipulations in (a) and (b) should be cumulative or alternative.

Mr. MARTIN: They are alternative, of course.

Mr. FLEMING: Then, if they are alternative the word "or" will have to be inserted after the semi-colon in line 20.

Mr. MARTIN: I believe under the Interpretation Act when the conjunctive is used, there is no need for a change of this kind. However, I have no objection to adding the word "or."

Mr. FLEMING: It would clarify the meaning. Therefore I would move:

That the word "or" be added after the semi-colon in line 20 of section 9 (1) of the bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McMASTER: Would the minister explain paragraph (c)? I find it difficult to understand the meaning of it. Let us suppose this act were declared in force on June 1. Then let us suppose that on June 2 one of our soldiers overseas were to marry an English girl. Would she become a Canadian citizen?

Mr. MARTIN: She would not be a Canadian citizen automatically.

Mr. COLDWELL: I should like to refer to subsection 2 (a). I understand that many years ago there were two forms of naturalization. In the homesteading days in western Canada there was a residence of three years, at the end of which time those making application received certificates which were looked upon as naturalization certificates. Subsequently, however, when the imperial act was passed and we changed our naturalization procedure to conform with it, we stipulated a period of five years domicile before naturalization could be changed.

Mr. MARTIN: It was five years in 1919 and three years in 1910.

Mr. COLDWELL: Some of these people took out the second naturalization certificate. Should we not recognize the first certificate to this extent, that where the name of an applicant was included in a certificate of naturalization on, as stated here, "the date of the certificate", it should be the date of the earliest certificate?

Mr. MARTIN: I would call the hon. member's attention to section 2 (d) where it says that—

"Certificate of naturalization" means a certificate of naturalization granted under any act heretofore in force in Canada.

Mr. COLDWELL: That covers the point I have just raised?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes, that was the chief point we had in mind.

[Mr. Fleming.]

Mr. COLDWELL: Then that satisfies me.

Section 9 agreed to.

On section 10—Grant of a certificate of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. FLEMING: This is a section of great importance. Up to the present time one might state fairly that there has been no disagreement in principle on the bill, although a number of textual amendments have been offered. But when we come to section 10 we have reached one of the leading sections in the bill. I suppose this section taken with section 26 would contain the nub of the bill, so far as debate is concerned.

May I draw the attention of the committee to the fact, first, that the bill contains no definition of "British subject". It has been indicated on all sides of the house that the correct interpretation of the term "British subject" is a person who owes allegiance to the crown. By section 28 it is made quite clear that such privileges as are extended to British subjects under this bill are confined to British subjects coming from one of the commonwealth countries. By section 28 these privileges are confined to those countries in the first schedule of the bill, which limits any benefits accruing to British subjects as such to those who come from the self-governing nations of the commonwealth. What I have to say relates to that class. We are not dealing with British subjects from other parts of the empire; we are dealing simply with British subjects from the self-governing nations of the commonwealth.

Mr. MARTIN: May I point out that this section deals with British subjects from all parts of the commonwealth. I do not wish to interfere with my hon. friend's argument, but I want him to know my point of view.

Mr. FLEMING: My remarks will be quite clear on that when I move the amendment which I propose to introduce. I draw to the attention of the committee the requirements of section 10. It will be found that it is permissive in empowering the minister, who is the Secretary of State, to grant a certificate of Canadian citizenship to any person who is not a Canadian citizen and who makes application for that purpose and satisfies the court that he has the qualifications within the terms of paragraphs (a) to (g) inclusive.

In a word, those qualifications are, first, that a declaration of intention to become a Canadian citizen should be filed; second, that the applicant has been lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence in Canada; third, that he has resided in Canada for a total period of five years, one of which must

be the year immediately preceding the date of the application, and four years of which must be within a six-year period—I am omitting certain exception, to which I shall return later—fourth, that he is of good character; fifth, that he has an adequate knowledge of either the English or the French language, or, alternatively, that he has resided in Canada continuously for more than twenty years; sixth, that he has an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship, and, seventh, that he intends, if his application is granted. either to reside permanently in Canada or to enter or continue in the public service of Canada or of a province thereof.

I draw the attention of the committee to one or two exceptions which are made. Paragraph (a) makes an exception in the case of two classes of persons; first, the spouse of a Canadian citizen residing in Canada, that is, a husband or wife and, second, a British subject. Those are the two exceptions. If the applicant has either one or the other of those two attributes he is absolved from filing a declaration of intention. That is the only benefit that accrues to the British subject under subsection 1.

Mr. MARTIN: He still has the other rights which were mentioned, the right to vote and the right to old age pension.

Mr. FLEMING: We are dealing now with the acquisition of Canadian citizenship under this bill. I am pointing out that the one exception made by this section in favour of a British subject as such is that he is absolved from filing a declaration of intention under paragraph (a). That is the one difference provided by section 10, subsection 1, between an applicant who is a British subject and an applicant who is not a British subject. The filing of a declaration of intention can hardly be regarded as an onerous undertaking. It is merely the act of filing the declaration in a court office. That is the extent of the benefit extended to a British subject under this section in respect of his application for Canadian citizenship. If that section is enacted in its present form and the renowned Winston Churchill chose to take up residence in Canada, he could not become a Canadian citizen in less than five years.

Mr. MARTIN: Nor could he for the past twenty-seven years.

Mr. FLEMING: I am going to come to that point the minister has been raising. I suggest that what the minister has raised in what he has just said and in what he has said very often during the debate is simply a strawman and I am going to deal with it in a moment.

Mr. GRAYDON: Not a very good strawman either.

Mr. FLEMING: Reference has been made to persons who come to this country for temporary purposes. Yesterday the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar said that people who had come to this country—this is, as I recall his remarks—from the British isles, not intending to make this country their final or permanent abode, up to the present time had rights of citizenship which, rightly speaking, should not be accorded to people who come for a period limited in point of time.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not quite say that.

Mr. FLEMING: That is the sense in which I apprehended the remarks of the hon. gentleman. Whatever his meaning was, I think it is quite fair to say that no one, regardless of one year's residence or five years' residence, can qualify under this bill for Canadian citizenship unless he has established domicile here. Five years' residence is the minimum, but it is five years after he has acquired domicile within the definition of that term given in section 2 (j), which is as follows:

> "domicile" means the place in which a person has his home or in which he resides and to which he returns as his place of permanent abode and does not mean the place where he resides for a mere special or temporary purpose . . .

We can wash out all those cases to which I understood the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar was referring. No one, whether a British subject or anything else, can acquire status under this bill to apply for Canadian citizenship or to begin to fulfil the necessary qualifications unless he has first established domicile. This means that he must have come to Canada with the firm intention of making this country his permanent home, that he has left the country of his origin with no intention of returning to it. That is the effect of this section. The applicant must first have established domicile in Canada and then, in order to qualify under the section dealing with Canadian domicile, he must thereafter have five years' residence.

If hon. members will look at section 10 (1) (g) they will see that he must have this permanent intention. That is reinforced by section 10 (1) (g) as well as by the section defining "domicile". So that we start with that point, that he must have come to this country with the intention of making it his permanent home. Then, domicile here having

been established, the time of residence, which is five years in practically all cases or one year in two cases under this section, begins to run.

Let us ask ourselves what is the purpose of requiring five years' residence. In the first place, it is linked up to the subject of domicile because it gives full proof of the intention of establishing a settled residence. It is designed principally, however, to ensure that the applicant shall have learned the ways of this country, shall have absorbed its democratic methods and shall have shown sufficient proof that he will be assimilated into this country and especially to that end that he shall have learned one or other of the two official languages.

What is the position of a British subject in Canada at the present time under existing legislation? In the course of what I shall say in reply to that question I shall deal with the point raised by the Secretary of State.

The Naturalization Act has no application to British subjects. It applies to aliens. The effect of naturalization under the provisions of the Naturalization Act is to extend to an alien qualifying under that act the rights and status of a natural-born British subject. The Naturalization Act has no reference whatever to British subjects coming to Canada. No British subject has ever had to qualify under that act. It simply has no application to British subjects coming to this country. Section 4 empowers the minister to grant a certificate of naturalization to an alien, and section 5 of the Naturalization Act, in defining the effect of the grant of a certificate of naturalization, provides that as and from the date of the naturalization the applicant shall have to all intents and purposes the status of a natural-born British subject. In other words, the Naturalization Act has for its purpose the granting to aliens who satisfy the requirements of the act of a status equivalent to that of natural-born British subjects. Similarly, where a person who has obtained a certificate of naturalization forfeits it for any one of several reasons, section 16 provides that he ceases to be a British subject. So we have that quite clear. The Naturalization Act has never had any reference to British subjects coming to this country.

Mr. MARTIN: My hon. friend does not suggest that I ever suggested it had?

Mr. FLEMING: No. I am trying to make clear that this bill, and especially section 10, with which we are now dealing, will make a great difference in the position and status of British subjects coming to this country. In other words, I am answering as directly as I can the point raised by the minister, and I must say with great respect that I completely differ with him in the view he has put before the committee.

Let us look for a moment at the elections act. We are assured by the minister that the government has no intention of changing the provisions of the elections act. At the present time that may hold out some hope that there will be no interference with the status in respect of franchise now granted to a British subject coming to this country who has established one year's residence here under the elections act. But, of course, we have agreement on the part of the minister, and I think this is known to us all, that there are anomalies about granting the right to vote to persons who are not citizens in the eyes of the country. I am sure that in the United States of America the idea of giving the franchise without citizenship would be regarded as a very strange and anomalous idea indeed. But whatever the anomaly may be, the anomaly is to continue. If section 10 (1) is left in its present form we are legislating an anomaly, when we compare the right to the franchise with citizenship.

Mr. MARTIN: Did my hon. friend read the judgment to which I referred last night?

Mr. FLEMING: I am acquainted with that judgment. There is no disagreement between the Secretary of State and myself as to the existence of the anomaly. As a matter of fact he admitted it last night. He pointed to other anomalies. Of course there are anomalies, and I am drawing to his attention that if we pass section 10 (1) in its present form we are legislating an anomaly, as to the existence of which the minister and I are in agreement.

I now turn to the Immigration Act. Here I come to the place where with great respect I hold quite a different view from that propounded in this house by the Secretary of State. He made reference to the fact that there has been a Canadian citizenship of a kind under the Immigration Act. He said that provision has been there for twenty-nine years and we are asked because of that fact to legislate in such a way that there would be no practical difference whatever in respect of application for citizenship between a British subject coming to this country and one coming from an alien land. That is the effect of section 10. If section 10 (1) is enacted in its present form there is no practical difference under this bill between the status of a British subject coming here from any other part of the commonwealth and that of a person

coming to these shores from an alien land. The only advantage that is given to the British subject coming here from another part of the commonwealth is that he is absolved from the mere detail of filing a declaration of intention, which is no material difference at all.

Mr. MARTIN: Does my hon. friend not think he should add that the British subject will continue to have certain privileges—the right to vote, the right to old age pension, the right to be appointed to a civil service position, and so on? Those are privileges not given to any other group.

Mr. FLEMING: We are talking about citizenship, and I am pointing out, and it is incontrovertible, that if section 10(1) is adopted in its present form there is no material difference between the position of a British subject from another part of the commonwealth and the position of an alien from any other land when it comes to applying for Canadian citizenship. That is incontrovertible.

We are told that it is not the intention of the government to interfere with the franchise in the case of a British subject who has been here for one year and has qualified. But is that a guarantee that it will not be changed? The minister would not go any farther last night, when asked if he would clarify the government's position, than to say that it is not the intention of the government to introduce an amendment to the election act.

Mr. MARTIN: What more could I say?

Mr. FLEMING: Presumably the law can be changed even apart from an intention on the part of the government.

I come back to the Immigration Act. The Immigration Act is an act dealing with a particular field. It does not at all purport to be an act defining "Canadian citizenship" or the status of a Canadian citizen. The Secretary of State was much closer to the law, may I say with great respect, when he said this afternoon in reply to a question by the hon. member for Lake Centre that the definition of "Canadian citizenship" under the Immigration Act applies only to a limited number of those in this country who have the rights of citizenship. Are we to be told that the limited definition of "Canadian citizen" under the Immigration Act, put there for a very limited purpose in relation to immigration and not at all for the purpose of defining the rights and status of a Canadian citizen, and applying to a very limited class of those properly entitled to the rights of citizenship in this country, is an answer to those who say that if you enact section 10 in its present form you are to all intents and purposes putting the British subject coming here from some other part of the commonwealth in practically the same position as an alien?

Let us bear in mind that there is no proposal to interfere with the Immigration Act. Whatever is to be said in justification of the provision of the Immigration Act which makes persons admitted under that act liable to deportation within five years of their entry in certain events—whatever is to be said in support of that will continue to be said because that act is not to be interfered with. But we are not here dealing with the Immigration Act but rather with the question of establishing the terms of citizenship, those who are to qualify for it and the terms on which they should qualify and the rights and privileges which flow from Canadian citizenship. So let us not drag in any red herrings about the Immigration Act because the term "citizen" is not used at all in that act in the same sense in which it is used in this bill. So let us have no confusion. The two acts are separate and distinct.

Even in the face of the provisions of the Immigration Act, what was the position of a British subject coming to this country? On lawful admission he had the rights and privileges of any other citizen of this country. After a year's residence he acquired the right to the franchise. He had everything in the way of citizenship rights that any Canadian-born citizen had. The only distinction was that, in certain clearly defined events, under the Immigration Act he was subject to deportation within five years. What were those events? One was the health condition mentioned yesterday in the debate: if, for instance, he appeared to be insane and had to be confined to a mental institution, or if he was convicted of offences involving moral turpitude. Under those conditions he was liable to be deported within five years. But within that time he had the rights of citizenship. Therefore let it not be said that the position of a British subject, if section 10, subsection 1 comes into effect in its present form, will be the same as it is now or as it has been for the past twenty-nine years; because that is not so; that has not been the law.

Let us be very careful about immigration. I would be the last person in the world to suggest that we ought to relax in any way the restrictions of the kind referred to in the Immigration Act. Certainly we do not want the kind of restrictions to which I have referred to be relaxed, and we must be very careful in our selection of immigrants at the source. But I am putting this forward to

establish what I think is an incontrovertible position, that if you enact section 10 in its present form you are taking from a British subject coming to this land from another part of the commonwealth something which he has at the present time.

Mr. MARTIN: What?

Mr. FLEMING: The right of citizenship after a year. All the rights of citizenship. Yes, his position is the same as that of a Canadian-born subject—

Mr. MARTIN: What right is taken away? Name one.

Mr. FLEMING: The right of citizenship in this country. The minister cannot, simply by saying to me, "Well, citizenship up to this time has been spelled with a small 'c' and in this bill it will be spelled with a big 'C' ", answer the point that I am making.

Mr. MARTIN: What right of citizenship is taken away?

Mr. FLEMING: He has every right of a citizen at the present time. He has the right to call himself a citizen of Canada.

Mr. MARTIN: What right of citizenship is taken away?

Mr. FLEMING: He has the right to call himself a Canadian, because he has had all the rights of citizenship in the country. It is true that he was liable to deportation if he was admitted to a mental institution or had committed some offence involving moral turpitude; but he was a citizen and he was a Canadian.

Mr. MARTIN: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. FLEMING: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MARTIN: We are in committee now. What right of citizenship does this bill take away from British subjects?

Mr. FLEMING: The right of citizenship; that is what. He has the right to-day to call himself a citizen of Canada.

Mr. MacNICOL: After one year.

Mr. FLEMING: After one year.

Mr. MARTIN: What is the hon. member's authority for that?

Mr. FLEMING: Does the minister need authority for that?

Mr. MARTIN: I certainly do.

Mr. FLEMING: Let the minister look at the present legislation. A British citizen coming to this country at the present time has every privilege.

Mr. MARTIN: And he continues to have.

Mr. FLEMING: Including the privilege of the franchise, which any Canadian citizen has had. From this time on, if this bill with section 10, subsection 1, in its present form is adopted, there will be a distinction between a Canadian-born British subject and a British subject coming from another part of the commonwealth. To every intent and purpose, except for the mere trifle of filing a declaration of intention, a British subject from another part of the commonwealth is an alien applying for citizenship.

Mr. LESAGE: Why should he not be considered as an alien?

Mr. FLEMING: If you reduce to the vanishing point the privileges which go with partnership in the commonwealth, if you do not put any store upon the benefits which go with being a British subject in the commonwealth, then all right, do not give the British subject any advantage here. But if it means anything to be a British subject—

Mr. LESAGE: What does it mean?

Mr. FLEMING: If it means anything to enjoy in other parts of the commonwealth the privileges which the laws of the other parts of the commonwealth extend to British subjects, then I say that there is good and ample reason why we should accord a special status to British subjects coming to this country to make this their home, a status over and above that accorded to those coming from alien lands.

Mr. GLEN: Would the hon. member abolish the period for acquiring domicile as a British subject in this country?

Mr. FLEMING: The point which the minister has raised is a quite proper one, if I may say so, and the amendment I intend to move will deal with it.

I have said something about the effects of this bill in depriving a British subject who comes from other parts of the commonwealth of rights which he now enjoys, rights which come to him automatically because he is a British subject, and as introducing a discrimination which I think is bound to create feelings of humiliation. Let us examine what I have suggested in the light of the purposes, as I conceive them, of the five years' residence, to which I referred earlier. I suggested that the reason we want a five-year Canadian domicile in the case of applicants for Canadian citizenship is that we wish to be sure that they have absorbed our ways, that they are capable of fitting in with our democratic conceptions

and that they have indicated a capacity for assimilation. Apply this to the British subject. First of all, what about language? A British subject coming from some other part of the commonwealth obviously speaks one of the two official languages of this country.

An hon. MEMBER: Not necessarily.

An hon. MEMBER: Not if he comes from Papua.

Mr. FLEMING: In the second place, I suggest that a British subject coming from the self-governing nations of the commonwealth does not need schooling in democracy. He is accustomed to looking at things from the point of view of the British traditional attitude toward democracy, the rights of the individual, his rights before the law, his right to equality before the law with all other citizens, his right to be self-governing, to determine the government by his vote at the ballot box. Surely we do not have to establish a school to train people with that background in the kind of thing we are proposing to establish by way of education for people coming from other lands.

Mr. LESAGE: What about the Americans?

Mr. FULTON: Answer that one yourself.

Mr. FLEMING: If the hon. member is suggesting that we ought to extend reciprocal citizenship to citizens of the United States, I do not know whether I am prepared to go that far, but if he will put the suggestion forward the house will perhaps give it serious consideration.

I return now to the answer I sought to give a moment ago to a question suggested by an hon. member opposite, when I said that it does means something to be a British subject—

Mr. MARTIN: Hear, hear.

Mr. FLEMING: —when we have regard to the advantages which are extended to British subjects in other parts of the commonwealth. I must take issue with the Secretary of State in his suggestion that, after all, the position is the same in the other parts of the commonwealth; that after all, this bill is just about the same law as they have there. If that is the impression the committee has I believe a good deal of correction is needed. These other nations of the commonwealth, with the exception of Ireland, have not yet enacted anything comparable with our citizenship bill. In Australia, for instance, in New Zealand, in the United Kingdom, they have no citizenship act. They have legislation there in relation to the franchise. If the franchise is a badge of citizenship, then the situation is that a definite privilege is extended by the laws of these member nations of the commonwealth to British subjects. A Canadian going from Canada to take up residence there has a definite advantage in that regard over persons coming from alien lands. That certainly is an advantage and I hope we do not want to deprive any British subject of comparable advantages here. Even though we were to leave them the franchise there for a time, we still would have a discrimination if section 10 (1) is adopted in its present form, and that, I suggest, is an indefensible discrimination. How long can we expect our partners in the commonwealth to extend privileges to us as Canadians if we are not prepared to deal with them on a reciprocal basis.

In South Africa there is the aliens act of 1937. South Africa there makes a clear distinction between British subjects and those from alien lands; and it is so even in the case of the Irish legislation, to which reference was made earlier in the debate on the second reading, the Irish nationality and citizenship act of 1935 and the aliens act of 1935, which on the face of them appear to suggest that Irish citizens are not British subjects from that time on, and that British subjects are not to have special recognition of their status in Ireland. But as I tried to point out earlier, the aliens exemption order of 1935 was passed on the heels of that legislation to give to British subjects from other parts of the commonwealth reciprocal treatment. If this legislation is adopted, I suggest that you carry Ireland a step further out of the commonwealth.

I am offering an amendment to section 10 (1) of the bill. I am proposing that in paragraph (c) in line 25 there be inserted certain new words. The amendment is:

That section 10 (1) (c) be amended by inserting after the word "war" in line 25, the following words:

"or is a British subject within the meaning of section 28."

The effect of that amendment would be that in section 10 (1) (c), where we now have an exception made for certain classes of persons in reducing the residence requirement in their case from five years to one year, we add to the exceptions the case of a British subject coming from another part of the commonwealth. I say coming from another part of the commonwealth, because in the amendment we introduce the words "or is a British subject within the meaning of section 28", and that is the section which confines "commonwealth" to those nations within schedule 1 of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN: For purposes of clarification, does the hon. gentleman intend that by thus reducing the period from five years to one year, once that year has elapsed a British subject cannot be deported?

Mr. FLEMING: The amendment would have no such effect whatever. I made it clear that we are not here dealing with the Immigration Act at all. I said that my own personal view was that I should be the last to advocate the removal of the restrictions to which I have referred, those causes upon which the right of deportation arises.

Mr. MARTIN: So that you would deport citizens of Canada?

Mr. FLEMING: I am prepared to say that anyone coming in must comply with all the proper restrictions in regard to health and obedience to our laws as they are now set forth in principle in the Immigration Act, and anyone coming here must be guided accordingly for the term of the five-year requirement under the Immigration Act. If the time comes when it is possible to determine sufficiently the health problems that were referred to yesterday, and to determine them in a shorter period, well and good. But I am not suggesting for a moment that the grounds for deportation under the Immigration Act should be reduced, because I think it is reasonable that people who have committed and have been convicted of offences involving moral turpitude, or who have become confined to institutions for the mentally ill, should in proper cases be deported. I am not prepared to see that legislation used, however —and I wish to make this clear—in order to deport people who are out of employment through no fault of their own.

Mr. MARTIN: But you would deport a British subject who had acquired citizenship under your amendment.

Mr. FLEMING: Certainly, if that citizen commits an offence involving moral turpitude during the five-year period of the Immigration Act, or is confined to a mental institution. I do not suggest the abolition of these requirements. I am contending that the individual must establish domicile here. We are not proposing that this should open the door of citizenship to anyone who does not intend to make this his permanent home. He must establish domicile under the definition of "domicile" which we have in section 2, and that requirement is buttressed by section 10 (1) (g), which provides that he must, if his application is granted, indicate his intention of residing permanently in Canada.

[Mr. Fleming.]

Let us remember that in the bill there is already reserved to the minister the right to revoke citizenship in certain cases. If it is sound in principle to revoke citizenship in the cases referred to in this bill, why should it not be possible to revoke citizenship within the period referred to in the Immigration Act for the causes I have mentioned, namely, conviction of an offence involving moral turpitude or confinement to a mental institution. I do not see the slightest distinction in principle between the case referred to by the minister and that provided for elsewhere in the act as a ground for the revocation of citizenship.

I call attention to section 21, subsection 1 (c), where we find this provision:

> 21. (1) The governor in council may order that any person other than a natural-born Canadian citizen shall cease to be a Canadian citizen if, upon a report from the minister, he is satisfied that the said person either
>
> (c) has, within five years after becoming a Canadian citizen, been sentenced by any court in Canada to imprisonment for a term of not less than twelve months.

There you have the same thing. A sentence of twelve months is ground for revocation of the certificate of citizenship under the bill introduced by the minister. Is there, then, any difficulty on the part of the minister, in the face of that, in accepting the principle that a Canadian citizen within the five-year period referred to in the Immigration Act should be liable to loss of certificate of Canadian citizenship if he commits an offence involving moral turpitude or is confined in an institution for the mentally ill?

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 19, for the relief of Margaret Penelope Brown.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 20, for the relief of Marion Cruickshank Isaac.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 21, for the relief of Malvina Angelina Seguin Gascon.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 22, for the relief of Nora Kathleen Loury Cheverton.—Mr. MacLean.

Bill No. 23, for the relief of Elsie Fisher Armitage.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 24, for the relief of Florence Mabel McIntosh Simpson.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 25, for the relief of Francis Gordon Sullivan.—Mr. MacLean.

Bill No. 26, for the relief of Minerva Jane Cory.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 31, for the relief of Esther Irene Lind Booth.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 32, for the relief of Katie Hoffman Pinsky.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 33, for the relief of Dorothy Adams Acer McDougall.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 34, for the relief of Helen Douglas Stewart Rankin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 35, for the relief of Olive Esther Rose Ewen.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 36, for the relief of Andrew Prem-Das.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 38, for the relief of Reginald Wesley Titcombe.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 39, for the relief of Hilda Forsey Pearce Johnston.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 40, for the relief of Ann Low Fuller Mitchell.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 41, for the relief of Marguerita St. Catherine McKeigan Guillevin.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 42, for the relief of Bessie Goldrosen Green.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 43, for the relief of Audrey Helen Jackson Maxham.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 44, for the relief of Frank Russell Yeoman.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 45, for the relief of Florence Joy McGibbon Lafleur.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 46, for the relief of Isobel Cameron McLaggan Oswald.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 47, for the relief of John Louis Charlebois.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 49, for the relief of Georgina Hylda Swaffield McKenzie.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 50, for the relief of Dorothy Ellen Cope Kimpton.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 52, for the relief of Charles Patrick Kavanagh.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 53, for the relief of Irene Gertrude Carry Staley.—Mr. Maybank.

Some hon. MEMBERS: On division.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

INMATES OF INSTITUTIONS FOR THE POOR

On the order:

Second reading of Bill No. 4, to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1938.—Mr. Fair.

Hon. PAUL MARTIN (Secretary of State): Before this motion is dealt with, Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity of discussing this matter with the hon. gentleman, and without in any way at this moment expressing the attitude of the government with regard to the matter may I say that in all probability next session a committee will be set up to deal with the elections act. So that in view of that possibility it does seem to me that it would be better to let this matter stand over until next session. Then, in the event a committee is set up, which I expect will be the case, this matter could be referred to that committee for consideration.

Mr. FAIR: With the definite understanding that this bill will be brought in and considered next session I am agreeable to the suggestion made by the Secretary of State.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): May I say there can be no definite understanding. There will be such action as may be possible in view of the circumstances prevailing at the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house that the hon. gentleman may have the privilege of withdrawing his bill?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Bill withdrawn and order discharged.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

COMMISSIONS TO AGENTS IN CONNECTION WITH SALE OF WHEAT

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River) moved the second reading of bill No. 5, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1935.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board Act was passed in 1935 after practically everybody in Canada, I believe, became satisfied that our marketing system, that is the grain exchange, had broken down. It was found necessary to pass that legislation; and while to a certain extent it is satisfactory to most farmers, there are still some things in it which should be rectified. In order to rectify some of these matters, I have on more than one occasion introduced the present amendment to the act. The relevant paragraphs of section 8 read as follows:

8. It shall be the duty of the board—

(h) to give effect to any order in council that may be passed with respect to its operations;

(i) in selling and disposing of wheat as by this act provided, to utilize and employ without discrimination such marketing agencies, including commission merchants, brokers, elevator men, exporters and other persons engaged in or operating facilities for the selling and handling of wheat, as the board in its discretion may determine;

(j) to offer wheat for sale in the markets of the world through the established channels: Provided that the board may, if in its opinion any existing agencies are not operating satisfactorily, take such steps as it deems expedient to establish, utilize and employ its own or other marketing agencies or channels.

This ties the wheat board down to using the established channels. It is my opinion that

this should not be so, that we are keeping in existence in Winnipeg an organization which is detrimental to agriculture, to farmers all over Canada and to other citizens of this country. Therefore I have introduced the following amendment, striking out paragraphs (h), (i) and (j) and substituting the following:

(h) subject to the provisions of paragraph (i) of this section, to give effect to any order in council that may be passed with respect to its operations;

(i) in selling and disposing of wheat as by this act provided, to employ such methods, consistent with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section, as will not involve the payment, directly or indirectly, of any commission or other remuneration to commission merchants, brokers or other marketing agencies.

The direct purpose of this bill is to eliminate the payment of commissions to brokers or other individuals, but the indirect purpose of the amendment is to do away forever with the grain exchange at Winnipeg. We consider that this step is long overdue and that the soonér it is taken the better. Those who profit by the operations of the Winnipeg grain exchange have boosted it as the best method of disposing of our grain. I am not satisfied that it is the best method, and intend to prove this before I have finished. Under the grain exchange system we have had grain prices going up or down as much as twenty cents a bushel without any actual change in the supplies of grain available within the country. It is quite certain that as long as a condition of this kind is allowed to exist, the farming industry cannot be on a sound or solid basis. During the first three or four months of each crop year, commencing August 1 of each year, we find from seventy to seventy-five per cent of the grain delivered to market; but because of the hedging of this grain as well as the selling of millions of bushels of paper wheat, that is wheat which does not exist in the country, wheat never sown and never grown, we find that grain prices have been forced down considerably. As a result, the very farmers who are most in need of higher prices have been compelled to take lower prices and sooner or later forced off their farms.

Most of these futures were bought by speculators, many of whom did not know the tricks of the grain trade; and unless those speculators were in attendance it was not possible for the grain exchange to carry on very successfully. We find that many types of citizens, including farmers, workers, teachers, lawyers, doctors and even preachers were in the grain exchange for the express purpose of making money. But in many instances we find that ninety per cent or ninety-five per cent of those people were skinned, and were losers in this racket. It would seem, however, that the racket is legalized, and one wonders why many other rackets in the country are not legalized.

For instance, let us consider the black market in meat, which exists at the present time. A good deal of fuss is being made about this racket. Why is it not legalized, if the grain exchange is legalized? The futures system, we find, provides protection for the banks, the millers and the elevator companies; but it entirely disregards the interests of the producers. In my opinion it is the interests of those producers which should be protected, first of all, because if we have not food we find that things do not go along very well in this or in any other country.

Those who claim that trading in futures is a satisfactory manner of marketing our grain should explain, before this debate concludes, why under a system of futures trading away back in the thirties our grain on the Winnipeg grain exchange went down to 38½ cents a bushel. In my part of the country this meant a price of 19½ cents a bushel for the best grain grown anywhere in the world.

When that condition existed many thousands of farmers lost the savings of a lifetime, and were out on the road without even their farms on which to live. These men were told that futures trading provides markets. This is not a fact. When Mr. Turgeon made his investigation he, too, said that it was not a fact. This is what I find at page 183 of the report of the royal grain inquiry commission of 1938:

I have mentioned the "imperfections" of the futures trading system, and I know that, in the eyes of many, the greatest of these is its dependence upon the speculator. And the fact must be faced that this dependence, while not absolute, is substantial not only in Winnipeg but in Liverpool, as the evidence shows. It has well been said that there are only three classes of buyers in the wheat market: (1) those who have immediate need of the wheat; (2) hedgers who buy to insure their transactions, and (3) speculators who buy and hold in the hope of making profits but also at the risk of making losses. When buyers of this last class are absent, or are present only in small numbers, the market becomes weak and prices fall. This was the situation which existed in 1931 when the government was urged to send somebody into the market to take the speculator's place, and the situation was met by the institution of stabilization measures.

Then, again, the opinion of the three wheat pool organizations was placed before the royal commission in this way, at page 39 of the same report:

We are satisfied that the futures market does cause fluctuations not justified by the supply and demand for wheat, and this fluctuating price

does not necessarily reflect world value. Indeed, it would appear to be true to say that the futures market is not a system of intelligent merchandising; it is merely an example of irresponsible mob blundering. This tendency toward instability in price, which many farmers are convinced is aggravated by speculation, is one of the most serious indictments numerous farmers level against the futures market.

I may say the wheat pools are still of the same opinion, because during the past winter and spring months those wheat pools, and practically every other farm organization in western Canada, passed resolutions demanding that the grain exchange at Winnipeg be closed and the present wheat board be continued in operation. I believe the government also agrees that the grain exchange should be closed, because away back in 1935, when conditions forced them to, the wheat board was set up, and is still in operation.

It is perhaps also worthy of note to know that all the grain exchanges in the world were closed during the war. If it is necessary and if it is good business to close those exchanges during the war, then why not in peace time as well because, while we have had a good deal of trouble in winning the war, the winning of the peace may be a bigger problem than some of us at present realize?

In 1942, according to the best information I have been able to obtain, there were on the Winnipeg grain exchange 109 operators, 85 of whom traded in futures and 24 in cash wheat. I understand that for many years a number of those men have been subsidized by the farmers, directly or indirectly, whichever way you wish to put it, and that they are waiting for those happy days to come back again. Many of them are collecting commissions on grain they never sold. This is not right. All along they have been collecting on grain that some members of the organizations sold, but also in the past they have collected on paper sales.

I think it is time this subsidization of a number of parasites should be done away with. Let them find employment while it can be found; let them get off the backs of the farmers where, at the present time, they have attached themselves as leeches. It is important that at this time Canadian farmers have purchasing power, because I believe we shall find in the near future we shall be scrambling again for markets for those industries operating in Canada. There is no better market for Canadian products than that found on our farms to-day. For that reason, therefore, it is important that the farmers have purchasing power.

Back in 1938 when the farm machinery industry was under investigation we were told that 70 per cent of farm machinery was being sold in western Canada. If we out there do not have more money to buy, then Canadian manufacturers will have to look somewhere else for markets.

Some of those who are agitating for the existence of the grain exchange tell us that we are ten cents to twelve cents a bushel better off because of the operations of the exchange. However, according to information I secured only a short time ago, the operations of the futures market means that we are getting ten to twelve cents a bushel less taken from us than before the operations of that system. If we were told, or if those in charge were good enough to tell us the cost to us of the operations of the exchange, outside of commissions being paid, I feel that many of us would be greatly surprised.

Fluctuations in grain prices in past years have constituted the second greatest cause of the farmers' defeat. Drought was the greatest, and price fluctuation was the second greatest. The farmers are continually gambling against odds against which they have no protection. We have dry weather, wet weather, frost, rust, hail, grasshoppers and several other pests. Then we have legislation which is permitted to stand on our statute books; and one more pest in this industry is that of gambling on the grain exchange. So that again I say: Remove this bloodsucker from the backs of the farmers of Canada.

Many commissions, I believe eighteen in all, have endorsed the principle of trading in grain futures. I am not at all surprised at that because in the past certain people have endorsed the principles of slavery, child labour, and longer hours of work, as many as twelve hours a day in some instances. It is time that we brought our system up to date. These things are not allowed any longer, and we should remove one more injustice by doing away forever with the operations of the Winnipeg grain exchange.

I could go on for quite a long time, but I expect there will be many other hon. members who will want to speak on this bill, including many who will want to talk it out rather than give it a fair democratic trial. When the arguments have been presented perhaps later on in the debate I shall have an opportunity to answer the objections that will be raised. With that I must take my seat and see what other hon. members have to say.

Mr. R. N. JUTRAS (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, when this bill was introduced at the last session I tried very hard to take part in the discussion but I was unable to do so because of the time limit. It came up on a

Tuesday last session just as it has at this session. I am gratified to have an opportunity of saying a few words on this question which I consider to be of great importance, especially to the farmers of western Canada.

I listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) has just said. I have made quite a study of this subject. At the time he introduced the bill for first reading I was surprised to note that most of his time was taken up in condemning the grain exchange as such. As far as I can see, this bill deals exclusively with the Canadian wheat board; it is an amendment to the Canadian Wheat Board Act. I am not unmindful of what implications there may be from the operations of the board that affect the grain exchange, but I think we should be more concerned with the effect that this bill will have on the Canadian wheat board than on the effect it may have on the Winnipeg grain exchange.

There are various ways of dealing with the grain exchange as such, and I am certainly not of the opinion that the onus of closing that exchange should be placed upon the Canadian wheat board. I think all hon. members will agree that this board has done a magnificent job since the start of the war. We should be careful before we start tampering with the organization or the administration of the board.

Before dealing further with this contentious matter, I should like to place on record a few words which I feel will meet with the approval of all hon. members, particularly those who come from western Canada. I wish to refer briefly to the manner in which the officials of the Canadian wheat board have discharged their duties and to commend particularly the chairman of the board for the efficient and obliging manner in which he has discharged his responsibilities as chief commissioner of the board since 1938. All those who have had dealings with Mr. McIvor will appreciate the full implications of my remark. To my mind, he has done a great job since the date of his appointment, and more particularly during the war. One has but to look at the reports of the wheat board to appreciate the extent of his responsibilities. In spite of his heavy duties as chief commissioner he has agreed repeatedly to serve on various committees. Hon. members will have noticed that he was the first to speak at the conference in London. He has been serving as chairman of the combined food board since January, 1943, and he has served his country well on the emergency grain transportation committee since 1943. After eight years as chief commissioner he is still the affable business man, anxious to help his fellowmen and keenly interested in showing a favourable balance sheet at the end of the year. It is no accident that he enjoys the confidence of his organization and his fellowmen.

I wish also to commend Doctor Grindley, as well as many others whom I do not happen to know personally but whose good work has attracted our attention. I should like to refer particularly to the field inspectors in my province. They deserve commendation for their responsible sense of duty and their sincere desire to have the administration of the board above reproach.

Mr. BURTON: Why not compliment the farmers who raised the wheat?

Mr. JUTRAS: I shall come to that afterward.

An hon. MEMBER: Why not stick to the subject?

Mr. JUTRAS: I am perfectly in order and I resent that remark very much. If this bill does not deal with the Canadian wheat board, I do not know what it deals with. The trouble with most of the discussion so far has been that it referred to the grain exchange and there is no mention whatsoever in the bill of the grain exchange. Then the hon. member remarked that this bill would be talked out. Surely he was not referring to the present speaker because I certainly cannot be accused of having taken too much of the time of this house. Those who say, "No, no," certainly cannot say the same. If the hon. member is seized at all with the importance of this bill he would not try to rush it through in one or even two hours. If the bill is so insignificant that it can be rushed through the house in half an hour or in an hour and a half, it is not worth considering. If it has any value at all it should be considered for at least a few hours and more than one member on the opposite side of the house given an opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. BURTON: All I was asking you to do was to give the farmers a little credit.

Mr. JUTRAS: I shall come to the farmers in due course.

Mr. BURTON: They are always left at the tail end.

Mr. JUTRAS: I think I am quite capable of organizing my own speech, if you do not mind.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: You must admit that the bill has been before the house for two years.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is talking about what?

Mr. JUTRAS: I resent the fact that every time we rise to say something we are accused of talking out a bill. I do not think any hon. member should be permitted to impute a motive like that, especially at the beginning of a discussion.

I was referring to the Canadian wheat board and I repeat that that board has done a magnificent job. There is no one more grateful to the Canadian wheat board than the farmers of western Canada. My reason for rising to-night is to defend the farmers of western Canada and to see that there is no tinkering with the Canadian wheat board so as to impair its efficiency. I ask hon members to bear with me for a while and be quiet. I know I have had to stay silent when hon. members across the chamber were speaking. I have had to put up with that kind of thing and I ask that they give me the same courtesy that I have to them.

I was referring to the field inspectors of the Canadian wheat board. I am very glad to give them credit for the work they have done and for the sense of duty they have shown. Theirs has been a big achievement and is in part responsible for the confidence which the Canadian wheat board enjoys to-day among the producers in western Canada. These officials are out on the road every day inspecting the various elevators and talking to the farmers coming to the elevators, and it is only fair that we should recognize the good work they have done. I repeat again that it is no small achievement, and we must give them credit if they have been able to win the confidence of the producer.

Coming now to the bill itself, I have read all the speeches that have been made on this subject at the last session. Very little was said about the Canadian wheat board; in fact there were only two or three references to it. There was a long dissertation condemning the Winnipeg grain exchange, but the other speakers who followed the sponsor of the bill confined themselves to extolling the great humanitarian and social benefits flowing from the grain exchange. We should be concerned primarily with the wheat board itself. I propose first to examine the amendment and then to analyse briefly the financial report of the Canadian wheat board.

The first contention of the sponsor of the bill is that it will, to use his own words, free the officials of the wheat board from some of the restrictions which have been imposed upon them. The new proposed paragraph (i), which was read a moment ago provides that the board is:

> to employ such methods . . . as will not involve the payment, directly or indirectly, of any commission or other remuneration to commissioned merchants, brokers or other marketing agencies.

In other words, this would compel the Canadian wheat board to do its own marketing without having the privilege of asking the odd elevator man or brokerage company to transact some business for it. The explanatory note is quite clear on that, and the intent of the sponsor is also made clear in the explanatory note, which states:

> This bill is designed to eliminate the prevalent practice of the Canadian wheat board of paying commissions to agents in connection with the sale of wheat and to free the board to conduct its sale operations without engaging and paying for such unnecessary service.

Those are strong words. To say that the Canadian wheat board is paying for unnecessary service is certainly, to my mind, a reflection on the officials of the board. Whether it would free or restrict the board is, to say the least, a debatable point. In the original act of 1935, we find this provision:

> The board is to offer continuously wheat for sale in the markets of the world through the established channels: provided that the board may, if in its opinion any existing agencies are not operating satisfactorily, take such steps as it deems expedient to establish, utilize and employ its own or other marketing agencies or channels.

Consequently, if the board feel they are paying for unnecessary services they have the right to establish their own agencies to take care of that situation. By what stretch of the imagination can it be thought that it would give the board more freedom to cut out this provision which gives the board the authority to establish their own channels? The intention of the amendment is to cut out this provision, and then it is claimed that the board would have more freedom.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Has not the board to pay these commissions whether it likes to or not?

Mr. JUTRAS: It does not have to, because the board may employ its own or other marketing agencies or channels if, in its opinion, any existing agencies are not operating satisfactorily. That provision is quite clear in the act, and that provision the amendment would cut out.

It comes down to this: Either my hon. friends believe that the officials are not using that provision of the act, or they have a different interpretation of that section. I

cannot read anybody's mind. I can only take the bill for what it is worth. We could go on discussing this for days, and I sincerely believe that it is our duty to have the officials of the board appear before a committee where they could be examined and give us the benefit of their experience. Then we could find out how they have been acting with respect to this section and how it has been interpreted. But with the bill before the house this cannot be done and we have to depend on the explanatory notes attached to the bill.

I would respectfully submit that we should hear from the officials exactly what is meant, for instance, by marketing facilities. The amendment refers almost exclusively to the marketing agencies, and paragraph (i) provides that the only restriction shall apply to the selling and disposing of wheat. That is an involved question. Exactly what is meant by marketing agencies is not clear to me. I have tried to find out exactly what is meant by it, but it is quite debatable. It would appear that the facilities used by the board at the present time are numerous and diversified. For instance, the Canadian wheat board, is, I believe, now using the facilities of the country elevators, the small and large mills, the terminal elevators, the government elevators as well as the private elevators, the pools, the United Grain Growers Limited, the terminals owned by the national harbours board, and the brokerage facilities of the shippers and importers. There is no doubt that the question of storage facilities, handling facilities, purchasing facilities and marketing facilities is interrelated and in many instances very difficult to seggregate. I do not believe it is the intention of this bill that the wheat board should go out and buy all the country elevators and put civil servants in every one of them to purchase the grain from the farmers, because, as I pointed out, the amendment refers more particularly to the selling and disposing of wheat. However, it must be remembered that the elevators are used at the present time to complete certain transactions of sale. For instance, I have in mind a country miller who buys wheat from the wheat board; this wheat often never leaves the community; it is bought there and sold to the miller right on the spot. In that case it could be argued that the elevator man has been used as a marketing agent. I am just pointing this out to show that the question is an intricate one, and a wrong policy might lead to serious consequences.

The allegation has also been made that large sums of money can be saved. Naturally when it comes to saving money I am 100 per cent in favour of the intent. However, there is always the danger that in trying to save money you may spend more than you actually save, especially when it has to do with setting up a large and cumbersome government agency or government organization.

I took the trouble to analyse the report of the Canadian wheat board. I have here the report of the board for the crop year 1943-44. This is the statement of operations on the crop account, western division, for the year ended July 31, 1944, and it is the last report, or at least the most recent I have. We find that the wheat acquired by the board amounted to 293,000,000 bushels, at a cost, in round figures, of $354 million. The surplus on cash wheat transactions is shown as $23 million. We now come to the expenses, and I bring these in with the object of trying to find exactly where we could save large sums of money. As I said before, if it can be done I am 100 per cent behind it, but before tinkering with this organization I should like to have some facts or figures on which to base a decision. In the report the expenses are given. The carrying charges are $4,000,000. Other items are: additional freight on wheat, $900,000; then, handling stop off division charges and so on, $2,000; drying and reconditioning, $19,000; brokerage charges, $115,000; administration and general expenses, $436,000, making a total of close to $5,000,000. The largest item of expense is, of course, the carrying charges, and as hon. members know, this represents the storage of wheat carried at country elevators at a rate determined under the tariff of the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada, plus haulage, and allowance for interest on the grain which is financed by the elevator company until it reaches the delivery point where it is turned over to the Canadian wheat board. The terminal storage rates are also fixed by the board of grain commissioners, and I believe the mill elevators take the rate that is nearest to the terminal elevators. So that I do not see how we could effect a big saving in this item of carrying charges. I have not been able to probe deeply into these items of brokerage charges and administrative and general expenses, but I would fancy that there is probably more than meets the eye in those items. If it is only $115,000 which we could save by setting up a huge organization, I am quite sure that in the long run we would not save any money but that actually it would be more costly to the wheat board; and naturally, if it is costlier to the wheat board, eventually it will be costlier to the producer,

to the farmer, because at the present time it is doubtful if you could hire more than seven or eight good marketing agents out of that appropriation of $115,000.

I have been referring to expenses, and for the benefit of those who are not from the western provinces I hasten to make it quite clear that those expenses do not represent losses and that they do not involve any liability to the treasury or the government, because the board has been operating at a profit. I do not know exactly how far back, but at any rate ever since 1940 it has been in the happy position of distributing money on participation certificates held by the farmers. As a matter of fact, distributions in the 1940-41 crop year amounted to a little over $26 million; in 1941-42, to $15 million; in 1942-43 the amount rose to $19½ million; and for 1943-44 the figures are not yet available, but I assume the amount is something like that of 1942-43. Actually a total of $60 million has been distributed to the farmers since the operation of the Canadian wheat board; and I repeat that these figures reflect a surplus, so that actually there is no cost to the government or the treasury. All administrative and general expenses are, of course, chargeable against the proceeds of the wheat. It explains why the board has been successful, when one considers the amount of money that has been distributed. Exactly where we should bring about such a change as has been mentioned by the mover of the bill is difficult to detect. However, I still maintain that it would probably be a wise thing to go over these reports with the officials of the department and get a full story on the subject. As a matter of fact, the Canadian wheat board has not lately been before a committee, and I believe it is almost due for an airing there. I therefore strongly urge that this be done.

I wish now to refer briefly to another angle of the situation. I shall turn to the administrative aspect and the experience of the past. In this bill the board is asked to do it own marketing exclusive of existing facilities. It is probably wise to remember that the pools attempted this at one time and abandoned it later, to use the existing facilities. I am given to understand that they now use the existing marketing facilities. I went back and read the debates that took place in this house in 1932 and 1933, when the then prime minister was going to blast his way through the markets of the world. Many pertinent things were said then and there is no doubt that the failure of the venture was not due to lack of energetic enterprise on his part. However, the fact remains that even the dynamic personality of the then prime minister did not make much of a hole in the wall of determination of the old world. I am quite sure that the country would not like a recurrence of the McFarland episode, and it is not inappropriate to be cautioned by it. I am given to understand that all grain handling companies, including the three pools and United Grain Growers Limited, use the existing facilities. Whether it is significant or not, it should at least arouse our curiosity.

When we consider the marketing situation, I submit that it would be dangerous to use the last few years as a criterion.

Everyone knows that it is a relatively easy matter at the present time to market wheat, as the minister pointed out in his statement at the time he announced the policy of the government on wheat. The European countries, nearly all of them our allies, are buying out of necessity and to a large extent on credit. Furthermore, the second world war came to an end with Canadian wheat producers in a particularly strong marketing position. Not only have the general disruption and bad weather reduced production in all areas, but the Australian and South African crop failures and a similar crop failure in the Argentine have left Canada and the United States as the only countries in the export market for wheat. This has coincided with the release of pent-up demands in liberated areas, so that there is no problem of finding markets to-day.

It is, however, very hard to say how long this situation will last. The European countries are now sowing all the wheat they can and it will take many years before they have money to pay. As I pointed out, we and the United States are now the only two wheat exporting countries in the world. It is to be hoped that the policy of the government, which is to offer wheat at a low price as compared with world prices, will encourage those countries which were not producing wheat before the thirties to revert to their original position before that time. The government assures them that we shall keep our prices around $1.55. However, this is a mere hope and we do not know what those countries will do, whether they will leave us the job of producing wheat, or whether they will attempt to produce their own.

It is well to remember that the success of that policy outside Canada will depend in no small measure on the support it receives within the country. The government gives the assurance that it will keep the price around $1.55, but it is seriously handicapped in the eyes of importers when political groups and various grain companies and the leader of the

opposition (Mr. Bracken) demand that producers be paid world prices. They, too, know the diversity of politics in a democratic country and they appreciate as well as the leader of the opposition the public appeal of the dollar.

I felt sure that the leader of the opposition, with his background and experience, would be the first to appreciate the wisdom of offering wheat at slightly lower than world prices. Apparently however, that was to be but the beginning of my surprise, because shortly afterwards he rose and demanded that the ceiling be taken away completely on all farm products. If I had time at my disposal I could go on...

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lots of time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but the hour reserved for private and public bills having expired, the house will revert to the business prior to six o'clock.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

The house resumed consideration in committee of bill No. 7, respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens—Mr. Martin—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford) in the chair.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, may I say a word now by way of explanation of the purpose and effect of the amendment. It will be observed that the amendment is introduced into certain excepting words in parapraph (c). In other words, where the section now requires one year's residence in Canada immediately preceding the date of application and then goes on, with two exceptions, to require four years' residence within the six years preceding the application, the amendment proposes to add to the two exceptions now contained in the paragraph a third exception. The two exceptions already provided for are these. First is the case where the applicant has served outside Canada in the armed forces of Canada during time of war; second is the applicant who is the wife of and who resides in Canada with a Canadian citizen. The amendment proposes to add another exception, in the case where the applicant is a British subject within the meaning of section 28 of the act.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): By naturalization.

[Mr. Jutras.]

Mr. FLEMING: A British subject within section 28 of the act, which means a British subject whether by birth or by naturalization coming from another part of the commonwealth, the nations of the commonwealth being set forth in the first schedule to the act. If that amendment is accepted, in my submission it will preserve the proper recognition to which British subjects from the other member nations of the commonwealth are entitled by reason of being subjects of the same king.

I have dwelt, Mr. Chairman, on the fact that this is introduced as a third exception. Will you please note that already in the act there are two exceptions to the principle for which the Secretary of State has been contending during this debate. He has argued that you cannot reduce the five-year period for two reasons, as I apprehend his remarks; first, that it is necessary that the five-year period be preserved because there are certain incidents attached to that five-year period of residence under the Immigration Act, and, second, that it would be an unheard-of thing to take away his citizenship from one who is a Canadian citizen. In view of what I said this afternoon I do not know that I need deal further with these two observations of the minister. Suffice it to say at this point, as to the first one, that the incidents applied by the Immigration Act will continue to apply in all cases, and therefore have no relevance whatever to the matter now under discussion with reference to section 10 (1) (c). In the second place, as to the alleged impossibility of taking away a man's right of citizenship once he has it, I need refer only to section 21, which empowers the Secretary of State, for any one of half a dozen causes or reasons, to deprive one who has received a certificate of Canadian citizenship of that certificate and thus deprive him of his rights as a citizen.

In passing, I observe that the right conferred on the Secretary of State by section 21 (1) (c) to deprive of his citizenship and of his certificate of citizenship one who within five years after becoming a Canadian citizen has been sentenced by any court in Canada to imprisonment for a term of not less than twelve months, goes much farther than the grounds of deportation now existing under the Immigration Act, in two respects. In the first place, the right given to the minister under section 21 (1) (c) will apply in the cases now provided for in the act for not less than ten years after the legal admission to this country of such person. If he did not acquire domicile at once after coming in, ten years would be the minimum. So that you are no longer dealing simply with the five

years provided by the Immigration Act; you are adding another five years. Thus the minister is asking this parliament for power to take away from one who has received Canadian citizenship under this act, for a period of ten years after his lawful entry into Canada, all the rights he has acquired as a Canadian citizen. In the second place, that right is vested in the minister in case of conviction for an offence for which the person has been sentenced to imprisonment for a term of not less than twelve months. In some courts it does not take a tremendously serious offence to lead to the imposition of a sentence of twelve months' imprisonment. That is going a great deal farther than the relevant sections of the Immigration Act, which are principally sections 40 and 43. It will permit the Secretary of State to take away everything in the way of rights of citizenship that has been acquired by a person under this act because of offences in many cases much less serious than those which must be proved before the Minister of Mines and Resources would have the right to exercise his power of deportation under the Immigration Act.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. FLEMING: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I yielded to a number of interruptions.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

The CHAIRMAN: With the unanimous consent of the committee the hon. member may continue.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. FLEMING: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank hon. members for their courtesy. So much for what might be said by way of introducing exceptions into the bill. The exceptions are there now; and if it is so important in the view of the minister that you should not have any exceptions cutting across the principle for which he is arguing in the light of the Immigration Act, then how does he justify the two exceptions that already exist in section 10 (1) (c)? I am simply adding an exception for which there is ample justification and without which a grave injury will be done.

Shall I be repeating if I again remind the committee that an exception exists already in section 10 (1) in respect of British subjects? I pointed out that the exception in the consequences which flow from it is of no importance, because all that is waived in the case of the British subject is the filing of his declaration of intention. Nevertheless there is a distinction drawn in section 10 (1) (a), and is drawn by the minister himself. What possible justification is there for the exception made in section 10 (1) (a) if the arguments he has been bringing before this chamber for the past two days are sound? There is no justification for it in principle.

I shall leave this question with the committee. The minister has indicated that as far as the government is concerned the British subject with one year's residence in Canada—no domicile, it will be noticed, but just one year's residence—is good enough to enjoy the great privilege of the franchise; but the British subject to whom is accorded what most of us consider to be the highest right of citizenship, namely the franchise, is, by the minister's argument, not qualified, for some reason or another, to enjoy the other rights of citizenship. Is there any consistency in that? I submit there is none. The committee will notice that my amendment calls for equating the residence requirements under this bill with those already existing under the elections act. In addition, domicile will be required; that is, the intention of making Canada the applicant's permanent home. But if that provision in the elections act which the minister supports is sound, then how can my amendment be other than sound in principle and deserving of the minister's full support?

I have heard some people say, "Well what about communists?" Some communists in Canada to-day are people who hailed from the British isles. Is that a reason for the discrimination which I say this section proposes to apply to all British subjects from other parts of the commonwealth in relation to their present status? It is clear from what has been said already that the full power enjoyed by the government under the Immigration Act is to be continued. There has been no suggestion from any quarter of the house that the Immigration Act should be amended. Section 41 of that act gives the government ample power to deport those who attempt to promote in this country the overthrow of the government by force. That power will still exist. If hon. members will look at section 21 (1) (e) of the bill they will see that the minister has reserved to himself the power, even after the granting of a certificate of citizenship, to revoke that citizenship and to withdraw the certificate in the case of any citizen who shows himself by act or speech to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty.

Are not those powers adequate? I submit they are adequate if the government will use them. There is nothing in the contention that because the odd or exceptional immigrant from the British isles has blossomed forth in Canada

as a communist, that is any reason for requiring all British subjects from other parts of the commonwealth to submit to the same conditions as those from alien lands.

There are several matters which, in conclusion, I shall discuss briefly. It is abundantly clear that change is made by this section in the present position of the British subject from other parts of the commonwealth who comes to this country. Right now he has all the rights of citizenship spelled with a small "c". This bill proposes to attach conditions which have not hitherto been exacted of him if he wishes to possess Canadian citizenship, with the citizenship now to be spelled with a capital "C".

He has been entitled to call himself a citizen. What is he to be in the five years of residence here? He is still a British subject. No one can take that from him. Thus, there are three classes of people provided for in this bill. There is the Canadian citizen, the man who is here and who has established his rights to become a citizen. There is the man who is an alien, and who continues to be an alien at least for those five years. In the third place, under the present bill there is an in-between class which is composed of British subjects who have not yet been here for five years. The British subject in this class is not an alien and he is not a Canadian citizen. What is he to call himself? He is still to be a British subject who is waiting to qualify at the end of five years for Canadian citizenship.

Who is there in this chamber who will say that it is a contribution to Canadian citizenship or Canadian unity to say to that man with all his traditions—the same traditions as we have, and the same democratic approach to life as we have—that for that period he is neither flesh nor fowl? I cannot square that with even common sense.

I have pointed out that the principle of section 10 (1) is to place British subjects from another part of the commonwealth and aliens from alien lands, no matter how good they may become as citizens, in precisely the same position under this bill, when coming to Canada and seeking to become Canadian citizens. That is the principle of section 10 of the bill, and it is a principle which I submit this chamber cannot endorse.

It means that we tell the British subject coming from another part of this commonwealth, "When you enter Canada, so far as your rights as a Canadian citizen are concerned, and your status, the fact that you owe allegiance to the same king as we do makes no difference." That is the significance of section 10. It means that our common allegiance means nothing under this bill. It is, as if we were putting up at the ports of debarkation of ships bearing immigrants to this country a notice to all British subjects from other parts of the commonwealth stating, "Your allegiance to the same sovereign as we have means nothing, when it comes to applying for rights for citizenship in this country." Can this chamber endorse that principle? How can it do so?

What would we lose by accepting this amendment? I submit we would lose nothing. There is no question of principle at stake in permitting a British subject to enjoy rights similar to those he now enjoys. In securing his rights to that Canadian citizenship, with domicile, plus one year's residence, and other qualifications, there is no principle at stake. There is likewise no inconvenience at stake—notwithstanding this red herring about the Immigration Act which has been drawn across the discussion of this question.

Moreover I say there is no question of Canadian autonomy at stake. From some of the expressions from some quarters of this chamber one would think that Canada, by recognizing any preferred position for British subjects coming from other parts of the commonwealth over aliens was derogating in some way from its autonomy. How could anything be farther from the fact? Those who are bringing that theme forward are troubling themselves with something in the nature of unwarranted fears and suspicions. There is somewhere an inferiority complex in that attitude. What we need in our approach to these matters is a complex of equality, not an inferiority complex. Let us not go on fighting old battles. In that connection I cannot help remembering a cartoon by the famous cartoonist Low of London which appeared a year or two before the outbreak of war. That was in the days when guarantees were being asked for—guarantees, guarantees, guarantees! Guarantees had been given by the government of the United Kingdom. But some of the continental powers kept on coming back asking for more guarantees. The cartoon showed two British statesmen talking to each other. One said to the other, "Our friends on the continent want us to guarantee the guarantee that we have given to guarantee the guarantee which we have given." And the other gentleman said, "Gad, that's going a little bit too far."

Mr. Chairman, surely this matter of autonomy is played out. There is no question as to our full equality in the commonwealth. How are we going to use the rights we have? Are we going to use those rights to place British

subjects from other parts of the commonwealth, men now with equal status in the commonwealth, in the invidious position where their allegiance to a common sovereign means nothing when it comes to the matter of securing Canadian citizenship? That is the issue raised by the bill, and that issue is inescapable.

I have asked what we would lose by accepting the amendment. My answer is that we would lose nothing. I ask, in conclusion, what we would lose by enacting the section as it stands. I suggest that, in effect, it reduces the value and store we place in a common allegiance to a common sovereign. I suggest that in putting the alien and the British subject from other parts of the commonwealth in precisely the same position we are saying in effect, "Well, that common allegiance means very little to us." It would seem that it means much less to us than I had hoped it meant. Is this any time to be reducing the value we are putting upon our rights throughout the commonwealth as citizens and as British subjects in common allegiance? This is no time for that. We have nothing to lose and we have everything to gain by strengthening those bonds. As to preserving our autonomy—certainly there is no thought of yielding one inch or iota of our autonomy. Let us exercise some common sense in the use to which we are going to put those rights which we possess as Canadians and as equal partners in the commonwealth.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Time.

Mr. FLEMING: The issue in this debate on section 10 is this: What value do we place upon our common allegiance with our fellow citizens in all parts of the commonwealth?

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Chairman, it is an interesting fact in dealing with a matter of this kind that, as one of the thirty-two immigrants in the chamber, in the course of events I am the minister of the department of which the immigration branch is a part. I remember distinctly when I left the old country, and I suppose I had in my mind then the thought that was expressed by the old Scotsman in his prayer when he said, "I do not ask Thee, Lord, that Thou shouldst give me wealth, all that I ask is that Thou showest me where it is." I may have had that thought in my mind; yet I recall most vividly that when I left Glasgow a very close friend of mine shook my hand and said, "You will not be able to forget Scotland when you get to Canada, but when you get there I want you to be a Canadian." I have endeavoured to be a Canadian. I just introduce that little personal note so that my remarks my not be taken to be prejudiced and it may be realized that I am dealing with this subject from the point of view of Canada and not from the point of view of the old country or with the idea of there being any discrimination against her.

Therefore I have to take exception to many of the things that have been said by the hon. member for Eglinton in his able presentation. When I came to this country I could have been a member of parliament within one year. After I had lived in Canada for a year and six months in a constituency I had the right to vote and was therefore able to be a representative of the people of Canada. There has been no deprivation of any of my rights during the years I have been here.

The hon. member speaks of the autonomy of Canada, but in my mind there is no question of the autonomy of Canada when it comes to those she will permit to come within her borders. No one can gainsay the right of this parliament to exercise its powers over immigrants and to impose any conditions of entry that it desires. When the hon. member says that this is a matter of strengthening the bonds between this country and the old country by the loosening of the provisions and restrictions against immigrants, I take clear issue with him.

Mr. FLEMING: I did not suggest anything of the kind.

Mr. GLEN: I understood my hon. friend to say that the passing of the amendment which he has proposed would mean the strengthening of the links between the old country and this country.

Mr. FLEMING: I am sure the minister wants my remarks to be correctly understood. What I said in that respect was that the passing of section 10 (1) (c) in its present form would have the effect of saying to persons from other parts of the commonwealth with a common allegiance that that allegiance has little or no meaning. I did not suggest that it had any bearing whatever on the Immigration Act. What I said was predicated on the assumption that there will be no change in the Immigration Act. I think he will recall that I supported the provisions of the Immigration Act all the way through.

Mr. GLEN: The hon. member in his explanation has not dealt with what I had in mind. He was dealing with and speaking of the Immigration Act. I was referring to the fact that no immigrant was deprived by this bill of anything that he had not already under

the Immigration Act. Perhaps I might read the sections of the Immigration Act which bear on the question. Section 2 reads:

In this act, and in all orders in council, proclamations and regulations made hereunder, unless the context otherwise requires,

(a) "alien" means a person who is not a British subject;

(b) "Canadian citizen" means

(i) A person born in Canada who has not become an alien;

(ii) A British subject who has Canadian domicile.

That is exactly what this bill is doing. The British subject who has Canadian domicile will obtain the full rights of citizenship. What is "domicile?" The definition in the act is as follows:

(e) "domicile" means the place in which a person has his home, or in which he resides, or to which he returns as his place of permanent abode, and does not mean the place where he resides for a mere special or temporary purpose;

(i) Canadian domicile can only be acquired, for the purposes of this act, by a person having his domicile for at least five years in Canada after having been landed therein within the meaning of this act.

Mr. FLEMING: For the purposes of this act.

Mr. GLEN: For the purposes of this act. If the amendment proposed by the hon. member were to pass there would have to be a corresponding amendment to the Immigration Act in order to have the two acts in conformity with each other. The amendment we are now discussing provides that entry can be allowed and residence take place in one year and that citizenship can then be accomplished. That comes into immediate conflict with the provisions of the Immigration Act that Canadian domicile can be acquired only after a period of five years. Necessarily it would have to be changed.

I think the hon. member is dealing with two subjects; the question of citizenship is one and the question of domicile is another. He is confused and he has arrived at the conclusion that his amendment will give effect to certain things and at the same time also give effect to the provisions in the regulations which an immigrant must undergo.

Mr. FLEMING: Will the minister permit a question?

Mr. GLEN: I did not interrupt my hon. friend.

Mr. FLEMING: I asked the minister if he would permit me one question.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): The hon. member who is speaking can be interrupted only with his consent.

[Mr. Glen.]

Mr. FLEMING: I am asking for his consent. I allowed him to interrupt me with a question.

Mr. GLEN: The hon. member dealt with section 21. In reading his amendment I think I could take exception to it on the ground that it is clearly out of order. The amendment contains the words "within the meaning of section 28." We have not dealt with section 28. That section may be altered and amended and the amendment of my hon. friend might not be relevant. I am making no point of that. I do not think the temper of the committee when dealing with a bill of this importance is such that it would permit the raising of any technicality with regard to points of order, and for that reason I am not taking exception to it. But I do say to the hon. member that his amendment is entirely out of order.

The hon. member dealt with section 21 which provides that the governor in council may order, upon a report from the minister, that any person other than a natural-born Canadian citizen shall cease to be a Canadian citizen if he has, within five years after becoming a Canadian citizen, been sentenced by any court in Canada to imprisonment for a term of not less than twelve months. The only authority given to the minister is with regard to a person who has landed in Canada and who has been the subject of prosecution and has suffered a penalty of twelve months' imprisonment.

The hon. member did not refer to the restrictions that are necessary under the Immigration Act. Section 3 of that Act contains the prohibited classes. It deals with persons who are mentally defective, diseased persons, persons physically defective, criminals, prostitutes and pimps, procurers, beggars and vagrants, charity immigrants, persons not complying with regulations, public charges, psychopathic inferiority, chronic alcoholism, mentally or physically defective, advocates of force or violence against organized government, members of societies opposed to organized government or advocates of unlawful assault or killing, enemy aliens, spies, conspirators, deported conspirators and illiterates. Exceptions are members of family accompanying a rejected person.

If the amendment proposed by the hon. member is adopted by this committee and we have a British citizen coming into this country and being accepted and in one year receiving his citizenship, then, as I said before, the provisions of the Immigration Act will have to be amended. Otherwise these charges could not be laid against an immigrant if he

became a citizen within one year. Surely Canada has the right to say what class of immigrant shall come here. In these days surely Canada has the right to say what type of citizen shall be admitted, and surely Canada has the right to say that those admitted shall have a sound body and a sound mind. Would the hon. gentleman say that one year would be a sufficient length of time within which to determine the character and physical fitness of the immigrant?

Mr. FLEMING: If that is a question my answer is no.

Mr. GLEN: The answer is no. But if the amendment of the hon. member were accepted the restrictions in the Immigration Act would be wiped out. The hon. gentleman did say in the course of his speech that there should be a careful medical inspection of immigrants entering this country and that the regulations should not be relaxed. It is an extraordinary position for him to take because, if his amendment were accepted and the immigrant obtained citizenship at the end of one year, the immigrant could not be deported on the grounds set forth in the Immigration Act. If the hon. member does not take that position, then he takes this, that citizenship having been granted, with all that that means, the citizenship can be revoked.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): The minister does not think that this repeals the Immigration Act? Yet it must if what he says is correct. But of course it does not do that.

Mr. GLEN: I am sure that the committee will agree with me that what I have said is the law of the land to-day.

Mr. FLEMING: And still will be if this bill is carried.

Mr. GLEN: We have heard a good deal in recent years of citizens of this country of Japanese origin who were losing their rights of citizenship, and we have all heard the protests that were made, that after the granting of citizenship these citizens were entitled to stay in Canada. I say definitely and surely that if the amendment of the hon. gentleman were carried it would mean that we would have to revoke the citizenship granted by this country to those immigrants who had been resident for one year in this country.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): You have already revoked the citizenship of the Japanese by order in council.

Mr. GLEN: I have said that that was done, but it has not yet been carried into effect, and we all know the outcry that was made over the revocation of their citizenship.

I have had a report prepared by the officers of the immigration branch with regard to the causes for deportations on the grounds of ill health and for other causes. There was a fifteen-year check made of people deported, and it shows that 14,367 British subjects were deported in the fifteen-year period from April 1, 1930, to March 31, 1945.

In those fifteen years 1,740 were deported following convictions for criminal offences after arrival in Canada.

In the same period 560 were deported on account of mental troubles, and the remaining 12,067 were deported for other reasons. The other causes for deportation are: becoming a public charge, entering Canada in violation of the Immigration Act or becoming incapacitated through tuberculosis or other disability. Entering in violation of the Immigration Act would include entry by stealth, entry without examination, entry by misrepresentation.

The department has studied all the criminal cases and all the mental cases occurring in British subjects deported over a ten-year period from April 1, 1930 to March 31, 1939. There were 845 criminal cases actually deported in ten years from 1930 to 1939, as follows:

	Persons deported	Per cent
First year	133	15·5
Second year ...	178	36·8
Third year	217	62·5
Fourth year ..	169	82·5
Fifth year	148	100
Total	845	

There were also 272 mental cases deported in the ten years 1930 to 1939, as follows:

	Persons deported	Per cent
First year	42	15·4
Second year ...	40	30·1
Third year	50	48·5
Fourth year ...	71	74·6
Fifth year	69	100
Total	272	

I asked the officers of the department to give me further particulars, and they state:

It has not been possible to make a thorough study of the situation but we have up to the moment examined forty-seven cases of British subjects deported following convictions for criminal offences after arrival in Canada, with the following results:

If domicile had been acquired within one year only 17 per cent of this group would have been deported; if domicile had been acquired within three years 66 per cent would have been deported. We examined twenty-four cases of British subjects deported on account of mental troubles. Had domicile been acquired in one year only 17 per cent of the group would have been deported; if domicile had been acquired in three years 50 per cent of the group would have been deported.

I have also been given a statement of deportations from Canada from April 1, 1930, to March 31, 1945. The table shows the causes for the deportations and classifies the deportations by British subjects, United States citizens and other aliens. It is rather a long table and with the permission of the committee I should like to put it on *Hansard*. It is as follows:

Statement of Deportations from Canada, from April 1, 1930 to March 31, 1945

Cause for Deportation

British Subjects—

Fiscal year	Criminal	Mental	Other
1930-31	432	189	2,274
1931-32	436	97	3,273
1932-33	333	96	3,350
1933-34	176	66	2,138
1934-35	68	26	248
1935-36	45	25	80
1936-37	22	9	148
1937-38	30	16	76
1938-39	21	11	99
1939-40	18	6	101
1940-41	9	1	98
1941-42	13	5	115
1942-43	49	4	29
1943-44	49	4	20
1944-45	39	5	18
Totals	1,740	560	12,067

U.S. Citizens—

Fiscal year	Criminal	Mental	Other
1930-31	151	30	90
1931-32	108	26	115
1932-33	142	22	146
1933-34	94	24	183
1934-35	58	14	119
1935-36	56	12	75
1936-37	44	10	108
1937-38	33	13	89
1938-39	54	17	71
1939-40	59	21	65
1940-41	47	9	65
1941-42	39	9	58
1942-43	48	13	40
1943-44	56	5	35
1944-45	42	8	32
Totals	1,031	233	1,291

[Mr. Glen.]

Other Aliens—

Fiscal year	Criminal	Mental	Other
1930-31	285	217	434
1931-32	462	207	1,756
1932-33	361	145	1,910
1933-34	223	94	1,037
1934-35	141	64	309
1935-36	106	26	151
1936-37	51	19	103
1937-38	38	10	87
1938-39	39	4	108
1939-40	33	1	90
1940-41	27	1	168
1941-42	17	..	199
1942-43	3	2	53
1943-44	6	6	48
1944-45	18	7	12
Totals	1,291	803	6,465

Totals by Cause—

Fiscal Year	Criminal	Mental	Other
1930-31	868	436	2,798
1931-32	1,006	330	5,144
1932-33	836	263	5,406
1933-34	493	184	3,358
1934-35	267	194	676
1935-36	207	63	306
1936-37	117	38	359
1937-38	101	39	252
1938-39	114	32	278
1939-40	110	28	256
1940-41	83	11	331
1941-42	69	14	372
1942-43	100	19	122
1943-44	111	15	103
1944-45	99	20	62
Totals	4,581	1,596	19,823

Mr. LOCKHART: Has the minister the total admissions?

Mr. GLEN: No; these figures are just of the deportations over fifteen years from April 1, 1930, to March 31, 1945. I will give the totals: Deportations for criminal offences numbered, in the case of British subjects, 1,740; for mental causes, 560, and for other causes 12,067.

Mr. LOCKHART: Would the minister put on the record the admissions as well as the deportations?

Mr. GLEN: I have not the admissions here. The argument I am making is this, that if citizenship were granted after one year's residence in Canada, the experience which the immigration branch has had with deportations is borne out by the table, which shows the actual results over a fifteen-year period.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I suggest that if the minister wants to make his statement complete he should accept the suggestion of the hon. member and also give the admissions.

Mr. GLEN: I am not dealing with the admissions to Canada but with the problem before us, namely, the question of deportation, because the hon. member for Eglinton has based his argument on British subjects, and I am pointing out what has been the experience with regard to immigrants coming in over a period of fifteen years. The whole basis of the argument I am submitting here is that if the amendment is carried we may be faced with the very same condition of affairs with regard to immigrants as has been threatened in the last fifteen years. More than that; in these days, after a war of six years, when the health of the people is necessarily lower than it was before, special care will have to be taken with regard to these people. I am informed by competent medical men that though an immigrant may to all appearances be well, and may pass the medical test, in one, two or three years diseases may appear which were latent in his body but would only come to light after a lapse of time.

Mr. FRASER: He should have the X-ray examination overseas.

Mr. GLEN: They have, I know, a pretty fair inspection. But I am also told in this connection that a person might have tuberculosis and might apparently be cured of it, could come before a medical inspection board and be passed; yet the disease might develop again within a period of two or three years. The same thing occurs in connection with mental cases.

When I say I am looking at these matters from the point of view of Canada I mean I am taking the position that Canada wants men of sound bodies and sound minds to come in here, and I am quite sure that no hon. member would wish it to be otherwise, because the results, as we know them through many records of people with mental disease coming into the country, are simply appalling. I have here a book entitled "The Fruit of the Family Tree". I got it from the library. It deals, among other things, with the famous case of the Jukes family in the United States. It tells the melancholy tale of Max Juke, a lazy New England vagabond, born nearly two hundred years ago.

The original record of these 1,200 social scourges reads as follows: 300 died in infancy; 310 professional paupers; 440 wrecked by disease; 50 prostitutes; 60 thieves; 7 murderers; 53 other criminals.

In another book, "The family and the Nation", by Whetham, dealing with the same matter, it is said:

One such case has been investigated fully that of the notorious "Jukes" family in the United States of America. The pedigree contains some 830 known individuals, all descended from five sisters born about 1760. A large proportion of these individuals have been in prison, some of them for serious crimes. Frequently the women have consorted with criminals. Many of the race have been paupers, partially or wholly supported by the country. The total direct loss to the state caused by this one family has been calculated as about £260,000 while the indirect loss cannot be estimated.

Is it any wonder that I, charged with the administration of immigration into this country, should look with a great deal of disfavour on the amendment proposed by the hon. member to-night? I would wish that the immigration department should be strengthened in order that it might protect the people of this country, when I reflect on such an illustration as the history of this family and what one insane person coming to a country and procreating, may mean to the state.

In this connection may I also say that certainly the amendment moved by the hon. member should take into account the obligations of the provincial governments. They are charged with the maintenance of mental institutions. The cost of these, as everyone knows, is enormous. Why should they not be consulted, because they would be more directly affected than we as a federal government would be?

It seems to me, therefore, that this amendment—and I wish to speak of it only on its merits—should not be accepted by the committee; and I think in the light of what I have said with regard to the soundness of it the committee will support my view that it should not be accepted.

Coming back to the original argument on the amendment, I cannot understand how anyone in the light of that amendment can read it otherwise than that a person who makes application, coming into this country, can be admitted to citizenship if he has resided in Canada for a period of one year immediately preceding the date of the application and, in addition, where the applicant has served outside Canada in the armed forces of Canada during time of war or is a British subject within the meaning of section 28. The hon. gentleman made some point with regard to two exceptions and said that this was a third exception. I do not think anyone in the committee is likely to object to the two exceptions of the applicant who has served outside Canada in the armed forces of Canada, or who is the wife of and resides in Canada with a Canadian citizen and has also resided in Canada for a further period of not less than

four years during the six years immediately preceding the date of the application. Surely there is merit in exceptions being made in cases like that. But what I say is that the effect of the hon. gentleman's amendment will be that a British immigrant can obtain, after one year, full rights of citizenship and the immigration department will be deprived of the right to inquire, after the year is over, into the capacity or character of the immigrant, and you will abolish absolutely all the provisions of the Immigration Act with regard to this class of immigrants.

Mr. FLEMING: It will not change one word of the Immigration Act.

Mr. GLEN: I do not see how you are going to divorce it, because if this amendment passes inevitably the Immigration Act must be amended. The two acts deal with the same matter, one expressely providing that one year will give the right of citizenship, and the Immigration Act providing, as I have already stated, that five years' residence in Canada is required. There must certainly be no overlapping in that respect, and if this amendment is carried, as it will be the latest expression of this house on the subject, you will immediately cancel all provisions with regard to the entry of applicants who are not, as we think, competent to enter the country under the provisions of this act.

I view this matter with a great deal of seriousness because to-day, with the tremendous number of applications from Europe and eleswhere by those who desire to come to Canada, I do not want to see the restrictions on immigrants relaxed to the extent that we may be bound to take those whom otherwise we would reject. It is an extremely serious matter. It is a matter on which, I know, every member of the house feels as deeply as I do. None of us would go to our constituencies and plead for anything other than that we should have only men and women of sound bodies and sound minds coming into this country. It is for this reason, realizing the dangers, that I have spoken with some degree of heat, although not personal heat. I feel that the committee should not pass this amendment. I feel that provincial governments should have some opportunity of giving expression to their views of the class of immigrants that should be allowed in, the qualifications of those immigrants, in order that those who are, after all, charged with the responsibility and expense of maintaining them shall have some say as to the conditions governing their admission.

[Mr. Glen.]

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I am not going to speak at length.

An hon. MEMBER: Good.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): "Good"? That is fine. I do not speak at length; it is not my practice to take up much of the time of the house. But I think the figures given by the minister in connection with deportations of people who have come to this country are startling, although he has not given us the figures of the total number of admissions. Of course we want in this country people of sound bodies and sound minds; but, assuming the figures to be as he has stated, I do not see that the amendment of the hon. member to my left is in any way related to this situation, because persons from any part of the British empire, if they are allowed by the department to come into this country, should be of sound mind and sound body.

I suggested before that this bill should go to a committee to be properly studied, and I am still of that opinion. If one may judge by the figures which the Minister of Mines and resources has given to the committee, it is obvious that something is wrong. This country must have been put to a cost involving thousands of dollars simply because the inspection of people coming into Canada has not been properly carried out. I repeat, there is something wrong, and it has nothing whatever to do with the question of somebody coming from some part of the British empire and not being given a privilege which we should extend on a reciprocal basis to all people from the British commonwealth of nations. The figures which the minister has put on *Hansard* are so startling that something ought to be done about the matter. We do not want to have unsound people coming to the country. I see the Minister of National Revenue over there and perhaps he can tell me what should be done in regard to the examination of these people. With medical science what it is to-day, we ought to be able to examine them and ascertain whether they are likely to make good citizens before they come in. I suggest that an investigation should be started right away.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not think the minister gave an answer to the members who originally asked him for the figures with regard to immigrants coming from the British isles.

Mr. GLEN: For this period of years?

Mr. GRAYDON: Yes. I have been checking up on one of the returns tabled this session, and I find that from June 1, 1945, to January 31 of this year, of 14,367 immi-

grants admitted to Canada 8,552 were British. I take it that the figures the minister has put on *Hansard* ought to be contrasted with the numbers who were actually admitted in those particular years. I do not wish to interfere with the minister's argument by asking him to put those figures on *Hansard,* but it would give the committee a better opportunity of assessing the exact position if the total number of immigrants from the British isles were indicated at the same time.

Mr. GLEN: I will see the officials about it, but I think the hon. member missed the point of my argument. I was not at the moment concerned about the question of admission into Canada. What I was dealing with was the fact that we had to deport British subjects who did not conform to the requirements of the Immigration Acts. These things are necessary no matter whether the people concerned are English, Scottish, Welsh or anybody else. It is necessary to have the power to deport them in that period of time and that is the reason I gave the figures to support the argument.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister is not doing it consciously, but unconsciously he is actually giving a black eye to the British isles by simply putting on *Hansard*—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. GRAYDON: Wait a minute. Do not be so touchy over there.

An hon. MEMBER: Another lecture?

Mr. GRAYDON: I was simply trying to state a case fairly and if it touches a tender spot I suggest that it might be well for my hon. friends not to be so touchy about it. It is giving a black eye to the British isles to put on *Hansard* the figures with regard to a large number of people who are supposed to have been deported from Canada without at the same time indicating the numbers that came in. That is the only reason I raised the point. I know that when the minister reflects upon it he will realize that the suggestion is a perfectly proper one, and those hon. members who have heard what I have said in this regard will not think it is so bad after all.

Mr. COLDWELL: In the table that has been put on *Hansard,* is there a break-down of the causes for deportation? While my guess yesterday was slightly high in the figure given, a large number of people were deported because they were public charges.

Mr. REID: Many asked to be deported.

Mr. COLDWELL: I should like to know whether, in the table that has been put on *Hansard,* we are given the number of persons deported year by year because they were public charges. As I said yesterday, my hon. friends are very anxious to protect British citizens coming to the country, but when they were in power they deported a large number simply because they were poor. I should like to know what the figure is.

Mr. GLEN: The table I have put on *Hansard* shows deportations in connection with the British isles and the United States from the point of view of criminal offences and mental reasons, as well as other causes. These other causes are not broken down.

Mr. KIDD: I know the minister wishes to be fair. He will correct me if I am wrong, but speaking from memory I believe that in the ten-year period from 1930 to 1940 there entered Canada about 150,000 immigrants annually. That would represent a million and a half, and of those 150,000 annually there were about 50,000 from the British isles. Multiply that ten by fifty and you have 500,000 British immigrants coming to Canada in that peirod. I suggest that, to be fair, the Minister of Mines and Resources should have tabulated his figures on a percentage basis. But that was not done. He should take the figures he submitted a few minutes ago and couple with them the half million immigrants who came from Great Britain. If he does so he will find the percentage is very small.

Mr. MITCHELL: This is the trouble you get into when you try to grade Canadians like eggs in a grocer's store. I came from the old country, as did the Minister of Mines and Resources, and I have had some experience as an alderman in Hamilton during the bad days from 1930 to 1935. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar raised a question about people who were deported because they were destitute, and I should like to get the figures of the number of people who voluntarily asked for deportation on the ground of destitution. I agree with the Minister of Mines and Resources. Those of us who have had anything to do with public institutions know it is absolutely necessary, no matter where people come from, that the state should have some say as to the return of individuals who, for reasons possibly beyond their control, become public charges—through insanity, disease or for any other reason. In my opinion, the amendment raises the question of differentiation between Canadian citizens. I believe that everybody should be treated alike, irrespective of where they came from.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): What about the Japanese?

Mr. MITCHELL: I can answer that too. If my hon. friend had been sitting where I sat in 1942, what would he have done?

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I would have done a better job than you.

Mr. MITCHELL: If he had been sitting where I was sitting in 1942, when freedom as we understand it was almost disappearing from the face of the earth, he probably would have taken the same position that we had to take, and the Americans had to take, at that time.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): The Americans did not.

Mr. MITCHELL: The Americans did it, of course. But I was speaking of an entirely different matter. I was speaking of the immigrants who have come to this country, and I think they should all be treated the same, irrespective of where they come from. If five years is the trial period before citizenship is granted, I think it is like the law; you cannot have two principles, one for the rich and a different one for the poor, for if you do you are headed for revolution. So that I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. FULTON: I think a few things remain to be added, and for a few minutes I would like to deal with what the Minister of Mines and Resources said. Before doing so, however, I should like to go back to perhaps the main tenor of the remarks of the hon. member for Eglinton, which was that by section 10 (1) (c) as it now stands the value of the common citizenship which members of the British commonwealth share is being reduced. At that time one hon. member on the other side interjected a remark to the effect that he saw no reason why a non-Canadian British subject should not be treated as an alien. Well, it has been said earlier in this debate, and I think with a certain amount of truth, that in this world as we know it the only approach we have had as yet to a common world citizenship it that concept of a British subject which is common to all the empire countries. A great deal has been said to the effect that somehow we must arrive at a concept of world citizenship. We have an approach to it in the concept of a British subject. It is not a question, let us make this clear again, of being a subject of Great Britain. It is a brotherhood which is shared by all the members of the empire; and to my way of thinking a British subject of Great Britain is as much privileged to share my citizenship of my country as I am to share his. We should not always look at it the other way. I do not always look to the United Kingdom when I think about British subjects. You can look to Australia or New Zealand or the other members of the empire. I say we should not always look to Great Britain, which is only the origin of the empire. We should look to all the other countries and develop a real feeling of empire unity.

I see no reason why that feeling should not be expanded. First we have to make it a real feeling within the commonwealth; and then I see no reason why it should not be expanded, as was said so magnificently the other day by Mr. Churchill, so that eventually we might be able to realize the ideal of a union of all English-speaking peoples. There are certain tendencies in the world to-day which are definitely working toward unity, toward a common idealism; and I think it would be a great shame if we in Canada, because of some misplaced or unreal concept of a derogation from our autonomy, were to strike a blow at the little progress we have made so far toward that common idealism.

That, I think, is what is at the root of the objections which come from this side of the house to this particular section of the bill. We do not accuse hon. members opposite of being poor Canadians or of trying to derogate from empire unity as a matter of policy, but we do feel that inadvertently—let us put it in that way—by this section they are striking a blow at the status of British subjects which we now hold. The Secretary of State has asked how this could be so, how this accusation could be correct when by this section no right which he now possesses in Canada is taken away from the British subject. I think the answer to that contention was given by the hon. member for Eglinton, that it is the very right of Canadian citizenship which is denied to him for the five-year period.

What does this denial mean? Some people may say it does not mean a great deal, but I say that if my position as a British subject means anything it means that I can have the knowledge that were I to go to Australia or New Zealand, then, because I share the same citizenship they have, I would be entitled to become a citizen of that country without going through the same formalities, the same procedure, the same routine and perhaps even the same delay as an immigrant from some other part of the world which is not a member of the British empire. I feel that quite strongly, and I value that right which is accorded to me by the other domin-

ions. I see no reason, in equity and in justice to the other members of the empire, why we in Canada should take that right away from British subjects from those parts of the empire.

It sometimes helps if we bring these things down to concrete, simple examples, and I should like to give one in this instance. It may seem far-fetched, but if it is thought over carefully I think some force will be found in it. I give the committee the example of Hitler, Mussolini and Churchill arriving to-morrow on a ship at Montreal and applying for Canadian citizenship. Under the terms of this bill as they now stand each of these gentlemen would have to go through the same procedure to become Canadian citizens. Churchill would have to go through exactly the same formalities and be subjected to the same delay as the other two. In the course of the debate it has been pointed out it is not necessary that the non-Canadian British subject should wait for five years. He shares our language, our ideas of government, our British traditions of freedom and democracy, and he requires no training in those principles. Sometimes, of course, when I examine the trend of government in Canada to-day, government by order in council; when I examine some of the opposition to the suggestions which are advanced by hon. members on this side, I think possibly that is put in the wrong way. Perhaps, after all, an immigrant from another part of the British empire does need some training when he comes to Canada. If the present trend is continued he will soon be needing training in dictatorship before he can become a full-fledged Canadian citizen. However, we on this side are fully convinced that after the next three or four years, after the people have had another opportunity to express their will at the polls, the position will be reversed, and the non-Canadian British subject arriving here once more will need only his traditions of democracy to be qualified to become a full Canadian citizen.

To deal for a moment specifically with some of the points raised by the Minister of Mines and Resources, the first contention he advanced was that if the amendment now before the committee were to be adopted it would necessitate a corresponding amendment in the Immigration Act. I think the first answer to that contention is that the hon. member for Eglinton made it abundantly clear that his amendment contemplated no change in the provisions of the Immigration Act. He dwelt at some length on the reasons behind that statement and, I think, showed conclusively that no change need follow. I shall not repeat his grounds, but would simply direct the attention of hon. members to that portion of the Immigration Act cited by the Minister of Mines and Resources in support of his contention. He read from section 2(b), which defines the meaning of Canadian citizens. In section 2 (b) (ii) it is stated that a Canadian citizen means a British subject who has Canadian domicile. Under section 2 (e) it is stated that "Canadian domicile can only be acquired for the purposes of this act" by a person having his domicile for at least five years in Canada.

The minister's point was that a British subject coming to Canada under this bill, as it is proposed to amend it, would require only one year of residence before he might be admitted to citizenship. He said that there is conflict, because under the Immigration Act he requires five years before he can acquire domicile. Therefore I wish to emphasize that part of the Immigration Act which says that Canadian domicile "can only be acquired for the purposes of this act", and so on. It is specifically stated that this provision is directed only to what is contemplated in the Immigration Act. Therefore it does not necessarily follow because we pass any other act whatsoever, or because we amend the present bill, that we must amend the Immigration Act.

This passage which states that Canadian domicile can only be acquired after five years "for the purposes of this act" clearly has reference to section 40 of the Immigration Act which gives the minister power to deport any person other than a Canadian citizen or person having Canadian domicile, for certain offences, and also if it may be found that such persons are suffering from lunacy or from certain contagious diseases. It is designed to protect the right in the minister to deport a person with residence of less than five years who may be found guilty of certain offences, or suffering from any of these complaints. Therefore, as I say, that provision as to domicile in the Immigration Act is clearly directed solely to that particular purpose contemplated in the Immigration Act, and is not affected by the present bill or by the present amendment before the house. That is my first point.

The Minister of Mines and Resources went on to refer to a feeling which he stated has become prevalent throughout the country against orders in council providing for the deportation of certain Japanese citizens. Here I should like to put myself clear for the record, and for the benefit of the hon. member for New Westminster who took me to task this afternoon for supporting another amendment.

Earlier in this debate the question of the Japanese was raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South. At that time I placed myself on record as favouring the implementing of the government's policy with respect to deportation of the Japanese. I did, however, declare that I felt this matter should be decided before the present bill becomes law, because if this bill becomes law the Japanese have the right to become Canadian citizens. I made that clear at the time.

If, however, the government's policy is changed, or for any other reason they do not implement that policy, and the Japanese remain in Canada, then, although I personally regard that as a mistake, as I have said we live in a democracy and presumably would have to abide by the decision of the majority. We, however, from British Columbia have asked for a fair chance first to state our case against the Japanese. If it should be decided, nevertheless, that they remain in Canada, then that decision can only be based on the fact that they are fit to become Canadian citizens, because they can be allowed to remain in Canada only if they are fit to be Canadian citizens. If, then, they stay in the country, my position would be that they must be given full rights to citizenship, much as I may disagree with the original decision to allow them to remain in the country.

Mr. REID: Even though they hold Japanese citizenship?

Mr. FULTON: That is an argument against allowing them to remain. But if the decision is to allow them to remain, then I am afraid my position is that we must give them full citizenship. That is why I supported the amendment previously suggested by the hon. member for Lake Centre as to elimination of racial distinction.

However, to return to the point made by the Minister of Mines and Resources about the feeling now being indicated in the country against this method of deportation of citizens by orders in council, let me point out that he said it would be an evil principle to admit that a man who had acquired Canadian citizenship could be deported in one year, or at any time after having acquired citizenship. I am wondering if the Minister of Mines and Resources has consulted with the Secretary of State in the matter, because if he will look at section 21 in the present bill he will find it is there provided that the governor in council may order that any person other than a natural-born Canadian citizen shall cease to be a Canadian citizen if upon a report he is satisfied that certain conditions exist.

It is provided in the bill that the governor in council shall have power to revoke a grant of Canadian citizenship, and therefore the righteous horror of the Minister of Mines and Resources at the suggestion advanced by the hon. member for Eglinton loses a great deal of its effect. If he supports the bill, that means that he wants it carried into effect as it now stands; if he supports the bill, he is supporting that very principle against which he protested, namely that the governor in council shall have the right to revoke a grant of Canadian citizenship.

Therefore I think that the Minister of Mines and Resources must either modify his opposition to the amendment offered by the hon. member for Eglinton or, at the proper time, suggest to the Secretary of State that he amend the bill by deleting section 21. I shall be most interested to see what course he follows when we come to section 21

The minister based his further argument against the present amendment on his objection to the possibility of admitting physically unfit and mentally unfit people into the country to become citizens and to become a liability upon Canada. I would point out to the minister and to other hon. members that full power will be left either to the Minister of Mines and Resources, to the Secretary of State or to whoever is administering affairs having to do with immigration, to send those people out of the country exactly as he has power now to do. It will be recalled that my first point was that nothing in the amendment involves any change to the Immigration Act, because the two acts are directed toward entirely different objects. The Immigration Act will stand and should stand as it is to-day. However, even if the minister does not accept that point, there is still ample power under section 21 of the bill to deport any person found to be suffering from certain complaints indicated, or to be guilty of certain crimes which would now render him liable to deportation under the Immigration Act.

Let me read some of the relevant parts:

> 21 (1) The governor in council may order that any person other than a natural-born Canadian citizen shall cease to be a Canadian citizen if, upon a report from the minister, he is satisfied—

Of a number of things. And one of those things is "that such person has obtained a certificate of naturalization or of Canadian citizenship by false representation or fraud or by concealment of material circumstances". I submit if it were found two years after the

arrival of a person in Canada that he or she was suffering from some serious contagious disease, it could be easily established that he or she had obtained the certificate by concealment of material circumstances, if the disease existed before the arrival of the immigrant. If it did not exist at the time of arrival I should not think we would be entitled to deport, because the disease would have been contracted after the arrival in Canada. But if it is a condition which existed before arrival, then I would say that citizenship had been acquired by concealment of material circumstances. There is power in the present bill for deportation under such circumstances.

If a person is guilty of certain crimes, such as are now contemplated by the Immigration Act, then under paragraph (c) of section 21 (1) there is, again, power in the Secretary of State to revoke citizenship and provide for deportation.

There are a number of other circumstances contemplated in that section which give the right to deport undesirable immigrants. I think it is a good section. I do not share the objection of the Minister of Mines and Resources to entrusting that power to the Secretary of State. As I say, a similar power is already in existence under the Immigration Act and there is no reason to change that. We shall have a double guarantee by section 21 of the present bill. Finally, if it should happen that the clauses I have recited do not cover the specific points the minister has in mind, then it would be a simple matter to amend section 21 at the appropriate time to give specific coverage.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we support this amendment because we do not wish to abrogate any of the attributes of Canadian citizenship which we now enjoy, and among those attributes is our status as British subjects. We do not wish to sever any ties with the empire, and they are very slender ties as ties of loyalty and affection must always be; you cannot put your finger on them and they are broken quite easily, particularly when there is a constant picking away, a pin-prick here and a pin-prick there. If that sort of thing continues, we are likely to wake up one day and find that these ties have vanished. Because we do not want that possibility to occur, we oppose with all our vigour this section of the bill as it now stands. Moreover, the fears expressed by the Minister of Mines and Resources with regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Eglinton can be dissolved if he will read carefully the Immigration Act, or if the Secretary of State will avail himself of the powers contained in section 21 of the present bill. For these reason I fail to see that the objections of the Minister of Mines and Resources have a great deal of validity, and I submit to the committee that it should judge on their face value the reasons advanced by the hon. member for Eglinton when he put forward this amendment.

Mr. HANSELL: I would not want this amendment to pass without saying a word or two on the matter. Like some of those who have spoken this evening, I also was born on the other side of the Atlantic ocean. However, I have spent most of my life in Canada. I appreciate the hon. member for Peel asking the minister if he would not on some future occasion give us a better and more complete picture. When the Minister of Mines and Resources was giving the details of the deportations my blood boiled. He may have been just debating a point, but he certainly was leaving an impression with me that we were taking a terrible chance in letting these people from the United Kingdom into Canada.

Mr. LESAGE: That is true.

Mr. HANSELL: My hon. friend over there says, "That is true." I should like that to get on *Hansard* with his name on it.

Mr. LESAGE: Yes, of course; I do not care.

Mr. FRASER: You should be ashamed of yourself for making that statement.

Mr. LESAGE: I never will, I hope.

Mr. MacNICOL: Those are the men who fought at Dieppe and Dunkirk. They did not run away. They were not conscripted either.

Mr. HANSELL: If the minister has failed to give the committee a complete picture, then as a responsible minister he opens himself to attack by the British people themselves. I ask him to remedy the matter quickly by giving us a complete picture; otherwise I will guarantee the British press will have something to say about this.

It may be perfectly true that many of the people who came to this country were deported because of mental failure, but what was their condition when they came here? What happened during the years? There must have been a reason for their condition. I do not believe there is any greater reason for mental deficiency than stark poverty. If the minister really wants to give a true picture, let him give the committee statistics showing how many Canadian people went insane during the nineteen-thirties and how many of our young men could not be placed in category

A when they were called to arms. What was wrong with this country? That should go into the picture.

In the nineteen-thirties, when this country was abundantly wealthy, how many people were put off their farms and out of their homes and because of a stupid policy had to go into the insane asylum? Many of those people committed suicide. That also is part of the picture. Considering the real wealth that we had and the fact that people were living in poverty, I am inclined to think it was the government that was crazy.

An hon. MEMBER: The government of the time.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You mean in Alberta.

Mr. HANSELL: Yes, the government of the time.

Mr. FULTON: Members opposite were here for five years of that time.

Mr. HANSELL: I am not concerned with that; I am concerned with the fact that somebody was running the affairs of this country at the time and did not have sense enough to be able to distribute our surplus real wealth to the poor people who were faced with the insane asylum because of their stark poverty. As I say, if anybody needed to be deported for insanity it was the people who were running this country at the time.

Mr. MERRITT: I wish to say a few words before this amendment is put to the committee. A short time ago you, Mr. Chairman, attempted to put the question and I noticed that the Secretary of State did not attempt to rise to answer the hon. member for Eglinton. I think that was a significant omission on the part of the Secretary of State.

Mr. MARTIN: Give me a chance and I will.

Mr. MERRITT: The Chairman attempted to put the question and the Secretary of State did not rise to stop him. I think I am entitled to take it that the Secretary of State did not intend to make a further statement before this amendment was put if he could avoid doing so. I am interested also in what the Minister of Mines and Resources has said. Neither the Secretary of State nor the Minister of Mines and Resources has made any attempt whatever to meet the real point raised by the hon. member for Eglinton in his amendment. The whole process has been one of dragging red herrings across the path and conjuring up strawmen, as my hon. friend has said, in order to support a section of the bill which is unsupportable in this country. When the Minister of Mines and Resources added to that process by attempting to drag his red herring across the trail, I was amazed indeed. I shall deal with that as I go on.

I do not believe that section 10 is in the bill in its present form on the grounds of health at all, and I propose to prove that and I have a particular reason for doing so. I have here the Montreal *Gazette* of April 30, of which the heading is "Martin defends Citizenship Bill," and the sub-headings are "Replies to Critics—Rights and Privileges of British Subjects Inviolate." If that is the kind of thing that is getting into the press as a result of the minister's jumping up and down all day yesterday and to-day to protest about the rights and privileges of British subjects being held inviolate under this bill, I wish to state that I for one entirely disagree with the minister, and I want the press of this country to know there are members of this house who do not believe that the rights and privileges of British subjects are being held inviolate under this bill.

Mr. MARTIN: Name one right that is being violated by this bill.

Mr. MERRITT: The minister asks what right of citizenship is being taken away from a British subject by this bill. I would answer him—the whole thing—the whole thing—everything that citizenship means. That is what is being taken away from the British subject who enters Canada under this bill. At the present moment a British subject who has been in Canada for one year has exactly the same rights as I, a British subject who was born in Canada. He has the same right to call himself a Canadian citizen that I have, and I would say to the minister that very many of them earned that right by their service to Canada. By that service they have the same right that I have by birth. The minister cannot deny that at the moment if a British subject from outside Canada comes to this country and is willing to serve and fight for Canada he has the same right that I have. The minister cannot deny that the moment this bill is passed that British subject no longer has the same right that I have because he has not the right to call himself a Canadian citizen. That is the right he will lose, the whole right—and that is the right which I shall retain.

Mr. MARTIN: I say that he does not lose one right under this bill and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. MERRITT: I shall go on as the minister is so interested in this point. I was coming down on the train last year and another member told me a pig story. He told me that

a pig in his pen had more freedom than a lot of Canadian people. He said that the pig had freedom from want because it was never denied food. It had freedom from care because all it had to do was to stay in his sty and be fed. It had freedom from rain because it was protected from the weather. When the hon. member had finished his story, I said to him, as I say to the minister, that the only thing the pig did not have, in spite of all these freedoms, was Freedom itself. That is the answer I make to the minister. It is a parallel case. So that the minister's pretence is torn aside.

I go on now to the series of other pretences which have been put up as the ostensible reasons for the wording of this section. First of all, we on this side claim that this will infringe the right of a British subject to vote. The minister said that nothing like that was intended. But he has practically admitted it. He challenged some member on this side to say that he would like to see the franchise act amended to restrict it to Canadian citizens. Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see any good reason, once we pass a Canadian citizenship act, why anybody but Canadian citizens should be granted the franchise; and I am prepared to say that that is one of the inevitable consequences of this bill, whether or not the Secretary of State intends at this particular moment to bring in any such amendment. Do not let us fool ourselves about this thing; it is too obvious. The Secretary of State may not do it, but somebody will do it and perhaps before very long.

Mr. MARTIN: Twenty-seven years.

Mr. MERRITT: The minister must have a copy of my notes and know what I was going to say.

The second pretence that is being advanced is the pretence that the provisions of the Immigration Act defining "Canadian domicile" have anything to do with this bill. The Immigration Act and the citizenship bill are two entirely different things. I shall not add to what the hon. member for Eglinton has said on that point except to comment that it is significant that the minister did not attempt to answer him.

The next strawman that was put up by the minister was his challenge to the hon. member for Eglinton to say that no citizen who has been granted Canadian citizenship should be deported. The minister forgot at the time he made that challenge—which the hon. member for Eglinton met by the frank statement that he would be in favour of granting the right to deport—that he had in his own bill that very provision in section 21, as has been pointed out several times. That was the next strawman to be knocked down.

I come to another thing. There has been talk as if section 10 by itself granted Canadian citizenship. Section 10 does nothing of the sort. It only provides the means by which application shall be made and the conditions under which application shall be made for the granting of citizenship. There is no reason in the world why, if my hon. friend the Minister of Mines and Resources—who is so full of these bogeys that he will not admit anybody into this country anyhow—is so frightened on health grounds, he could not have the officials of the immigration branch appear in court at the time application for citizenship was made, and oppose the application if they were not satisfied with the physical or mental health of the candidate for citizenship. Even if the minister's officials did not turn up to do that, we already have in section 21 ample procedure for the revocation of a certificate. If necessary, a further subsection could be added providing that the certificate could be revoked for any of the reasons so laboriously read out by the Minister of Mines and Resources. Any government wishing to do more than pay mere lip-service to the status of British subjects, could have found procedural ways to get around procedural difficulties and procedural strawmen, which they have set up in order to support a section which strikes deeply at a status which a very large number of Canadians, although they do not talk about it a great deal, value very deeply indeed.

I have noticed that the Secretary of State several times, when the status of a British subject has been eulogized, has called loudly and vigorously, "hear, hear."

Mr. MARTIN: Because I believe in it.

Mr. MERRITT: Yes, the Secretary of State believes in it. I call upon the Secretary of State for more than lip-service to a status in which he believes.

I go on one step further. We showed good reason for differentiating between the status and the treatment of someone coming into Canada who was a British subject, and someone coming into Canada who was an alien. I am not going to restate the reason; it has been stated over and over again; and I have heard nobody on the other side claim that a British subject coming into Canada has not a start in training in our democratic methods over an alien coming into Canada. That is our stand, and it is not based on anything but

a good sound reason and a good solid belief in a status which we know to be valuable, and valuable to Canada.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that speakers on this side of the house have laid bare all the pretences and strawmen set up by the Secretary of State. I want to give now what I believe to be the real reason why the minister insists that this provision be kept in the bill and the amendment not accepted. That real reason has been stated to-night by the hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet. He made the following statements on two occasions. He said, "Why should not British subjects be treated as aliens?"

Mr. MacNICOL: Shame.

Mr. MERRITT: And again, when somebody raised the question of the knowledge that British subjects held of democratic rights, he said, "What about Americans?" If the hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet is giving voice to beliefs held by any hon. members other than himself—and I have reason to believe, after all I have heard in this chamber, that that may be so—I wish to say that I believe the minister has listened to these arguments, and that is why the amendment is not being accepted. I say to him that he has heard the roar of the train with the hot-box as he lay dozing away in the country, and because of that roar he has failed to notice the steady murmurings of the countryside.

An hon. MEMBER: That is complicated.

Mr. MERRITT: Hon. members laugh; they do not understand what I mean. I will make it too clear for them. I will simply say that he has listened to a vocal minority and he has missed the clear feeling of the majority of people in this country. I say this too, that he has overbid the middle position in this country. We on this side of the house who believe in the status of a British subject follow the principles it upholds. We believe in evolution. We believe in freedom. I said the other day in the house that the very reason I am proud of being a British subject and that I want to remain so, is that I am perfectly free if I have that status. So that we shall go all the way in compromise with other Canadians to meet their views so long as that process is evolution; but when it becomes retrogression and when it cuts in on rights that we hold to our hearts as dearly as they hold their feelings, then we must stop; we cannot agree with views of that kind, and Canadian unity is not to be built upon that kind of foundation.

I am all for building up complete Canadianism. I am all for enlarging the status of the Canadian citizen. But that must be done and that can be done without derogating from another right which I also hold dearly. There is no reason why these rights should clash. There is no reason for this difference of views; there is nothing in it at all. A Canadian who is a British subject cannot rest content if his Canadianism is incomplete. There need be no clash, unless you want to torture yourselves over words.

I have said some things earlier in this debate upon the value of the status we are toying with so lightly and paying lip-service to, but that we are not upholding. I just wish very shortly to repeat them in principle.

The value of the status of a British subject and of the British commonwealth of nations is that, in time of trouble, although we differ often in good times, we can sink our differences and be as one to face that trouble. Another great value to us all is that it enables us to enter into negotiations with another empire country in a spirit of mutual trust, which you could not do with a foreign country. You cannot be sure of a foreign country; you can be sure that though your brother-country may disagree with you, it will never take advantage of you or knife you in the back. Finally, the status of a British subject is the status of freedom itself.

Let us talk for one second about change in status. We are British subjects; we are free; we can change our status any time we want to. So that I say yes, if your change is based on a sound principle of evolution I am with you to change it; but if your change is based on a misconception of the status, on an inferiority complex or something of that nature, if your Canadianism is so lukewarm that you doubt it when it is allied to citizenship in the British empire, if that is the motivating cause of the desire to change, then I say no; I am not with you. In this case I say that that is the motivating cause.

Canada has in this post-war world a new role and a big role. We talk a great deal, and rightly, of our new and greater place in the world. Canada, therefore, has the responsibility which goes with that power. It has a responsibility now in the task of evolving this status of a British subject and of the British commonwealth of nations. What Canada does in connection with the status she is doing not only for Canada; she is setting an example, as the Secretary of State has already said, to the British peoples in all parts of the world. Although this bill will not affect me at all,

because it will not deprive me in any respect of my rights as a British subject, nevertheless I cannot see the rights of other British subjects who may come to Canada derogated from in any way that I should not like were it applied to myself. That is why I have spoken in this way. The minister has also said that the position I take is an extreme one. Let me disabuse his mind. The position I take is in no way extreme; it is the position that is taken by the great majority of the people of Canada.

We talk also of this great question of national unity in the country and no one wants it more than I do. Indeed, there is no one in Canada who does not want it and want it quickly. But I must say I am fed up with gibes directed at my status as a Canadian because I am one of those who hold the British connection, dear. Let me say to hon. members opposite, who so freely make gibes at me and my kind, that our Canadianism is not complete; that we walk in a shadow; that we are colonials, and things of that nature—that I bitterly resent these remarks. I do not reply with counter gibes, but I do say to them that Canadian unity is not to be built on any foundation such as that. I will go a long way to meet the views of any hon. gentleman in this house, but I do not see why I should have to put up with things that I consider insulting to myself. If we who value the British connection think that Canada's destiny is to take a part in the world commensurate with our greatness as a nation, and therefore we look outwards as well as inwards—outwards to the world as well as inwards on ourselves—that does not make us any less good Canadians than those who look inwards only.

May I conclude by saying that I shall await, from the Secretary of State with interest some reasonable ground upon which he can support his opposition to this amendment. But it will have to be a great deal better, if it is to convince me, than anything I have heard so far in this debate.

Mr. MARTIN: I have listened attentively to the hon. gentleman. I did not intend to take the line which I am about to follow, but I feel that in the few moments remaining before eleven o'clock I should say this. No one appreciates more than I do the character and gallantry of the hon. gentleman. No one admires him more in this house. In fact, we all admire the hon. gentleman for his gallantry. But he has no monopoly on patriotism in so far as it concerns Canada—

Mr. MERRITT: Nor does he claim it.

Mr. MARTIN: —or in so far as it concerns the feeling which all of us share of loyalty to a common crown, which is the basis of that common status which we call British subjects. Under this measure British subjects do not lose one right which they have now.

Mr. COCKERAM: They certainly do.

Mr. MARTIN: My hon. friend says they certainly do. Let me repeat that under this bill British subjects, at the end of one year, having resided in a constituency for two months continuously, will have the right to vote. Having resided here for one year, after the passage of this bill, British subjects will be able to run for parliament. They will be eligible for civil service appointments; they will be eligible to vote. I repeat, what right under this bill is taken away from British subjects?

I should have thought that my hon. friends would have commended the government—and perhaps, too, the Secretary of State—for doing what is done in no act in any dominion in the commonwealth, namely, saying, without fear and unequivocally, in section 26—the only place where it is done in the British commonwealth—that a Canadian citizen is a British subject.

Why try to create the impression that only one group in this house has loyalty to the crown? We all have. Loyalty is not confined only to one group; it is shared by all of us. As my hon. friend spoke I reflected that I happen to be three-quarters of French descent. My wife's father's people, all came from the British isles. As a young lad I studied in the province of Quebec. My mother, a French-Canadian woman, said, "I want you to understand that Canada is a large country with many groups." As the hon. gentleman sitting right in front of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard knows, I took my university course at the university of Toronto and I studied at an English university with the view of trying to understand both sides. I cannot, therefore, sit in my place and have anyone suggest to me that I have not a full appreciation of the value of the words "British subject".

It is for that reason that, addressing myself to other hon. gentlemen in this house who take an opposite view—what I call an extreme view—I have resisted the suggestion that this bill suffers in its purposes because of the implications of section 26.

I believe that Canada is a free nation within the commonwealth, a commonwealth which, as I said last night, has been a source of good in the world and has been maintained because

those who have had to do with the commonwealth have recognized that by giving personality, maturity and autonomy to its constituents it could thereby best carry on as a great force for good in the world.

This bill, instead of depriving British subjects of their rights, gives them a right which they have not to-night—documentary proof wherever they go in the world as to their national status. That is the situation.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, May 1, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

STANDING COMMITTEES

RAILWAYS, CANALS, AND TELEGRAPH LINES—FIRST REPORT

Mr. L. O. BREITHAUPT (Waterloo North) presented the first report of the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING—SENATE BILL

Bill No. 18, for the relief of Juliana Edmonda Isabella Ferdinanda Becquaert de Beaujeu—Mr. MacLean.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

NATIONAL FILM BOARD—HERBERT HUGHES

Mr. FRASER:

1. Is Bert Hughes an employee of the National Film Board?
2. If so (a) what position does he hold; (b) what salary does he receive; (c) what are his duties?
3. Are there any known communists employed by the National Film Board?

Mr. CLAXTON:

1. This question presumably refers to Herbert Hughes, who is a temporary employee of the film board.

2. (a) Circulation manager; (b) $220 per month; (c) distribution and shipping of catalogues, and other similar materials.

3. No. Of course, applications for positions in the public service of Canada do not require applicants to state their political affiliations.

[Mr. Martin.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

VETERANS AFFAIRS—WHITEHORSE AREA

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. To what financial assistance are veterans resident in the Whitehorse area of the Yukon entitled?
2. Is approved agricultural land available for settlement by veterans in that area?
3. Is it possible for veterans to purchase property and fulfil the requirements for the erection of homes in Whitehorse?
4. What steps have been taken by the Department of Veterans Affairs to rehabilitate veterans in the Yukon territory?

POSTAL SERVICE—COMMISSIONS ON STAMP SALES

Mr. PROBE:

1. As of March 31, 1946, in what post offices in Canada is it the practice of the department to sell stamps to the public without commission being paid on such sales?
2. Are stamps sold in post offices in Canada by individuals or companies who receive commissions on such sales? If so, in what post offices and at what rate of commission or on what terms?
3. Do any persons or companies other than those selling in regular post offices receive commissions on stamp sales? If so, at what rate of commission or on what terms?
4. How many persons or companies received commissions in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946, for sales as above?
5. In what general cases do the salaries or remuneration of postmasters become affected by the amount of stamp sales within their post office?
6. With respect to the persons or companies included in the terms of questions 2 and 3, in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946, how many received commissions of (a) less than $1,000; (b) between $1,000 and $5,000; (c) more than $5,000?

ESQUIMALT NAVAL BARRACKS—CIVIC ARENA

Mr. PEARKES:

1. Has an ice hockey arena been authorized for the Royal Canadian Naval Barracks at Esquimalt, British Columbia?
2. If so, what is the estimated cost of this building?
3. Has construction commenced?
4. If so, have any priorities for building materials been granted?
5. Have any requests been received for permission to construct a civic ice arena in Victoria?
6. If so, have building permits been granted or refused for the construction of a civic arena?
7. If refused, for what reason?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

WHITE PASS AND YUKON RAILWAY

Mr. COLDWELL:

For a copy of any agreement or agreements under which the White Pass and Yukon Railway acquired properties in the Whitehorse and Yukon territories.

NAVAL HAUL-UP SLIP, ANDERSON'S POINT, N.S.

Mr. GILLIS:

For a copy of any agreement entered into between the Sydney Engineering and Dry Dock Company and the Department of Munitions and Supply or the Department of Reconstruction, with respect to the operation of the naval haul-up slip at Anderson's Point, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia.

RADIO BROADCASTING — PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS AND CROWN COMPANIES

Mr. COLDWELL:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and recommendations exchanged between the Department of Transport, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and any provincial governments, regarding the ownership of radio stations by provincial crown companies or by provincial governments.

Mr. McCANN: In view of the fact that a committee on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has been set up I would suggest to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar that this motion be withdrawn. The information which he seeks can be brought out to a better advantage when the committee is sitting.

Mr. COLDWELL: The radio committee may not sit for some time; therefore it would be a few weeks before the information would be available. I am anxious to get it as soon as possible; therefore I should be glad if the house would pass the motion.

Mr. McCANN: In any event it would be necessary to receive the consent of the provinces that the information be given. I oppose the motion on the ground that it is not the practice to produce in the house correspondence between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which is a separate corporation, and other agencies.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister has said that this is a separate corporation. Is it?

Mr. McCANN: That is what I say.

Mr. GRAYDON: If it is a separate corporation, has there been any change with respect to its employees being allowed to organize a union? I understand that in the past they were not allowed to organize, on the ground that the corporation was connected with the government. It cannot be both. The government cannot blow hot and cold with respect to the corporation. Either it is a separate corporation or it is a department of government.

Mr. McCANN: I have no knowledge of a desire on the part of the employees of the corporation to organize a union, and therefore I cannot answer the hon. gentleman's question. I take the position which has been taken in this house before, that since the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is a separate corporation, correspondence between it and other agencies is not producible in the house.

Mr. COLDWELL: I hope the minister will obtain the permission of the provincial governments as soon as possible. I should like to point out also that this is a practice that has crept in in recent years. Formerly permission was regarded as necessary where the correspondence was with governments of other countries; now it is the governments of the provinces as well.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Coldwell) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Argue	McCullough (Assiniboia)
Bentley	Macdonnell (Muskoka Ontario)
Blackmore	MacInnis
Blair	McKay
Bowerman	McLure
Bracken	McMaster
Brooks	Marshall
Bryce	Matthews (Kootenay East)
Burton	Menary
Campbell	Merritt
Cardiff	Moore
Case	Murphy
Castleden	Nicholson
Charlton	Probe
Cockeram	Quelch
Coldwell	Robinson (Bruce)
Coyle	Ross (St. Paul's)
Desmond	Ross (Souris)
Diefenbaker	Rowe
Drope	Senn
Fair	Shaw
Fraser	Skey
Fulton	Smith (Calgary West)
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)	Stanfield
Gillis	Stephenson
Graydon	Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Hansell	Stirling
Harris (Danforth)	Strum, Mrs.
Henderson	Thatcher
Hlynka	Townley-Smith
Hodgson	Tustin
Irvine	Webb
Jaques	White (Hastings-Peterborough)
Johnston	White (Middlesex East)
Knight	Zaplitny—75.
Kuhl	
Lennard	
Lockhart	
Low	
McCuaig	

NAYS

Messrs:

Arsenault	Boivin
Baker	Bonnier
Beaudoin	Bourget
Belzile	Bradette
Benidickson	Breithaupt
Bertrand (Laurier)	Bridges
Bertrand (Prescott)	Brown
Blanchette	Claxton

Cleaver	Lapalme
Cloutier	Lapointe
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)	Leger
Croll	Little
Cruickshank	McCann
Dechene	McCubbin
Denis	McCulloch (Pictou)
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)	McGarry
Dionne (Beauce)	McIlraith
Dorion	McIvor
Douglas	Mackenzie
Dubois	MacKinnon
Emmerson	MacLean
Eudes	MacNaught
Farquhar	Maloney
Fournier (Hull)	Marquis
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)	Martin
Gagnon	Matthews (Brandon)
Gardiner	Mayhew
Gauthier (Portneuf)	Mitchell
Gibson (Hamilton West)	Mullins
Gladstone	Mutch
Glen	Nixon
Golding	Parent
Gour (Russell)	Raymond (Wright)
Gourd (Chapleau)	Reid
Grant	Richard (Gloucester)
Hallé	Rinfret
Harris (Grey-Bruce)	Ross (Hamilton East)
Healy	St. Laurent
Howe	Sinclair (Ontario)
Ilsley	Sinclair (Vancouver North)
Isnor	Sinnott
Jutras	Smith (York North)
King, Mackenzie	Stuart (Charlotte)
Kirk	Tremblay
Lacombe	Tucker
Lafontaine	Warren
Lalonde	Weir
Langlois	Winkler
	Winters—97.

Mr. COTE (Verdun): I was paired with the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Hazen). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ABBOTT: I was paired with hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. GINGUES: I was paired with the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. WHITMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Harkness). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. PINARD: I was paired with the hon. members for Hastings South (Mr. Stokes). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MICHAUD: I was paired with the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Ferguson). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. MacNICOL: I was paired with the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Gauthier). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. CASSELMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Chevrier), the Minister of Transport. Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I was paired with the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Macdonald). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BOUCHER: I was paired with the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Richard). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BRADSHAW: I was paired with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Marier). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

EDUCATION

EQUALIZING OF OPPORTUNITY—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO PROVINCES

Mr. F. S. ZAPLITNY (Dauphin) moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into consideration ways and means of equalizing educational opportunity across this dominion and granting financial assistance to the various provinces for this purpose.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move this resolution I am doing something with which I am sure a great many members of this house agree. Since this resolution first appeared on the order paper some time ago, a large number of hon. members as well as others outside the house have expressed interest in it. I hope therefore that what I have to say and what other hon. members may have to say on the resolution will be carefully considered by the government with a view to doing something about it when the debate is ended.

I should like to present a few reasons why I consider the matter of education and the question of federal aid to education to be among the most vital issues before us to-day.

Education is practically synonymous with civilization. If we read history we realize that in some ways education must be considered older than civilization itself, because had it not been for education, whether in an organized or in an incidental form, no civilization would have been possible.

I ask the house to give consideration to the fact that education is in the modern world one of the chief sources of power. We talk about natural sources of power, about solar and

other varieties of energy. If it were not for organized education over the years it would not have been possible for us to enjoy the benefits of the natural energy which we have developed. Any of us who read history at all realize that the discovery of steam power, of electrical energy, of the internal combustion engine, and—more recently—atomic energy, has been possible, not because somebody merely stumbled on the discovery, as we are sometimes erroneously led to believe, but because people skilled in science and research have, over a number of years, done work which they would not have been able to do had they not had the advantages of education.

Let me refer again to atomic energy. Most of us who read about it in the first instance might have had the idea that some bearded recluse, playing around with test tubes in his laboratory, stumbled across a startling discovery and so we had the atomic bomb. Of course we know that that is not so. It took the scientific experts not of one country but of several allied countries together, with a whole staff of trained men working for a long time and spending millions of dollars on equipment, before they, working as a team, came to the conclusion that the atom was divisible.

I would also ask hon. members to realize that education is so important that the race is actually between education and disaster in the future of the world. All we have to do is glance at the headlines each day to realize that there is grave danger of world conflict at almost any moment. Once again we are, so to speak, sitting on a powder keg; and in my view only through education can the peoples of the world solve their problems and face up to their great opportunities.

We must have education in order to solve our problems of the future—and we have great opportunities, because if we can apply the knowledge we have gained during the course of the war, especially in the discovery of new forms of power; if we can learn to control the power which we have discovered and developed, we shall be the masters of our destiny. But if we allow these new forms of power to control us; if we allow these new methods of destruction to gain mastery over us, the future of the world will be black indeed.

Some people will say that there is organized education all over the world, that the people of to-day are not as ignorant as the people of one hundred or even fifty years ago. Perhaps that is so, literally speaking, but comparatively speaking I would say that we are as ignorant to-day in relation to the complexity of our environment as was primitive man in relation to the comparative simplicity of his environment. We sometimes laugh when we read about the centuries it took primitive man to discover that by rubbing two sticks of wood together he could create fire. We have since learned how to create fire in all its forms, and yet we have not learned to use it without burning our fingers.

I say, therefore, that in the interest of the future of civilization itself we must turn our attention more and more to education as our hope. We can make out of atomic energy either a utopia or a Frankenstein's monster. If we can so train ourselves and so train future generations of children that they can put atomic energy to use for peaceful purposes and the happiness of mankind, we shall have created a utopia or something very much like it. If on the other hand that skill and that knowledge are not there, then we may have created something which will devour us in the end.

Someone may ask why it is I express such concern about the present state of education. We may think that the educational system we have in Canada at present is adequate. It is certainly something better than we had years ago, but I would quote, from "Canada 1946", the official report on the state of education as the department responsible for this report sees it. These are not my words. They will be found at page 204 of "Canada 1946":

> The Canadian Teachers Federation reported that, using the criteria of cost per pupil, no progress was made during the sixteen years ended in 1942. Teachers' salaries, which form a considerable percentage of this, began to increase after the outbreak of war but until 1943 rose no more proportionately than the increase measured by the cost of living. Since that time several of the provinces have increased their minimum salary standard and while none as yet has reached the mark set by the C.N.E.A., Saskatchewan's minimum of $1,200 for teachers with permanent certificates and $1,000 for others is a long way from the $400 or less received by highly qualified experienced teachers in the middle 1930's.

The significant fact there stated is that, according to the Canadian Teachers Federation, an organization that should know, and does know, no progress has been made in relation to cost per pupil in the last sixteen years ending in 1942, which means that if the cost of education has risen, if teachers' salaries have risen, it has been only in proportion to the cost of living all round, and we are not proportionately any better off so far as the educational system is concerned.

I wish to turn now to an analysis of the present position in dollars and cents. The figures I will use are for comparative purposes

only, and do not mean that what I am going to propose has to be carried out to the letter.

Mr. LaCROIX: Is the hon. member aware of the fact that education, according to our constitution, is entirely under the control of the provinces?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I am aware of that, and in due course I will answer the hon. member's question. I shall be glad to deal with it as I go on. According to a survey report of the Canada and Newfoundland Education Association, 1943, we were spending at that time $146 million on education in this country. We cannot say that this is either adequate or inadequate without reference to the recommendations of the committee in that respect. They recommended that an annual increase of $144 million be made, which is almost double what was spent at that time, and in addition they recommended that a capital expenditure of $59 million be made in order to improve buildings, equipment, facilities and so on, making a total increase of $203 million. If we add that to the $146 million spent at that time, it comes to $349 million.

As I say, I am not using these figures because I am asking the government to spend any specific amount of money, but rather as a comparison to see what the position is. It means that if we work it out on the basis of the Canadian population, estimated roughly at twelve million, we have a per capita of $29, which would answer the recommendation of the Canada and Newfoundland Education Association.

The reason I quote these figures is to show what it would take in the way of financing by the provinces, the municipalities and the federal government to implement the report of the C.N.E.A. Out of the $29 per capita, how much is the federal government proposing to spend in the financing of education at the present time? The only source from which I can get figures in that respect is the dominion proposals to the provinces in connection with the dominion-provincial conference, which appear at page 46 of the brief. All members, I believe, have the brief.

With the exception of special training given in connection with rehabilitation, the dominion proposes these sums of money to the provinces, if an agreement is reached. First of all there is a lump sum of $85,000. I would not say that is a ridiculous figure, but I do not know how it got in there; perhaps it is a left-over from some benevolent fund. That $85,000 is to be spent in this way: $5,000 to Prince Edward Island and $10,000 to each of the other eight provinces. However, it gets better as it goes along. There is an amount of $1,915,000 to be allotted annually to the provinces on the basis of the number of youth in the age group of fifteen to nineteen in each province. There is a capital allotment of $10 million to be used for putting up buildings and getting equipment in connection with vocational training. This is on the basis of vocational and technical training, none of it being earmarked for elementary or public school education.

This works out to a total of $12 million proposed by the dominion to the provinces if an agreement is reached. Going back to the per capita figure of $29, it means that the dominion is proposing to spend one dollar per capita out of the $29 that needs to be spent in order to provide even a modest and reasonable standard of education in the country, which leaves $28 out of the $29 per capita to be raised by the provinces and the municipalities.

How is this amount to be raised, and in what proportions? According to figures I have from the bureau of statistics for 1941, the latest I could get in this respect, the municipalities were raising 83·3 per cent on school finance, and the provinces 16·7. From the figures I am using for illustration purposes it can easily be seen that under the present proposals of the dominion government to the provinces, and under the present system of financing education in this country, the municipalities will still have to carry the heaviest burden. Then come the provinces, and after that the dominion, whose costs will be very light in comparison. I myself cannot see how this can be done under the present set-up. If the proposals of the dominion to the provinces were implemented I do not believe that even a minimum standard of education could be attained in Canada without much greater contributions by the dominion government.

So much for the present financial situation. The resolution calls for equality of educational opportunity in Canada. This is the theme to which I want to devote most of my time today. No one will argue with me when I say that unless we have equal opportunity in education, and an equal standard of education, or come as closely as we can to it, all talk of national unity is futile. Last night we heard a great deal from all sides of the house about the need for national unity. Unless we can first get equality of opportunity in the field of education across this dominion, we shall not reach the stage of national unity which we all desire.

I wish to place on record a few tables of statistics which will bear out my contention that the opportunities for education across Canada are anything but equal at the present time. To save the time of the house I am going to ask for consent to place the tables in *Hansard* without going through them in detail.

The first table to which I should like to refer deals with the expenditures per child between the ages of five and nineteen by provinces, which is referred to in this report as the expenditures per unit. It will be seen from the table that the amount ranges from $14.29 in Prince Edward Island to $49.61 in British Columbia. Approximately three times as much is spent in British Columbia as is spent in Prince Edward Island. These are the two extremes.

Now let us take three geographical areas for purposes of comparison. If we take the maritime provinces as a unit we find, according to the 1941 figures, which are the latest ones I could obtain, that $21 per child is spent. If we take the prairie provinces as a unit we find they are spending $33 per child. Ontario and British Columbia as a unit are spending $46.50 per child. The Canadian average is $33 per child. How does this compare with the recommendation of the Canada and Newfoundland Educational Association? Their recommendations work out to $67 per child. In other words we shall have to spend $67 per child throughout the dominion if we are to attain even a reasonable standard of education. At the time to which I have referred we were spending approximately $33, which means that we shall almost have to double our expenditure for education if we are to reach the standard recommended.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has the hon. member the unanimous consent of the house to place the tables on *Hansard?*

Mr. COTE (Verdun): Would the hon. gentleman tell us the source from which he obtained these tables?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: This table is taken from the report by Professor K. F. Argue, presented to the national convention of the Canadian Teachers' Federation in 1945. The table is as follows:

Expenditure per child (ages 5-19)

By provinces: 1941

Prince Edward Island	$14 29
Nova Scotia	22 70
New Brunswick	19 74
Quebec	22 86
Ontario	46 87
Manitoba	35 37
Saskatchewan	32 85
Alberta	39 41
British Columbia	49 61

Comparison of three areas:

Maritimes	21 00
Prairie provinces	33 00
Ontario and British Columbia	46 50
Canadian average	33 00
Amount recommended by Canada-Newfoundland Education Association	67 00

The next table to which I want to refer is one that shows that there is not only a difference between the amounts spent, and consequently a variation in standards of education from province to province, but also a difference between urban and rural centres. Those of us who come from rural areas will agree that almost without exception the opportunities for education in rural Canada leave very much to be desired. Indeed that is an understatement. Here are some figures which will show that the opportunities and facilities for education in the higher brackets, namely, high school and universities, are much greater in urban centres than in rural areas. The table gives a comparison of boys by age groups across Canada. These figures were also taken from the Argue report:

Attendance: urban and rural. 1941.

Boys by age groups:

	Rural per cent	Urban per cent
13	93	97
14	75	94
15	52	81
16	33	59
17	19	39
18	12	25
19	7	16

The figure of 16 per cent is not a high one, and leaves much to be desired; but it is more than twice as high in the urban centres as in the rural areas. It means that out of every one hundred boys who started school, only seven were still in school by the time they had reached nineteen. This is a serious state of affairs. We who come from the rural areas know something about the reasons why so many boys and girls leave school at the age of fourteen or fifteen. I have had some practical experience in teaching. There are two chief reasons for this situation. One of them is that in the rural areas, especially throughout western Canada, there are no high school facilities for teaching these children unless their parents are in a financial position to send them to a town of considerable size where they can attend high school, which incurs expenditures greater than the parents are able to afford. The second reason is that where there are facilities for high school education in small towns they usually consist of a two-room school, with all the grades from grade 9 to 11 in one room and from grade 1 to 8 in the other. The high school teacher is

obliged to handle all grades from grade 9 to 11, and sometimes from grade 8 to 11. Therefore it is physically impossible to offer the variety of courses to fit the needs and desires of the students who are attending school. I have seen boys and girls of fourteen years of age leaving school because the talents with which they are gifted or the abilities which they possess cannot be satisfied in a school which offers only one course of education. This lack of variety, this lack of something to satisfy their intellectual appetites, causes them to become disinterested. They leave school not because they have not intelligence. Perhaps they have more than the average intelligence in certain lines, but the courses offered lack variety. Everybody has not the same intellectual appetite, and these students do not wish to take what is offered.

In my twelve years of experience in teaching I have seen young people who were practically geniuses being driven away from school because of the fact we had nothing to offer them to keep up their interest. You cannot offer a potential electrician a course in history and expect him to like it. It is not up his alley. On the other hand, you may have a budding diplomat, and if you make him do mathematics two or three hours a day he is not going to try to carry on.

I have another set of figures to which I wish to refer, and I am going to ask the consent of the house to put them on *Hansard* in order to save time. This refers to the variation and inequality in salaries across the dominion. I do not think anyone will deny that if we want to have a high standard of education we must, first of all, have a high standard of teaching personnel. There are several reasons why people who might otherwise become good teachers, either leave the teaching profession, or go somewhere else rather than make any effort to enter that profession.

In this connection let me quote from the report of the reconstruction committee of the Canadian Teachers' Federation. This report contains a significant paragraph as to the quality of teachers which, in the opinion of the Canadian Teachers' Federation, we should have. They state:

> The status of the teaching profession must be raised to the level where it will attract into the profession young men and young women of the very best character and ability in such numbers as to allow for a careful selection of those to be trained as teachers, on the basis of health, leadership, character and other outstanding qualities of mind and heart, as well as on the basis of academic standing of at least one year of post-secondary study.

That is asking for a fairly high standard, but it is not at all too high. I am one who considers education so important that we cannot overemphasize the quality of teaching personnel. But if we are exacting that type of teaching personnel, if we are asking for that type of teachers, then we must be prepared to pay for it. The following table, from the bureau of statistics, which I mentioned earlier in my observations, will serve to show the way in which we have been paying for it:

Median salaries of Teachers, 1944
By provinces: Rural

	More than one room	one room
Prince Edward Island	$598	$538
Nova Scotia	730	580
New Brunswick	774	612
Ontario	1,204	1,021
Manitoba	996	843
Saskatchewan	955	902
Alberta	1,176	996
British Columbia	1,250	1,007

A mere glance at these figures will show that in none of the provinces is the schedule of teachers' salaries anywhere near where it should be. Indeed, in some of the maritime provinces the salaries are such that it is impossible for the teachers to maintain any adequate standards of academic attainments; in fact it makes it difficult to make a living. I could probably say much more about the position in which teachers have found themselves for many years; but I shall refrain from doing so, since the time at my disposal is passing by.

Having given those figures, having shown the lack of equality in opportunity across the dominion, and having proven, I suggest, that there is a need for the federal government to enter the field of financing education, I should like to place upon the record the stand taken in this connection by certain organizations and individuals.

What is the stand of the Canadian Teachers' Federation, a body which is in a position to speak for teachers in this dominion? In a letter dated July 23, 1945, addressed to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), the Canadian Teachers' Federation said this in part:

> The plain truth is that education can never be raised to the status that it should occupy in a democratic society unless the dominion government provides the necessary money by liberal grants on the basis of need.

And that is "liberal" with a small "l".

Mr. GRAYDON: That is taken for granted.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I should like also to quote a resolution passed by the national convention of the Canadian Teachers' Federation in 1945. This is recent, and puts the organization clearly on the record. This is what they say:

Whereas important aspects of federal-provincial finance are to be decided at the present dominion-provincial conference; and
Whereas the matter of federal aid to education is considered to be one of the most important of these;
Be it resolved that we urge the federal and provincial representatives at this conference to see that the matter is included in their discussions with a view to implementing some such scheme in order to assure all Canadian children an adequate standard of education.

Surely this sets out their stand clearly and unequivocally; there can be no quibbling as to the position of this great body of teachers.

Where do the political organizations in this country stand? I am fortunate in having before me excerpts from statements made by the leaders of three of the parties, and by one of the ministers of the government. I shall begin by quoting the leader of my own group, in a statement he made in May, 1945. Here are his words:

Education is a matter of concern for Canada as a whole; not for a community or a province only. And next, and equally important, there is implied the recognition that the resources of the provincial governments are insufficient to undertake all the educational activities that modern requirements of peace and war demand.

That makes it clear where we in this group stand in the matter of federal financial aid to education. I now come to the then leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon). Here are his words—and I wonder if he will recognize them to-day:

The ability to pay affects the whole problem of equal opportunity. The answer lies in federal aid for education.

I believe this sets out his attitude quite clearly. If it does not he will have an opportunity of setting the record straight.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is anybody arguing against that?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Not at all. I am just leaving it open, in the case the hon. member wishes to say something.

Mr. GRAYDON: Perhaps the hon. member does not like me to think in that way; but I do.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I now come to the leader of the Social Credit party, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low). Here are his words.

Equality of educational opportunity is desirable and, therefore, substantial federal grants should be made to the provinces.

I think that is clear, and the hon. member nods his head in agreement.

I come now to the government side of the house, and quote these words from the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) who, I assume, speaks for the government in this respect:

But the constitution does not prevent the federal government from giving substantial assistance to education.

I hope the hon. member who interrupted me earlier will take that to heart, because those are the words of a minister in the government he supports. I believe these quotations place upon the record as fairly as it can be done the attitude taken by the various political parties in the house, taken, significantly enough, in May, 1945. It will be recalled that there was an election in June of that year. I have no reason to believe that any one of these gentlemen has taken a different position since then; therefore I have nothing but the highest confidence that, when the time comes, each of them will rise in support of this resolution.

In the time left at my disposal I should like to answer two possible objections to the proposal I made. One of those objections, which was implied in a question asked by an hon. member opposite, is that of provincial autonomy. I was asked whether I was aware that, according to the constitution, education is under the jurisdiction of the provinces. I answered that I was well aware of that, and may I point out that a careful reading of my resolution will show that I am not asking the federal government to take over the administration of education in this country. That is not suggested in the resolution, or in anything I have said to-day. What I am asking for, and what all the leaders of the various groups and one of the ministers of the government have agreed upon, is that the federal government should make substantial grants to the provinces to make it possible for the provinces to finance education properly. I hope that will clear up any misunderstanding which may exist in the minds of hon. members. This resolution does not suggest that the federal government should administer education.

Mr. LaCROIX: Is the hon. member adding the words, "Without any control from the federal government, so far as expenses are concerned?"

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Although I thought I had made myself clear, for the benefit of the hon. member may I repeat that I am not suggesting that the federal government take over the administration of education. My resolution calls for a substantial federal grant to the provinces, to be used as the provinces see fit.

Mr. LaCROIX: Without any control?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I think I have made it clear.

The other objection which may be raised, and it is one of the stock objections, is the matter of cost. There are those who will throw up their hands in despair and say that this will cost too much. I do not deny that it will cost money, and a great deal of money because if we are to obtain quality we must pay the price. But let me assure the house that if we want to make the safest possible investment in the future of this country there is no safer or more gilt-edged security than the education of the growing children of Canada. It is impossible for us to overspend in this respect. What I have said earlier in my address should, I think, bear out the fact that for every dollar spent in this way we shall get hundreds, perhaps thousands, of dollars of value in the future. I ask hon. members to use their imaginations to the extent of realizing that we are now standing on the threshhold of a great opportunity. We have discovered through our scientific efforts the sources of power of which we never dreamed before. All we need to do now is to control those powers and direct them into the proper channels, and then we shall have in the future a veritable paradise in this country. I have no apologies to make and no hesitation in recommending to the government, with all the vehemence I can gather, the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. HANSELL: If I may ask the hon. member a question because I do not expect to participate in this debate, I fancy that what has bothered some hon. members, judging by the interruptions, is the same question that is bothering me. I agree that we should seek financial aid from the federal government, but can my hon. friend throw some light on this question? Can we expect the federal government to give financial aid to the provinces without the federal government expecting to have something to say as to how the money is to be used?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: It is quite possible that the federal government may make certain recommendations to the provinces as to the best possible way in which the money could be spent, but I would point out that it is not necessary for the federal government to go into the fiield in which the provinces are now operating. The federal government, without interfering with what the provinces are doing, could spend large sums of money for erecting buildings and in purchasing equipment and in paying for teacher training which the provinces are in need of to-day.

Mr. HANSELL: That is a good answer.

Mr. BONA ARSENAULT (Bonaventure): (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny) on his very able presentation of this resolution; however, the fact remains that were this motion to be adopted by the house, it would, in my estimation, constitute a serious threat to provincial autonomy, with regard to education. The resolution is worded as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should take into consideration ways and means of equalizing educational opportunity across this dominion and granting financial assistance to the various provinces for this purpose.

Such a resolution constitutes a threat to our provincial rights in matters pertaining to education. It does not say what sort of education it is intended to equalize across the Dominion. Does it refer to primary, secondary or postgraduate teaching? We do not know. But in its very vagueness, the resolution constitutes a threat, and it is up to the representatives from the Province of Quebec, from the French speaking settlements of Ontario, New Brunswick, the western provinces, and other parts of this country, to ward off this intrusion of the federal government in the field of education.

Section 93 of the British North America Act grants the provincial legislatures exclusive rights in matters of education and teaching, so that the hon. member for Dauphin has presented his resolution in defiance of our constitution, in defiance of the greatest chapters in the history of French Canada, of those heroic struggles which our compatriots have had to wage in Ontario, New Brunswick, western Canada and elsewhere, on matters with regard to which there can be no compromise.

Those who, in this period of unrest, take pleasure in gnawing at the confederation agreement of 1867, may as well know that the French-speaking members of this house are ready to take up the challenge.

We want none of this federal centralization in matters pertaining to education.

I would not be surprised that this apparently harmless motion would be but the beginning of a great manoeuvre launched by the partisans of centralization in Canada, to deprive us of our educational rights and aim a blow at provincial autonomy in that respect.

As lately as October last, at their annual convention, held in Quebec City, the Canadian Congress of Labour put forward the following proposal:

> That a standard educational programme be drawn up by the federal government and implemented by the municipalities.

When one is aware of the present tendencies within neutral labour unions, the suggested surrendering of the educational field to the Federal government, in defiance of our constitution, is not at all surprising.

But when a member of Parliament, the member of party represented in this house, one whose attitude is often so typically Canadian and who is therefore discreetly admired by a great number of his colleagues, puts forward a proposal which would have such a centralizing effect on the field of education, we have reason to be thoughtful, particularly when this member's party could well constitute, before very long, His Majesty's official opposition in this house. To those who might think that this approach to this important question is peculiar to the members from Quebec or to the French-speaking members of the other parts of the country, may I say that at the last meeting of the Canadian Newfoundland Education Association, held in Toronto in October 1945, the director of education for Ontario, Mr. Althouse, stated that the provincial autonomy in matters of education was not only a provincial right but a national asset.

Certain provinces, he added, due to financial difficulties, would gladly accept the federal government's intervention by way of grants, but other provinces, including Quebec, do not want any such grants as their acceptance would imply a recognition of the dominion government's rights in educational matters.

Not only did the director of education for Ontario admit the exclusive right of the provinces in educational matters but he also recognized its practical value from a strictly Canadian standpoint.

Further, on February 13 last, the hon. Wilfrid Bovey, who sits in the legislative council, and is a member of the Canadian Association for Adult Education, a recognized authority in educational matters, after lauding the teaching standards in the province of Quebec, made the following statement in the Quebec legislature:

> I have been told that our third party proposes to establish a dominion department of education. I do not believe in the centralization of education. I believe in a maximum of decentralization. I believe that the principles recognized in the province of Quebec are sound. If the day comes—and I think it will come—when the dominion government increases sharply its grants for educational purposes, we must make sure that we do not sacrifice our academic freedom for financial considerations.

Personally, I am convinced that in educational matters we would lose this freedom to the extent that we accept such grants.

In a questionnaire submitted to the Prime Minister, which was published in *Maclean's* of February 1, 1946, the following question was asked:

> Do you believe that the dominion government should play a larger part in education?

And the Prime Minister replied:

> Under the Canadian constitution, education is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. Therefore the dominion government must not in any way interfere in matters within the purview of the provinces. But the central authority should help the latter to make greater educational facilities available (1) by concluding financial agreements which would enable the provinces better to meet the cost of education; (2) by granting financial assistance towards vocational training, scientific research, educational training of servicemen, etc.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the stand taken by the Prime Minister of this country, that is the policy of the Liberal government, the policy which should be endorsed by all Canadians respectful of confederation and of the exclusive rights of provinces in educational matters. We are against any direct Dominion cooperation which would inevitably result in a more or less rigid control by the central authority in this sphere which, under our constitution, is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces.

And this question offers a special importance to the province of Quebec to which rights have been specifically guaranteed by the constitution.

Do you realize where the direct interference of the dominion government in educational matters might lead at a time when not a single dominion deputy minister is French-speaking and when most of the key positions in the dominion civil service are held by people who are undoubtedly well intentioned but who are neither of our tongue nor of our faith.

In Quebec, the educational system is placed on a non-political basis. This province has no minister of Education, but a department of Public education represented in the legislature by the provincial Secretary. The Superintendent of Public education of the province of Quebec has two secretaries as assistants, one French speaking and the other English speaking, and all the powers in the educational field are vested in the Superior council of public education with the superintendent as ex-officio chairman. This council is comprised of two committees, one with a Catholic membership and the other composed of Protestants and they hold separate meetings. Each committee has the same number of members and administers, independently from the other, all educational matters falling

under its jurisdiction. Besides, in every community with a protestant minority, this minority is entitled to form its own school board.

Some provinces should draw inspiration from this time-honoured system which is perfectly satisfactory to the various racial and religious groups and leaves no room for provincial, and much less federal, political interference of the kind suggested by the hon. member for Dauphin.

Education is probably the Canadian activity that has been the most difficult to establish on a sound basis. At any rate, no other has required more sacrifices and heroism. In Quebec, but more especially in the French speaking districts of Ontario, New Brunswick and the Western provinces, it has required the best that could be recruited in intelligence, devotedness, courage, self-denial and perseverance of a racial group feeling that it had a religious and intellectual mission to fulfil; of a racial group that has so far proudly discharged its duty and has entrusted to the French-speaking members of this house especially, the imperative duty of fighting every attempt at absorption and every infringement of our rights, especially in the field of education.

I will no doubt be permitted to add with Mgr. Camille Roy that:

"Compared to the other provinces of the Canadian confederation, the province of Quebec has indeed nothing to envy from the points of view of its institutions, its general intellectual culture, or the special value of its leading classes."

Of this, I need no better proof than the acknowledged excellence of the young French speaking representatives sitting in this house since the opening of the present Parliament.

The provinces have already accepted indirect help from the federal authorities in extra-scholastic fields such as scholarships, professional and technical training which had become imperative, it was claimed, as a result of war.

Because of this fact, the supporters of centralization will no doubt invoke the classical argument of precedent to insist from now on, on a direct participation in school activities, which we shall oppose to the limit of our strength. This is the reason for which we oppose the motion of the hon. member for Dauphin, which, we hope, will be defeated by the house.

(Text):

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I desire to participate in this discussion only briefly. I am prompted to do so by the fact that for a good many years I have taken a keen interest in the subject brought before the house by this resolution, and also because during the course of the debate the mover of the resolution (Mr. Zaplitny) mentioned my position with respect to federal aid to the provinces. I would recall to your mind, Mr. Speaker, that in October, 1943, at a convention in the province of Quebec of teachers' associations there, a comprehensive discussion with respect to education generally was participated in by three of the political parties: the party to which the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny), the mover of the resolution, gives allegiance; the party of the then parliamentary assistant to the Prime Minister, now the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton); and the party represented by myself. That forum provided an interesting opportunity to discuss in some detail the approaches of the various parties to the subject of education. Because of the fact that the leader of the C.C.F., Mr. Claxton and myself are all federal men, the question of federal and provincial jurisdiction naturally formed a subject of discussion. To-day I only want to confirm and in some respects to reiterate and repeat the position which I took then and which I hope I shall always take with respect to this matter, namely that we must base all our discussions about education on the firm and solid foundation that, though we discuss the matter in the dominion parliament, it falls directly and completely within the purview and jurisdiction of the provincial governments. That, I think, must be our first approach. While the hon. member for Dauphin spoke of it later in his speech, I should like to make it the foundation upon which any arguments I shall advance will be built.

I was interested in the interruption and intervention of the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell), who raised a question which is probably in the minds of most people who have given some study to the subject of education and how it shall be financed. I thought there was some merit in the question he raised. I have only one concern with respect to federal aid to education, and I believe it is profoundly shared by most hon. members. In seeking federal aid for education we must bear in mind that when it is forthcoming it must be subject to complete safeguards that the giving of money shall not be used as a big stick over provincial governments to impose upon them the will of the dominion concerning education, or anything else. I therefore preface my remarks by saying that when aid is sought, or when it is suggested that the government should consider the whole problem of giving aid to the provinces in matters of education, in whatever

aid is given both the letter and the spirit of the constitution with respect to the safeguarding of education for the provinces shall be observed. That is one of the planks upon which we must stand in connection with dominion aid to education. I am one of the last in this house—and I think I have plenty of company in other parties—who would consent to any rigid standardization or uniformity of the educational system, because in a country with such varied interests as Canada it just cannot be done. We have to consider our Canadian problems in the light of the conditions in which we as a nation find ourselves, and work upon that basic ground as best we can to make a good job out of the situation as we find it.

That viewpoint, however, does not lead me, and I hope it does not lead either the country or this parliament, to the conclusion that we as a federal parliament must neither discuss nor deal with the question of education across Canada. There are many ways in which the safeguards I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks can appropriately be applied and at the same time we can still do a great deal as a dominion parliament.

What the hon. member for Dauphin said a few moments ago with respect to educational opportunities is perfectly true. I feel keenly in this matter because, like many others in this house, I was born and raised in a country district, where we had to go two and a half miles to and from school morning and night, where the conveniences were quite different from those available in urban places or, for that matter, in many rural districts nowadays. As one moves on and takes a place in the business, industrial, professional or agricultural life of the country, one realizes how important it is to have a good educational system. More than that, geography and finance must not be the sole yardsticks by which the amount of education in this or any other country is to be measured. My conviction in that respect comes from the depths of an experience which many of us have had who originated in the rural districts of Canada. For that reason it seems to me that the boy or the girl in the remote hinterlands of Canada is just as great an asset to the country and should be developed in the same degree as the person who was born under more favourable geographical and financial circumstances. I would go farther; as far as that aspect of the problem is concerned I believe there is a responsibility resting upon the dominion parliament, subject to the safeguards and to the jurisdictional questions which I have mentioned, to give opportunities to people who, because of such circumstances as I have indicated, are now denied those opportunities. I remember very well making this statement in October, 1943, at the forum to which I was referring a few moments ago:

> While the cost of education is not necessarily the only measure of educational value, at the same time it may well serve and sometimes does serve as an index of educational facilities.

There is one matter I wish to touch upon, and my remarks this afternoon are not planned; they come to my mind as I approach a subject in which we are all interested.

Mr. MARTIN: From the heart.

Mr. GRAYDON: Well, that is perhaps the fact. We talk about schools as being the only element in education, but there are two other important factors that should be considered. I know that the hon. member for Dauphin is a very distinguished leader in his own profession; and I must be careful, too, when I discuss the teaching profession, especially when I recollect that early in life I came under the influence and control of a young lady who is now my wife and who was for a few years in that profession. I have, therefore, a wholesome regard and respect for the authority and influence of that great profession. I would say, however, that there are two other important factors to be taken into account, namely, the home and the church. Let us not always assume that all the educational facilities in the country are provided by the primary and secondary schools or by any other type of school. They certainly do a great work and anything I say must not be regarded at all as a reflection upon them. I do not believe, however, that the schools can do a good job—and I say this with a firm conviction—unless they form part of a great team in which the home and the church are important partners.

I believe that the greatest citizens in Canada have been trained for citizenship and to take their part in the future of this country in this three-way partnership that I have mentioned—the home, the church and the school. I am going to express a purely personal opinion which I have stated before in private. Perhaps there is no harm in repeating it in the House of Commons. I have sometimes wondered whether we are not organized to the point where we have become overorganized as a society. And in this I have not education in mind.

People are planning so hard and comprehensively to live better that they themselves have scarcely the time to live. So that instead of placing the emphasis upon the objective they place it upon the method. The

result is that the objective comes in for secondary consideration. I hope that in our education, as in other matters, the objective will not be lost sight of in the maze of organization which is so often essential if that objective is to be attained.

I do not know what my colleagues in the house have found in the ramifications of their experience, but my opinion is this. The skill of the mind is an important matter, but let us also remember that there is a skill of the hand; and if we build up in this country only those who are skilled in brains, skilled in mind, and disregard the skilled hand of the manual labourer, we shall not have the balanced type of activity, the balanced population, which in my opinion is essential to the well-being and the advancement of a great Canadian community.

I have seen, as no doubt many other hon. members have seen, well educated men and women who have not been able to make their full contribution to society and to lead a fuller life. This is something I have discussed many times before, though I am not sure whether I have mentioned it in the house However, I shall do so this afternoon. I refer to the industrious man—or the woman —who is endowed not merely with a good brain or with skilful hands but with a well developed fund of common sense. Such a man or woman is a great asset, an important factor in making a full contribution to the Canadian community and to Canadian affairs generally.

Education is a broad topic with many ramifications, and much as I should like to philosophize on the subject this afternoon I must hurry on to one or two points I have in mind. I do not think we always plan our education as well as we might. I know this is strictly a provincial matter, but I do not think there is any harm in mentioning it here because it applies to all the provinces. I suggest that we do not always educate our men and women for the callings for which they are best fitted. The selective type of education seems to me to be of vast importance in the days that lie ahead. This nation has a population of eleven and a half millions and it cannot afford to waste many of those people by educating men and women for the wrong jobs. For that reason I hope that as time goes on, in the various educational movements in Canada, we shall eliminate as far as possible the round pegs in square holes, as we have tried to do in other directions. I say that because there is no reason why a man who is capable of developing manual skill should not have just as high a place of prestige and standing in any community in Canada as the man who is skilled in brains and mind. That is the kind of balanced community I should like to see in this country. I should like to see people educated along the lines for which they are best fitted. It is a waste of education, a waste of money, if we follow any other course, because every time a man or woman is turned out of one of our universities there is a substantial public investment in that person. Because there is a public investment in every one of them the public has some right to see that the money has been spent in the proper places, as is done in other investments that the people make. That, I hasten to point out, is another personal view. I felt that this was the forum which gave me the opportunity to express it. I believe in the selective form of education which is being utilized in some provinces, perhaps not all. It is being utilized to some extent in the province from which I come. Speaking of Ontario I should like to say that since the present regime took office in that province there has been a most marked and significant advancement on the whole question of costs of education, the whole question of plan of education and the utilization of the best means of reaching the objective of a well educated province.

May I mention the question of our position in the schools with regard to teaching. This is not a national matter. It may be regarded as a matter that comes entirely within provincial jurisdiction. I wish to mention it because it fits into the general picture. One of the things that this country must do is to see that the seats of learning, whether they be higher or lower, are purged of any teachers who may be found to have undemocratic ideals, whether they are purveying them to the pupils or not. This is a matter that recent events would indicate as being an essential need. In making reference to it I am not casting any reflection upon any seat of learning except to say that if in the future we are to build up a great Canada based upon democratic ideals and principles, we cannot do so unless we have people teaching those ideals in the schools, whether they be public schools, high schools, or universities. I should like to see more emphasis laid upon the teaching of what democracy really means. We have a great system of government, our democratic system. I know there are weaknesses in it, but there will always be weaknesses in any type of government where there are imperfect people to govern. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that more emphasis ought to be laid than has been laid in this country, and in others, upon seeing that our younger generation are brought up under democratic ideals, and that the dangers of other types

of totalitarian government ought to be shown to our younger generation. It may be argued, of course, that these are matters again that should not be dealt with in a measure of this kind, but to me they seem to be part and parcel of a great general picture which deserves to be shown.

Great strides have been made in the teaching of civics and in the teaching of our form of government, but I believe we can go even farther. As a layman I feel—I am going to risk such criticism as may come to me—that perhaps we might do more than we have done along that line.

There is another matter to which I should like to refer before I conclude my rambling remarks. Coming up through our schools in every province we have men and women who almost seem to be predestined to take leadership in certain lines of activity. There is not one in this chamber this afternoon who, if he looks back on his early school days, cannot think of some students whom he regarded as potential leaders, and who, because of financial or other obstacles standing in their way had to finish their schooling at an early age. Because of that we have lost men and women with leadership qualities who could have contributed much to this nation as a whole. Our brilliant minds must have some avenue by which they can reach the top, regardless of geography or finance.

I well remember that in the early days of another parliament the present Secretary of State (Mr. Martin), and others of us, took a stand in favour of something which comes within the jurisdiction of this parliament and of which this parliament should take cognizance, namely, the question of a comprehensive system of national scholarships. That was a movement and a policy that met with almost universal approval in most parts of Canada. I raised it again in the session of 1944; I raise it now. I believe that national scholarships would interfere with nothing so far as the jurisdiction of the provinces is concerned. It could in no way be regarded or criticized as stepping into the field of provincial jurisdiction. On a broad national scale it would help to bring out of the schools of our country our men and women who would be of great value to the nation at large. Once a comprehensive system of national scholarships is put into effect my belief is that no money would be better spent. No money would provide greater dividends to the people of Canada than national scholarships. I wish to leave that thought with the minister and with the government.

There is another problem to which I should like to call attention. Now that the war is over—I know there was some objection during the war and no one desired to press it at that time—we should institute a national library. Othe countries have been pressing for this. It is a matter which has been brought up on many occasions by the teachers' federation. It is a matter which finds agreement amongst educationists generally. This country is in the position where it can no longer suggest that we cannot afford to place at the disposal of the people of Canada a great national institution such as a national library. I leave that problem with the government as one to which they might properly give their consideration.

I have another suggestion to offer. There ought to be some move made by provincial governments to come to some kind of agreement whereby there might be an effective provincial teachers' exchange. This is a matter on which leadership might properly be given by the dominion government. It is a matter which, in my opinion, would go a long way toward bringing into effect the type of national unity which my hon. friend suggested when he moved his motion.

I should like, if I may, because of the time factor, to pass over some of the points I had in mind when I rose to speak. I wish to say in passing, however, that when we speak about the division of jurisdiction between the dominion and the provinces in matters of education, we should keep in mind that in 1944 there was passed an amendment to the Technical Education Act, which allowed the provinces and the dominion to work hand in hand in matters of vocational and technical training. So far as I know, that amendment met with unanimous approval in parliament, following which it became law.

The whole matter of vocational training and technical assistance has been worked out between the dominion and the provinces. The provinces have jealously and properly maintained full jurisdiction over the manner in which money shall be expended for educational purposes, and the education made available. At the same time, however, there has been a broadening and a levelling of the burden of payments across the dominion.

I think most hon. members in this debate have hesitated to go far into the question of dominion-provincial relations, and for a very good reason. To-day within the precincts of this building the whole question of finance, as applied to the provinces and to the dominion is open for discussion and decision. In my view it would be presumptious if, in the

midst of significant discussions which have not yet been concluded or which have not come to fruition, parliament were to attempt to set out in specific form proposals which in any way would interfere with or which would project themselves into the general discussions now taking place.

I am sure the remarks of other hon. members will be made with that important reservation, as indeed mine have been made, and that they will be made for the purpose of bringing before parliament some thoughts respecting the manner in which, in the days ahead, as a federal parliament we can help our people in matters of education. That has been our desire and our objective.

When discussing this afternoon one of the fundamental matters which come before the people of Canada, we are discussing something which has also been projected into the international field. The economic and social council of the united nations organization set up at San Francisco was a new organ. It was a further experiment in the field of international cooperation and understanding. We have tried different curatives; but the preventive measures as envisaged by the work of the economic and social council constitute some of the most important work of the united nations. Under the activities of the economic and social council comes the whole question, on an international level, of cultural and educational cooperation.

As I sat in the conference at San Francisco, when the economic and social council was being set up I was deeply impressed with the importance and the stress indicated by the various delegates of the world upon the question of education. Sometimes we take education for granted. In my view, however, many of the world's problems can be either solved or made more acute, depending upon the type of education applied to them.

While in Germany last December those of us who were there had some opportunity—perhaps not a great one—of assessing the position of the younger members of the German population. While it might be considered presumptuous on my part to express an opinion as to what should be done in that country—because it is under the competent control of the allied control authority—nevertheless it was the opinion of many that through proper educational processes and planning there was still hope to make of the younger boys and girls of tender age a democratic nation which would eventually take its place among the nations of the world. Yet this was a country which in twenty-five years on two occasions and with bad education along totalitarian lines had disturbed the peace of the world so materially.

We talk about the tremendous value and importance of education. This afternoon I should like to add my word to those of the hon. member for Dauphin and to say that in my view the government should take into consideration ways and means of equalizing educational opportunity across the dominion, and of granting financial assistance to the various provinces for this purpose; but with these reservations and conditions, namely that by its support of such a resolution the present position of the dominion-provincial conference and the negotiations taking place therein shall not be prejudiced. In addition to that, nothing herein should be allowed to permit the dominion government or parliament, by the payment of any sums for any purpose, to wield a big stick over any province, or to compel or enforce its will in those provinces with respect to any type of education upon which parliament might decide.

Mr. BENOIT MICHAUD (Restigouche-Madawaska) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the resolution dealing with education which is now before the house, I wish to voice my remarks in my mother tongue, the language of my forbears and of the long line of pioneers and settlers who, during 300 years, through hard and persevering work, performed inconspicuously and receiving but little notice, have so deservingly contributed to the building up on the American continent of this country of abundance, this land of unlimited prospects, this extraordinary country which is envied and admired throughout the world, and which should ever be foremost in the thoughts of the members of this house, my country and yours, Canada.

In using the language of my forebears, I wish to pay a tribute to 13 generations of ancestors who are sleeping their last sleep in this Canadian soil which they have cleared by dint of unremitting toil. I wish to render homage to all my fellow-citizens of French language and culture, and thereby to reaffirm their right to the use of their language and to the development of their culture, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I wish to pay a tribute to all those worthy pioneers, those valiant settlers, those daring trappers, those fearless explorers, like Louis Joliet whose tercentenary we celebrated last year. Finally, I wish to honour all those gallant missionaries and those heroic nuns who left their beautiful and dear country to dedicate their lives to the evangelization of the wild tribes of the new world, in the most primitive living conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I may be forgiven if I emphasize those facts, but I want to stress the highly civilizing part played by the doughty people who came from France in the seventeenth century and who prompted the historian Parkman to make this significant statement:

> Spanish civilization crushed the Indians; English civilization despised and neglected them, but French civilization opened its heart to them and gave them its love.

We have heard, during the last month, words of high praise about the real merits of English culture and the numerous advantages which the status of British subject implies; therefore, I do not see why a wrong interpretation should be placed on my tribute to those great men of the past, sprung from another race which is equally noble and proud, and steeped in a culture which has brought such a great contribution to the progress of mankind in many fields.

Mr. PINARD: Hear, hear!

Mr. MICHAUD: Thinking of all those great men of the past, most of whom were born outside this country, and who have so greatly contributed to the building up of the Canadian nation, I wish to say that their sacrifices were not made in vain. The civilization they so highly personified and which they established in this American wilderness, has kept progressing satisfactorily.

Thanks to the fair-mindedness of the majority of our countrymen of British origin, this same civilization may now be expected to flourish in peace, in harmony and in justice, to the country's greatest benefit and glory.

No one more than myself, as a former teacher, bewails the lack of educational facilities unfortunately apparent in many sections of this country.

Until I was fifteen, the only school-house I ever knew was the small, overcrowded, one-room affair, under a teacher holding the lowest elementary certificate then available.

Some years later, I taught in schools that were hardly better equipped, save for the teacher who, nevertheless, must not be too underrated.

There are now schools in my constituency which are even more handicapped than those I knew as pupil and teacher. It saddens me deeply, and I have no dearer wish than to see established throughout Canada, a school system which would command the admiration of the whole world and, especially, bring joy and happiness to all Canadians. And that is why, if I thought that this resolution could in any way bring some improvement in our schools, I should unhesitatingly say: "Let us carry it, and put an end to this debate."

While deploring the deficiencies of our educational system, we should not however yield to pessimism and close our eyes on the consistent progress accomplished in this field during the last few years. At its last session, the Quebec legislature passed a bill which, according to a school inspector will do much to promote the cause of education in that province.

I am not very familiar with conditions in other provinces but I know that in New Brunswick, of late years much progress has been made in this field.

Among the many laws enacted in my province for the promotion of education, I should like to mention the following: first, an act to raise the minimum wage, second, an act providing very liberal grants for the building and equipment of new schools of all kinds, from little red schoolhouses to consolidated rural schools.

Finally, may I point out that under the rule of county units, all country districts in the county are grouped for the purpose of financial administration. As a result of this law, passed by 14 out of 15 counties in the province, a minimum of uniform and quite satisfactory educational facilities has been established. The new act came into force some three years ago in the first counties where it was applied, so that it is rather early to come to a conclusion as to its effects, but even now we may foresee very encouraging results from this new legislation.

Does that mean that the situation is satisfactory? Far from it. Salaries are still too low, as well as teaching standards. Schools are too few and are not adequately equipped.

From a practical point of view, however, what is the meaning of the present resolution? It calls for financial aid to the various provinces with a view to insuring that all parts of the dominion will share the same educational facilities and in order to help the provinces financially. In other words, this resolution, in the last analysis, is asking the dominion to grant certain sums to the provinces for educational purposes.

At the present time the dominion government and the nine provinces are discussing problems of a significance and importance that can hardly be exaggerated. They bear directly on the matter of financial assistance to the provinces. I believe that nobody in this house is unaware of the tremendous difficulties facing our public men at this moment.

A number of very ticklish problems have been dealt with in the course of negotiations. Time and again the provinces have charged the federal government with intruding in

provincial matters and invading the field reserved exclusively to the provinces by section 92 of our constitution.

No field has been more jealously guarded by the provinces, none has been freer of dominion interference than that of education. The fact that it has not yet been mentioned once at the dominion-provincial conference seems to indicate that the policy on this matter has never wavered since confederation.

I am not well versed in provincial history, but I know that in New Brunswick, when the Public Schools Act was passed in 1871, vain efforts were made by the minority to have it disallowed. It was hotly and bitterly discussed during the 1872, 1873 and 1874 sessions. Rightly or wrongly, the dominion refused to exercise its power of veto.

In any event, parliament took the position that educational matters came under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. Here is a statement, chosen at random, made during the 1872 session by Sir John A. Macdonald:

It is common knowledge that this matter almost threatened the existence of confederation and that, if the federal parliament had been asked to settle the problem of public schooling, that would have been sufficient for the people of Lower Canada to repudiate confederation.

To my mind, the above-mentioned act clearly violated the spirit if not the letter of the confederation act and in support of my contention, I will quote more evidence from the same statesman:

I entirely disagree with the hope expressed in certain quarters that we should, by some means, oppress one language or place it on a level inferior to that of another. I believe that the attempt, if made, would fail or that it would be foolish and spiteful to carry it out should it be practicable. The oft-repeated statement that Canada is a conquered country is always untimely. Whether Canada be conquered or surrendered we have a constitution under which all British subjects are placed on an equal status, enjoying equal rights as far as language, religion, property and the individual are concerned. There is no superior race; there is no conquered race, here; we are all British subjects and those who are not of English descent are nevertheless British subjects.

Like any other piece of human workmanship, the British North America Act is marked by some imperfection, and when interpreting it, we would do well to remember the words of the Master: "The letter killeth and the spirit giveth life".

To my mind, the unfortunate educational quarrels that have been rife since 1867 are directly due to the narrow meaning which we attach to sections 93 and 133 and which never occurred to the fathers of confederation.

[Mr. Michaud.]

Thank God, bitter educational quarrels have vanished almost completely from this country, equal to Europe in area. As if Canada were not large enough to harbour comfortably two civilizations, while more than twenty different cultures are flourishing on the old continent.

To all Canadians, holding these narrow views on education and linguistic rights and interpreting section 33 in its more restricted meaning, may I point out that this section does not insure greater protection to the minorities in Quebec than to the minorities in other provinces. There is the difference, however, that under the same section, Quebec has always granted the greatest possible protection to minorities, while other provinces have subjected them to vexations and inflictions such as the double tax, with which this province is faced once again.

In fact, for the past five or six months, there has been an organized campaign to limit the full flowering of one culture and to strip minorities of rights already sorely curbed. The local papers of yesterday and to-day bring us snatches of the unfortunate struggle waged at a time when harmony and tolerance of the highest degree are so eminently desirable.

I am convinced that the distribution of equal educational advantages throughout the country matters less than the dissemination of an educational system based more directly on the principles of equality, justice and tolerance mentioned in Sir John A. Macdonald's judicious saying, which I quoted a moment ago: "There is no superior race". Such is Canada's greatest need, as regards education. The discussions which have taken place in the house for the past month lead one to believe that things have changed considerably since 1890. In this very house, we have heard some members speak on behalf of one race and one culture. Discussion did not always remain on a friendly plane. Some members considered expressions, harmless in themselves, such as the words "imperialists and colonials", meant for them. They replied by other equally innocuous statements which were nevertheless intended to do mischief, and we heard the words "conscripts, conscription, etc."

Those terms, to my mind, carry no opprobrium. I ask my fellow-citizens on this side of the house to keep calm when an hon. member opposite speaks of conscription. That method of recruiting exists in practically every country in the world. Even Great Britain had to resort to conscription during the last two wars.

We have no reason to upbraid a man for not taking up arms of his own free will in defense of a foreign country or even of his own, when the laws of the land do not compel him to do so. Until the Napoleonic wars, there were only career soldiers, armies of mercenaries, and conscription or coercion for military service did not exist.

I need not remind hon. members opposite that Great Britain did not have to enforce conscription when my ancestors were called upon to defend Quebec, the key to Canada, against the armies of Arnold and Montgomery in 1775.

Mr. PINARD: Hear, hear!

Mr. MICHAUD: May I be permitted, in that respect, to quote the words of testimony spoken by Lord Baldwin, on April 21, 1939, before the student body of the University of Toronto:

(Text)

And let Canada never forget it was the loyalty of Quebec in the American War of Independence, and subsequently, that settled the future destiny of Canada and makes her nationhood to-day a reality. Two languages, two cultures, two great religious branches, unity and freedom.

Great Britain did not have to resort to conscription when it was necessary to defend this country against the United States in the war of 1812-14. It was not my ancestors who were lacking in loyalty around 1850 when there was strong agitation for the annexation of Canada to the United States. Finally I wish to point out that conscription in Canada did not apply only to the province of Quebec. The figures quoted by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) during the hectic session of November, 1944, show that the draftees were distributed throughout the provinces in such proportions that it is very difficult for a province to cast reflections upon another. Incidentally, the draftee who threw his rifle overboard in Halifax—an incident which assumed gigantic proportions in the eyes of the official opposition—was not from Quebec and was not of French origin or language.

In view of the fact that some time the most trivial discussions in this house give rise to fiery outbursts, it seems that the teachings of Sir John A. Macdonald have not been very well understood by many citizens of this country, and for this reason I am of the opinion that the encouragement which the Dominion government should give to education should be along the lines that I have suggested.

I hope my remarks have not been offensive. I have endeavoured to limit them to generalities and I would be sorry if they had been misunderstood.

In concluding, I wish to summarize in a few words the stand I have taken on the present resolution:

First, education does not come under the federal authorities and this field is among those that the provinces guard with the greatest care.

Secondly, all that the federal government could do would be in the nature of financial help to the provinces.

Thirdly, such financial help from the federal authorities, as far as administration is concerned, is presently under discussion by the provinces and the federal government and any resolution adopted in this house could not, in any way, contribute to the success of the conference.

Fourthly, the greatest need of education in Canada, is for education in accordance with the principles expounded by the great statesmen I have quoted in the course of my remarks.

Let us hope that this kind of education may be instilled and perfected for the greatest good of our country.

(Text):

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset emphasize the fact that we of the Social Credit group greatly appreciate the opportunity of associating ourselves with the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny) in support of his resolution. We have felt for a long time that the federal government should take steps toward the equalization of educational oportunity in Canada and toward giving financial assistance in the field of education.

Speaking in the House of Commons a few weeks ago, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), a former minister of education in the government of Alberta, emphasized the fact that we must strengthen the sinews of our Canadian democracy and revitalize that democracy. It is obvious to me that there is a growing feeling among Canadians that that revitalization is overdue and that the strengthening of the sinews of our Canadian democracy is also overdue.

I am sure that the members of this house will agree with me when I assert that unquestionably the greatest agency for accomplishing the revitalization of democracy is education. It would seem, therefore, that we as Canadians must direct our effort toward two things: first, a nation-wide effort toward the improvement of education and the

expanding of that education, and, second, making possible a greater equalization of educational opportunity in this country. The provision of even a modest programme of technical, agricultural and adult education, to say nothing of equalizing the limited educational opportunities which we now enjoy, offers such a task under our present system of financial restrictions as to be quite beyond the possibilities of several provinces, possibly all of them. The provision, therefore, of this expansion of opportunities should be the prime concern of all Canadians, not of just one community in Canada.

I realize fully that under the British North America Act education was one subject assigned exclusively to the legislative authority of the provinces, barring, of course, the education of Indians. Probably in no other field does the anomaly of the authority allocated to the provinces on the one hand, and the narrow basis of taxation assigned to the provinces on the other, become so apparent as with respect to education.

History, I believe, reveals the reason for this. Confederation, as we all know, occurred in 1867, but it was not until 1870 that the first legislation was passed in England to establish the ordinary public elementary schools. It is certain that the fathers of confederation in all their wisdom looked eastward in rendering many of their decisions, but even in looking eastward they could not discover that in England the ordinary public elementary schools had yet been established. Even making allowance for the greater social progress which has taken place in North America, it is inconceivable to me that the fathers of confederation could have envisioned such development as has occurred in the field of public services. Many provinces have actually in the past expended more on education than the subsidies which they received annually from the dominion. May I also say that those fathers of confederation could hardly be expected to have envisioned the development which has taken place in the fields of technical and agricultural education and of vocational instruction.

I said a moment ago that many of the provinces found themselves in the position of expending more for education than the subsidies received from the dominion. Let me just go back to my own province for one moment to give the house an indication of the trend there as far as educational costs are concerned. Back in the fiscal year 1935-36 the government of that province appropriated approximately $1,450,000 for school grants. During the present fiscal year the ordinary grants in that province for educational purposes amount to $5,372,000. That is an increase of approximately $4,000,000 between 1935-36 and 1945-46. May I say that in that province, where we have progressed tremendously in the field of education, we now find that approximately 20 per cent of our total revenues must be appropriated for educational purposes. Think what that means: fifteen government departments, and a department of education having to be granted approximately 20 per cent of all revenues to meet educational costs. That is not all. Other departments make appropriations for repairs, say, to our agricultural colleges, to our technical schools, for capital structure, and so forth, making a total grant in our province of $6,555,000 a year for educational purposes; that is, between 20 and 25 per cent of our total revenues.

Naturally in our province, as in most other provinces, the people are asking for—demanding, may I say—better schools, better paid teachers, better facilities within those schools. Certainly they are entitled to them; but there must be a limit to which a province depending upon its own resources can go in order to provide those much needed and necessary services to its people. I might add that we are also faced with this situation as far as the costs of operating the public and separate schools, namely providing elementary and secondary education in our province: we have to meet as high as 26·2 per cent of the costs. In some of our divisions the cost of operating rural schools requires that the government pay 40½ per cent, and in at least one of these remote areas where conditions are not so good the government of the province have been called upon to pay 80 per cent of the cost. I say that the government of our province are happy to do that, but what will happen in advancing those educational services if we are forced, through conditions over which have no control, to witness our revenues falling drastically? There can be only one result unless we secure federal assistance, namely a reduction in our educational services to our people, and I am sure we do not want to see that happen in any part of Canada.

In this dominion we have no legal restrictions upon the migration of people from one province to the other. The educational standard, therefore, of one province is of vital concern to another province. If people migrate from what I might call, from the point of view of education, a low standard area to a province having a higher educational standard, the latter will suffer the infiltration of what I can think of in no other term than,

perhaps, the ill-equipped masses. This question of unrestricted migration from one province to another is one of the strongest reasons for urging upon the federal government grants-in-aid to assist the provinces to bring about the equalization of educational opportunity.

Mr. LOW: With no strings attached.

Mr. SHAW: As my colleague the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) asserts, with no strings attached. I intend to come to that if time permits.

I am not one of those who are always inclined to look elsewhere in order to determine what we should do. I think we have made a pretty good job in many respects of carrying on, ourselves. But let us look to England for a moment. In England education has undergone a marked change; and I am not speaking of the period since the labour government came into office; this happened a long time ago. In England over 50 per cent of the cost of education is met by the central government out of the national treasury. There is no question over there, as far as one can ascertain, about the principle that education is a national responsibility. As far at least as I am able to determine, they recognize that grants for education in the modern state are virtually indispensable; and I say that the same applies here.

The best evidence which I have been able to procure would indicate that in the United States the situation is similar to our own. I have in my hand an interesting publication which came off the press in 1937, entitled, "Wealth, Children and Education", by John and Margaret Norton, of Columbia university. I am going to quote a short section from this, not because I want to indicate what conditions are in the United States but because conditions here are in so many respects parallel to what we find there. I quote:

> Larger participation by the federal government in the financing of public education has been advocated by many students of the problem of educational finance during the past two decades. This advocacy is based upon the known facts of the lack of significant educational opportunity for hundreds of thousands of American boys and girls and upon the increasing evidence of the disparity among the states in ability to support schools.
>
> The obligation of the nation to provide support for public education is fundamental. Schools and other means of education have been recognized from the beginning of our history as necessary for the maintenance of the nation and for the prosperity of its people.
>
> It was in line with this early appreciation of the importance of education that action was taken by the congress of the United States in the support of schools. As the nation expanded beyond the thirteen original colonies, land was set aside in each state by the federal government for the support of higher education. In more recent years money has been granted for the development of agricultural experiment stations, for vocational education, for the rehabilitation of those injured in the great war, for persons disabled in industry, for a programme of education of youth and adults through the extension service of the department of agriculture, and for many other purposes.

The situation is quite comparable here and I expect to deal with it in a moment. I continue the quotation:

> But all of the measures taken up to the present time are insufficient to meet the legitimate demand for an acceptable programme of education for all children and youths throughout the nation. There are children in the United States for whom no school at all or a very minimum term of three or four months is provided. There are others who are taught by teachers with inadequate preparation. There are still others for whom the necessary books and other educational supplies are wanting. There are hundreds of thousands enrolled in schools in which the opportunities provided are limited to a traditional school curriculum which takes little or no account of the special aptitudes or abilities of those who vary in intelligence, in interests, or in vocational outlook from the selected group for whom the schools were originally organized.

How true that is in our own country.

> Children who are denied education in the poorer sections of the country to-day will live in other parts of the United States and will be responsible for government, local, state, and national, in the years which lie ahead. From those areas in which educational opportunity is most meagre there will be recruited the population of our cities.

This publication deals with the disparity of opportunity as between states, and communities within states. I have no up-to-date statistics showing the disparity in this country, but it would almost stagger the imagination if one did have complete statistics. The discrepancy between provinces is not so great; but go into any province and notice the discrepancies which exist as between communities, and you will agree that it is staggering. In our own province, for example, the government, through the department of education, has made every effort to remove these disparities within its own province. There have been special grants; there have been bonuses to teachers. In our province they bonus teachers to go into our more remote areas to carry the message to children who otherwise would be without the opportunity of attending school. That is in Alberta. Better salary schedules have encouraged better teachers to join the profession there. Then, of course, through the reorganization of our whole administrative system, we have enabled some of the schools which operated for only a month or two during the year to operate now for a full ten-month period.

I could go on for a considerable time and deal with the situation which did exist in some of the remote communities and the situations that exist to-day, but I shall not take the time at the moment to do so. The following extract is to me extremely significant. I do not even recall the source from which I obtained it, but I think it is worth listening to because it contains the very essence of truth:

> Because a province or an area within a province is too depressed to furnish an adequate programme of education is no fault of the children. Poorly equipped schools, underpaid and dissatisfied teachers cannot produce an environment for our children which is conducive to mental health and a progressive society. This is a good reason for claiming that education is a national problem. The productivity, the mental tone and the outlook of all our people make Canada what it is. If an area is depressed, if its children suffer and become disillusioned, the effect on the social and economic institutions wrought out of the experience of hundreds of years may be disastrous. Reckless and irresponsible experimentation in education may result in immeasurable damage to the fabric of society. Recent European experience has shown that we cannot afford to permit our young people to become discouraged.

When I refer to this fact I do not want it to be thought that I am trying to create the impression that Ottawa, as we say, has totally ignored education in the national sphere, because I realize that is not correct. If my reading has resulted in my being correctly informed, it was early in the present century that there was an exodus of people in Canada from the farm back to the city. This, so I have learned, caused a great deal of concern. The government or governments of the day recognized the need for encouraging a more diversified agriculture and the carrying of scientific knowledge out to the farms. I believe it was in 1913 that $10 million was provided by Ottawa to be paid over ten years, $20,000 to each province per annum, the balance distributed on a population basis. Most of this, however, went for capital works. No province could resist the offer; the people would not permit them to. They had to construct educational institutions, and by that time, the end of the ten-year period, the grant ceased and the provinces were left with the complete responsibility of maintaining the institutions which they had established.

I believe it was in the same year, 1913, that a royal commission reported in favour of dominion grants for technical education on the ground that, since technical education might give a stimulus to national development, the federal government had both an interest and a responsibility in it. I believe it was in 1919 that a dominion act provided another $10 million for a ten-year period for technical education, $10,000 to be paid per annum to each province and the balance on a population basis. The province in that case was to spend an equal amount. What happened in my own province? If the information I have is correct, we spent a million and a half on the technical school in Calgary. But the grants suddenly ceased and we had the whole project on our hands, to be kept up and operated out of revenues from the province.

In 1931 there was a new measure for the promotion of vocational education. I believe that $750,000 per annum was to be paid to the provinces under that act for a period of 15 years, and in 1937 $1,000,000 was appropriated for technical education. But this actually was a relief measure since it was designated for the purpose of education of young unemployed people.

While a province naturally appreciated the assistance granted under this act and other acts, it left them in the unfortunate position of using most of the grant for capital works and then having to shoulder the full responsibility of maintaining and operating the institutions.

I also know that under the Vocational Training Co-ordination Act of 1942, which was a war emergency training program, any type of training needed in connection with the prosecution of the war was to be made available. Provision was made there for rehabilitation of the armed forces, and we know that there was to be a continuation of those projects commenced under the youth training.

These are all very fine. I congratulate the government on them. But it was unfortunate, I would suggest, that it took a war to bring about a recognition of the dire urgency of giving the children, our greatest asset, the opportunity of higher education.

Speaking of the rehabilitation of the armed forces, which is taking place under the Vocational Training Coordination Act of 1942, I wish to congratulate the government. In my city of Red Deer we have one of these institutions. I have talked to the young men and they are completely satisfied with the nature of the instruction being offered. There is a fine staff of teachers. Though this may be apart from the subject, I take the opportunity of expressing the wish that the government, the responsible minister, would decide to cooperate with the city of Red Deer in taking care of the serious housing situation that has developed there as a consequence of this school. There is a great deal of buck-passing from one department to another.

These young men come back from overseas after four or five years and they go to Red Deer to take the vocational course. They

are asked to be separated from their families again. Any who do find rooms for their families squeeze out somebody else or render it impossible for a returned serviceman to secure adequate accommodation.

I say, in passing, that I wish the government would make that picture wholly complete and satisfactory by cooperating with the council of the city of Red Deer. I know that during the war the government made provision for ordinary educational services for the navy, the army and the air force in various ways. We appreciate all that. We know it is providing education for many of those who would not have been educated if there had not been a war; but we also remind the government that there are still those younger generations coming up, those who were too young to participate in the war. We should like to see an extension of all these educational facilities to these younger people as they grow up.

We all know that the provision of technical education is extremely costly. The same might be said of agricultural advanced education and of any type of vocational training. We realize that we must have the best type of teachers; we recognize that we must have the best possible equipment in these institutions; but, Mr. Speaker, the provinces have reached the stage where it is becoming impossible for them to proceed much further in the provision of these facilities.

I believe the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) referred to geographical and financial factors when considering this matter of education. I reflect with horror upon some of my experiences in the early thirties while engaged in the profession of teaching. Almost daily I saw children, bright youngsters, walking out of my classrooms simply because economic conditions at home were such as to make it impossible for them to carry on with their education. Fortunately—and it is tragic to have to couple the two together—many of them have been provided now with an opportunity for further education as a result of having volunteered for service in the armed forces of Canada. But if there had not have been a war what would have been the situation? The words of the hon. member for Peel bring this one experience to my mind. I remember a little lad of about ten. He just did not seem to get anywhere in school when taking the ordinary courses we had to offer him. I had written him off as just a bit hopeless. One Saturday afternoon that lad happened to come to me. I was standing beside a truck, the hood of which had been lifted. He started asking me questions about the engine, and he embarrassed me quite a bit. He knew more about it than I did. That lad should have had an opportunity of leaving the ordinary school, the best that we could provide, and taking the course for which he was properly adapted. That case could be multiplied scores of times.

Let us consider our universities. Generally speaking, our universities are struggling along on endowments, tuition fees from students and provincial grants. We know what the result has been. Every year we lose many of our finest professors from the universities. A number of them go over the border into the United States because they are offered more money. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not saying that these professors are looking only for the dollar, but they had a costly course of training and we think they are entitled to decent remuneration. They cannot get it from many of our institutions to-day, and because the institutions cannot meet the cost these professors are leaving us every year. The dominion government should make available to the universities of this country sufficient funds to enable them to retain the best possible instructors.

There is a great deal of controversy with respect to how the assistance should be granted to the provinces. All one has to do is to listen to the discourses which have taken place in another place in recent days to know the great differences of opinion which exist. My colleagues and I feel that the only way in which the grant could be made to a province for education purposes is on the weighted basis, taking all factors such as the wealth of the province, the taxable income, probably the number of children of school age within the province, the number of children in rural areas, and so forth, determine a formula and apply it in an impersonal manner. That is only one way. I wish to emphasize that we are not advocating interference by the dominion government with the administration of education within the provinces. We say, leave it with the provinces. The federal government might do something else, namely, establish a capital fund for the construction of schools. Every member of parliament, at least those outside the cities, has occasion to travel through the country and speak to audiences in these schools. On top of that I have had an opportunity of teaching in some of them, and the situation is a disgrace. Capital costs are so high in every part of Canada to-day that it is becoming increasingly difficult to improve these schools. Even in so-called normal times it is becoming increasingly difficult to provide the necessary schools. The

federal government should establish a capital fund at cost to enable the provinces to build more and better schools.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that it must be apparent to all that a nation cannot compete successfully with other nations to-day if the entire responsibility for educational training and scientific research is left to the care of each individual province. Let me make that clear. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I refer to care only in the sense that the provinces have to meet the bulk of the costs connected with educational institutions.

May I repeat what I said earlier? We support this resolution. We feel that the government should take into consideration ways and means of equalizing educational opportunity across the dominion by granting financial assistance to the various provinces for these purposes.

Mr. JOSEPH ALFRED DION (Lake St. John-Roberval) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I oppose the resolution now before the house because it would inevitably lead to the centralization of education. I feel that for all true Canadians provincial autonomy in that field is an inalienable right. It is not merely a relic of the past, but a spiritual value of present importance for the peace and prosperity of the Canadian nation as well as for the progress of education itself.

From a pedagogical standpoint, the mischief done by centralization cannot be overemphasized. It tends to kill all initiative among teachers and to hamper teaching. Through it, the drawing-up of the curricula falls into the hands of bureaucrats and officials, and without any desire to say evil things concerning those honest people, no one can be content with holding only favourable opinions about them. With centralization, impersonal reports and directions are substituted to intimate and beneficial contacts. That is why experienced teachers fear educational centralization. As an illustration, I only have to mention what happened in the American Senate in 1944. I quote from the September 1944 issue of *Relations*:

The American Senate has just received bill No. 637, which was supposed to save education through generous grants from Washington. The vice-rector of the Catholic University of America, Mgr. Edward B. Jordan, in his booklet entitled "Federal Aid for Education," states the reasons for that rejection. The sponsors of the bill had brought up as arguments the situation of poorly-paid teachers and the too unequal educational facilities as between the various states. But those reasons did not overshadow the much more serious drawbacks that are involved in any federal subsidy in that field. Generally speaking, the writer said, the opposition to the bill " took the form of a protest against any measure likely to bring about federal control on education" . . . The bill would be the wedge which would allow the federal authorities gradually to gain control of the whole United States public school system, thus ruining the principle whereby the control of schools belongs to local authorities, a principle that has featured American civilization since the colonial days.

I quote further:

The statement made by the President of Harvard, Dr. James Bryant Conant, deserves to be quoted: "In the field of education, more than in any other sphere, the only principle that should be held is the one whereby responsibility is devolved on local authorities. The dangers of a centralized and strong power, having a preponderant influence in educational matters is so obvious and they have been so often pointed out, that it would be unnecessary to make further comments about them."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but it is six o'clock.

(Text):

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, May 2, 1946.

The house met at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC BRIDGE AT MISSION, B.C.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. What is the depth of the Fraser river at the C.P.R. bridge at Mission?
2. How many piers are there in this bridge, and what is the total space taken up in the channel of the Fraser river by the piers?
3. Since the construction of the bridge, how many yards of rocks have been dumped at the piers?
4. What effect have these obstructions had on the channel of the river?
5. Are the C.P.R. granted exemption from dyking or any other taxation on the Mission-Huntingdon branch line?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull):

1. 24·36 feet.
2. (a) Twelve; (b) 136 feet.
3, 4 and 5. No information.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

VETERANS LAND ACT—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. PROBE:

1. Have negotiations been undertaken by the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide regular mail and transportation service for the veterans settled under the Small Holdings feature of the Veterans Land Act (a) at Regina; (b) at Saskatoon? If so, of what nature and with whom?

2. What steps have been taken to secure priority for purchase and installation of telephone equipment on behalf of veterans on small holdings at Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert, where the nature of the veterans' occupation makes the installation of such service necessary?

COLD STORAGE SUBSIDIES

Mr. WINTERS:

1. How many subsidies have been granted under the Cold Storage Act, 1907?
2. To whom were the subsidies granted?
3. For what purpose was the subsidy granted in each case?
4. What was the amount of the subsidy in each case?

UNITED NATIONS

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION—CANADIAN AND OTHER CONTRIBUTORS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to reply to a question which was asked two days ago by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) with respect to the contributions of various nations under the UNRRA agreement. It was mentioned at the time that this information was being prepared by the Department of External Affairs. It has been prepared and it was intended to include it in a complete report on UNRRA which will be presented to the house, I hope within a few days. In the meantime I have the information which my hon. friend has asked for and it might be placed on *Hansard*. This is statistical information and in connection with it I would draw the attention of the house to the following facts.

It will be noted that Australia, Canada, the Dominican republic, Iceland, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States of America have made a second contribution to UNRRA. Canada, the Dominican republic, Iceland and the United Kingdom have completed their contributions; the United States has paid in $750,000,000 out of its second contribution and the second part of $600,000,000 is in process of authorization.

Of the invaded countries, which are only expected to contribute to the administrative expenses of UNRRA and not to the operating fund, four, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Poland and Yugoslavia, have made contributions of supplies produced in their country.

The contributions to administrative expenses were only set at the meeting of UNRRA which took place during the month of March, and therefore as of the end of that month few countries had had time to make their contributions to administrative expenses. This explains the amounts which appear as yet unpaid in the largest number of cases, particularly in the second group of countries; those which were invaded were only expected to contribute to the administrative expenses of the organization.

It may also be worth noting, as indicated in the last note to the tables, that the amount paid or available is over eighty per cent of the total authorized or in process of authorization for UNRRA. With the completion of the second contribution of the United States of America, Australia and New Zealand, this percentage will be raised to almost ninety-five per cent.

The statistical information follows:

Operating and Administrative Contributions of Governments Members of UNRRA Authorized or in Process, by Country as of March 31, 1946
(In U.S. Dollar Equivalents)

Country	Total	Paid or Available	In Process—Due in 1946
Contributions—Total	$3,670,799,021	$2,973,638,423	$697,160,598
Contributions of Non-invaded Countries (Operating and administrative)—Total	3,656,465,110	2,967,328,423[h]	689,136,687
Australia	76,800,000[a]	38,400,000	38,400,000
Bolivia	108,238[b]	31,746	76,492
Brazil	30,195,000[b]	20,000,000	10,195,000
Canada	138,738,738[a]	138,738,738	....
Chile	2,179,312[b]	....	2,179,312
Colombia	2,427,312[b]	1,219,907	1,207,405
Costa Rica	406,500[b]	97,718	308,782
Cuba	6,061,000[b]	1,235,000	4,826,000
Dominican Republic	1,400,000[a]	1,400,000	....
Ecuador	156,500[b]	——	156,500
Egypt	4,346,833[b]	70,000	4,276,833
El Salvador	135,250[b]	8,750	126,500
Guatemala	15,250[bc]	8,750	6,500
Haiti	55,250[b]	48,750	6,500
Honduras	115,000[b]	58,750	56,250
Iceland	1,409,306[ab]	1,402,806	6,500
India	24,562,072[b]	24,042,072	520,000
Iran	338,100[b]	....	338,100

Operating and Administrative Contributions of Governments Members of UNRRA Authorized or in Process, by Country as of March 31, 1946—Continued

Country	(In U.S. Dollar Equivalents) Total	Paid or Available	In Process—Due in 1946
Iraq	231,250[b]	17,500	213,750
Liberia	20,250[b]	18,750	1,500
Mexico	3,692,500[b]	1,148,000	2,544,500
New Zealand	16,952,000[a]	8,476,000	8,476,000
Nicaragua	135,250[b]	128,750	6,500
Panama	415,250[b]	142,083	273,167
Paraguay	44,949[b]	18,649	26,300
Turkey	[d]	....	....
Peru	1,032,500[b]	646,538	385,962
Union of South Africa	18,265,000[b]	4,130,000	14,135,000
United Kingdom	624,650,000[a]	624,650,000	....
U.S.A.	2,700,000,000[a]	2,100,000,000	600,000,000
Uruguay	546,000[b]	505,000	41,000
Venezuela	1,030,500[b]	684,166	346,334
Contributions of Invaded Countries—Total[e]	14,333,911	6,310,000	8,023,911
Belgium	305,000	175,000	130,000
Byelorussian S.S.R.	65,000	....	65,000
China	1,525,000	875,000	650,000
Czechoslovakia	515,000[f]	385,000[f]	130,000
Denmark	5,293,161[f]	18,750	5,274,411[f]
Ethiopia	15,250	8,750	6,500
France	1,300,000[g]	1,300,000[g]	....
Greece	152,500	87,500	65,000
Luxembourg	15,250	8,750	6,500
Netherlands	475,500	262,500	195,000
Norway	91,500	52,500	39,000
Philippines	15,250	8,750	6,500
Poland	1,355,000[f]	1,225,000[f]	130,000
Ukrainian S.S.R.	195,000	....	195,000
U.S.S.R.	2,790,000	1,750,000	1,040,000
Yugoslavia	243,500[f]	152,500[f]	91,000

[a] Includes both first and second contributions.
[b] Council's administrative allocation for 1946 included pending government's legislative action.
[c] No operating contribution authorized as of 31st March, 1946.
[d] Amount of contribution not determined as of 31st March, 1946.
[e] Excludes payments in local currencies to defray local expenses of UNRRA missions.
[f] Includes value of contributed supplies.
[g] Includes advance payment of $80,000.
[h] The amount paid or available is over 80 per cent of the total authorized or in process. With the completion of the second contribution of the U.S.A., Australia and New Zealand, this percentage will be raised to almost 95 per cent.

MILK

INQUIRY AS TO SUMMER SUBSIDY RATE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. CHARLTON (Brant): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Owing to representations made by the Milk Producers' Association and the increased costs of production, would the minister not consider continuing throughout the summer months the winter rates of subsidy on milk?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The question which has just been put by the hon. member has been submitted to me, and one has also been put on my desk by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Sinnott) relating to the same matter. I think I should answer both at the same time. The question put by the hon. member for Springfield reads:

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Will the hon. Minister of Agriculture restore the 55 cent milk subsidy to dairy producers?

The position in regard to milk subsidies is that a subsidy is paid both in the winter and summer months. There is a subsidy on whole milk of 55 cents in winter and 35 cents in the summer months. The time at which the change is made is 12 o'clock on the night of the 30th day of April to cover the new dairy year. There has been no change made this year, so that the suggestion here that we restore the 55 cents milk subsidy is scarcely an accurate way of stating the position. The order governing the subsidies has been exactly the same for the last two years, and the new order will make it the same for the next twelve months. In other words it is just a seasonal reduction from 55 to 35 cents.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that if there are to be seasonal subsidies there is no possibility of having the same subsidy in the

summer months as in the winter months. To ask anyone to continue the winter subsidy into the summer months would be asking something illogical if we are to base the decision on production costs

There may be some reason for saying that we should have a flat subsidy throughout the year. In that event we would have to take into consideration winter costs of production as well as summer costs and average the two to arrive at the proper figure for a subsidy for the whole twelve months. In giving consideration to this matter, which I have already said the government intends to do, it will not be a question of returning in the summer months to the winter subsidy, but it will be the question whether we should have a flat rate throughout the year and in determining that question consideration would have to be given to both winter and summer production costs to arrive at an average figure.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister spoke of the costs of production in the summer months as compared with the winter months, but is it not a fact that the production costs this summer to the farmer will be higher than they have been in other summers?

Mr. GARDINER: That is a question that would have to be considered in arriving at a figure. There are two different groups of producers of whole milk. One is part of the group living close to cities, and this group place emphasis on the importance of winter production. They breed their stock and conduct their whole business with the idea of supplying milk at a time when the costs are high. I understand that this group will not be satisfied with a flat rate throughout the whole year, so there has to be a discussion with both groups—those who want a higher winter rate and those who want a flat rate throughout the year. I have some doubt whether any decision would satisfy both groups.

Mr. GRAYDON: You could increase both rates.

TIMBER CONTROL

SHORT SUPPLY OF LUMBER IN PRAIRIE PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. W. BURTON (Humboldt): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Reconstruction, notice of which has been sent to his office. Is he aware that the timber controller has offered further inducements to the saw mills operating in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia to ship lumber beyond the prairie provinces? Secondly, what reason has the timber controller to justify the further depletion—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member knows that the rules do not permit him, in asking a question on the orders of the day, to make a statement. If he wishes to put a question, it must be brief and to the point.

Mr. BURTON: I would ask the minister what justification there is for further depleting the present short supply of lumber in the prairie provinces.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to put his question on the order paper.

Mr. BURTON: Is all of my question ruled out, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked the hon. member to put his question on the order paper.

HOUSING

APPLICATION OF ACT TO FARMERS AND RESIDENTS OF TOWNS AND VILLAGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): I would like to ask the Minister of Reconstruction a question. Will he indicate to the house the arrangements which have been made to enable farmers and residents of towns and villages to take advantage of part 3 of the National Housing Act? The question was asked by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson) of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) when he was responsible for national housing. Since then the Prime Minister has tabled P.C. 1513, of April 16, vesting in the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) the responsibility for housing.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): I shall be glad to accept the question as a notice and give a reply to-morrow or Monday.

WHEAT

BONUS FOR SHIPMENTS OVERSEAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether he has yet had an opportunity to discuss with his colleagues the question of paying to the farmers a bonus of 30 cents a bushel on wheat for immediate delivery so that it may be shipped overseas, and if so, what the decision is in this regard?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, when there is a statement to be made on the point raised by my hon. friend it will be made in this house.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

NATIONALITY, NATURALIZATION AND STATUS OF ALIENS

The house resumed from Tuesday, April 30, consideration in committee of bill No. 7, respecting citizenship, nationality, and naturalization and status of aliens—Mr. Martin—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee last sat it was considering amendments to section 10 moved by the hon member for Eglinton:

That section 10 (1) (c) be amended by inserting after the word "war" in line 25, the following words:

"or is a British subject within the meaning of section 28."

Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. MARTIN: Before proceeding, I think this might be the appropriate place—I was waiting until we finished with subsection 1—to say that I intend to introduce an amendment to provide for a new subsection 2. As the committee will recall, in my opening statement I said that I should be glad to listen to suggestions from all sides of the house, and after listening to the debate and giving some consideration to the matter, I should like to offer an amendment to section 10 to provide that the requirement as to British subjects going before a judge and making a declaration and so on shall be dispensed with. The situation now will be that, the necessary period of residence having been complied with, a British subject will merely make an application to the Secretary of State, and if the department is satisfied as to the declaration the certificate will issue. It is felt however that in certain doubtful cases there should be the right to refer the declaration and the application to a proper officer for consideration. The situation will be, therefore, that British subject applicants shall not be subjected to the normal ceremony provided for in the bill in so far as it applies to other groups. As to the actual terms of the amendment, I will disclose them after subsection 1 has been dealt with, but I thought I should tell the committee ahead of time that that is the proposal.

Mr. GREEN: Will it be necessary for that British subject to take the oath of allegiance?

Mr. MARTIN: Oh, yes. He will take the oath of allegiance as the governor general has done, as we all do, as all members of parliament do. But he will do it simply by signing a document.

Mr. GREEN: There will be no appearance in court at all?

[Mr. MacKinnon.]

Mr. FLEMING: The amendment to be proposed is as to subsection 2; is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN: It will be a new subsection 2. The present subsection 2 will become subsection 3.

Mr. FLEMING: It will be an entirely new provision?

Mr. MARTIN: It is a new subsection.

Mr. FLEMING: Will the minister indicate whether he intends to dispense with the residence requirements in subsection 1 (c)?

Mr. MARTIN: The situation will merely be that a British subject who wants to become a citizen of Canada under the law, and who will continue at the end of one year, as now, to have the right to vote, the right to civil service employment, the right to pension, all the rights he has now, if at the end of the period he will simply write on a special form to the department of the Secretary of State, that certificate will be issued to him.

Mr. FLEMING: But he still will not be a citizen?

Mr. MARTIN: Any rights he has now will be continued.

Mr. MacNICOL: If he does not write in and ask for a certificate of citizenship, what will be his status?

Mr. MARTIN: Obviously if he does not write in, nobody has the opportunity of knowing of his existence.

Mr. MacNICOL: He still would be able to have all the prerogatives—

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. I thank my hon. friend for asking that question. He will have the right to vote, the right to an appointment in the civil service, all the rights he enjoys now, whether he applies for it or not. That has always been and will continue to be the situation.

Mr. BOUCHER: Will the privileges that a British subject in Canada now has be extended to members of the commonwealth who enter Canada later under the same conditions? In other words, does it just happen to those who are now in Canada?

Mr. MARTIN: No. With regard to those who are now in Canada, with regard to all British subjects now in Canada, on the passage of this act they are automatically affected just as is the hon. member himself. They do not have to do anything.

Mr. GREEN: Is it not a fact that they must have been here for five years before they can be in that position?

Mr. MARTIN: Oh, yes; that is the law now.

Mr. GREEN: If they have been here only four years and eleven months they are not in the same position as we are?

Mr. MARTIN: That is right. The law is the same as it has been for twenty-seven years, under a provision introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden.

Mr. FLEMING: The minister is begging the same old question.

Mr. BRYCE: I have been listening, but it gets more complicated. I am a layman and I do not follow this lawyer's argument. I was an immigrant thirty years ago. Had I come in after this bill was passed, would I have the same status as I have through coming here before, and if I were living here would I get Canadian citizenship papers at once, or only after five years' residence in Canada?

Mr. MARTIN: Take the specific case. If the hon. gentleman came in after the passage of this bill, then in one year, as a British subject, he would have the right to vote. Under this bill that right is confirmed. He would also have under this bill the right to any privilege which a British subject now enjoys.

Mr. POULIOT: The only difference is that his passport will indicate, I presume, that he is a Canadian citizen.

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. POULIOT: A British subject who comes here and has not been here a year would also have a passport describing him as a British subject.

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. POULIOT: And therefore the only difference between the two would be the description in the passport according to their liking. One would be here for a year and he would be described as "Canadian citizen", and if less than a year, he would be described as "British subject".

Now I will ask another question of the minister. If a British subject comes here and stays here more than a year, will he be bound to accept a passport describing him as a Canadian citizen, or will he be allowed to have a passport describing him as a British subject?

Mr MARTIN: The situation continues as at present.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes. Therefore there is no change. I wonder why some hon. members are so bitter about it, and others so enthusiastic. Why be bitter against nihil and be enthusiastic for nihil? It is shadow-boxing. I thought there was something in it until the minister said that there was no change. It is a compilation, the same as the revised statutes, where the commissioners have not the right to change a single provision of the law. We are in a strange position. As for me, I am a Canadian citizen and at the same time I am a British subject. When I am asked who I am I say I am a Canadian, and officially I am described as a British subject; but now, when I travel, I shall have the privilege of receiving a passport describing me as a Canadian citizen. That is all. I do not think there is anything else. Because all the gentlemen who come from all over the empire—not only those of British stock, but every British subject—will be described as a British subject. That is all. I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will not waste energy in fighting a measure which was acceptable to Sir Robert Borden, to Mr. Arthur Meighen, perhaps to Doctor Bruce, since he never objected to it when he was in the house; and Doctor Shields made no speech about it. Now I will tell the minister one thing in all candour.

Mr. MacNICOL: Doctor Shields is away in the south.

Mr. POULIOT: I was not informed as to his whereabouts.

Mr. MacNICOL: It was in the newspapers.

Mr. POULIOT: The Liberal party is an imposing group in the house. The Liberal party has the majority in the house. A small turbulent minority is always complaining about what is done—and sometimes I am one of them.

Mr. MacNICOL: Most of the time.

Mr. POULIOT: When I speak on my own behalf as a Liberal. But I am surprised that concessions should be made to appease that small and noisy crowd. And why? Why do that? Why disappoint all the supporters of the Liberal party to appease—no, not to appease but to try to appease—those who will never be appeased? It is useless. It only hurts someone's head on the rock. They are good fellows with genial dispositions, but sometimes they are bitter, and so persistent that finally concessions are made to them. Why? They build skyscrapers on pinheads and then they describe the skyline—the skyline of skyscrapers built on pinheads. Let me say this to the younger set, the younger smart set of the Progressive Conservative party: they will be astonished to know how ungrate-

ful a section of their own party is. I have here an editorial from the St. Catharines *Standard,* a Conservative paper. Some time ago I asked whether Doctor Bruce was resigning to make a hole for Mr. Meighen to fall into, and the incident is related by that great Conservative paper, which states:

> More than that, his presence in the house would stir public interest in national affairs, as it hasn't been aroused since he left the arena. John Bracken is proving a wise leader and a man of courage, but every leader needs some brilliant stars in the field. Mr. Bracken has a few now and they are more than making good, but what a team Diefenbaker and Meighen would make! They would be like Ruth and Gehrig coming up with the bases full!

An hon. MEMBER: Who was full?

Mr. POULIOT: The bases. Now, Mr. Chairman, back benchers have the same rights as front benchers, just as the British subject has the same rights as a Canadian citizen. They do their best, they work hard, but they work hard for an ungrateful crowd. The only one who is described as a brilliant star is the hon. member for Lake Centre. He outshines all the others, and to find his equal they will have to import Arthur Meighen to the House of Commons. What a tough proposition!

Mr. MacNICOL: The member for Lake Centre is brilliant, very brilliant.

Mr. POULIOT: Surely; I do not deny it. But the member for Davenport is equal to him, the member for Muskoka-Ontario is at least his equal, and the member for Vancouver-South is also his equal. I have great admiration for the gentlemen who compose the Conservative party, and I think this article is unfair. The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard—

Mr. HANSELL: Do these gentlemen come under this section?

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, yes; because they describe themselves as British subjects, and that is the subject matter of the clause. I was going to say, with reference to the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, that he was born in this country and he has less Canadian spirit than his deskmate the hon. member for Nanaimo, who was born in England.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. POULIOT: I would ask my hon. friends to listen to this.

Mr. GREEN: Be fair.

Mr. POULIOT: I will define Canadian spirit if the hon. gentleman wishes. I have the Oxford and other dictionaries. I stand by my guns. There is the hon. member for Eglinton and there is the hon. member for Kamloops. They are brilliant young men but they do not speak for the Liberal party; they do not speak for the C.C.F. group or for the Social Credit group; they do not speak for the Bloc Populaire; they do not even speak for the Conservative party, according to what was said by the St. Catharines *Standard.* I regret it on their account and it will be sufficient to make them understand that, from the point of view of their party, their efforts are fruitless.

There is something else I would say about colonialism, but if what I am going to say is granted as established and proved I will not go on. A friend of mine sent me this fine book. It is a little lighter than the other because it is printed on India paper. I am quoting from Webster's New International Dictionary.

> Colonial: Of or pertaining to a colony or colonies; specifically of or pertaining to the British colonies, especially American history, the thirteen which formed the United States of America.

It is a definition which must have been written by civil servants in Ottawa. We now come to "colony", the definition of which is very interesting. It is as follows:

> A Roman colonia, which was a subject settlement of Romans (orig. of coloni) in a newly acquired or hostile country, made originally as a means of permanent occupation.
>
> A Greek apoikia, or a settlement, nearly always independent or self-governing, of Greeks in a foreign country.
>
> A company of people transplanted from their mother country to a remote province or country, and remaining subject to the jurisdiction of the parent state; loosely, any distant territory dependent on a ruling power.

What is colonialism? It is:

> A state or quality of, or the relationship involved in, being colonial.
>
> A custom, idiom, idea, feature of government, or the like, characteristic of a colony.
>
> The colonial system or policy in industrial legislation or extension of territory.

There is nothing to insult anybody in saying of one gentleman that he is colonial, even if he does not realize it himself. The hon. member who spoke the night before last was much aggrieved by the fact that one may speak of colonials and non-Canadians. I want to make myself clear. It is only an observation that everyone has the right to make, that a man is not a Canadian in spirit, although he may be a very good citizen otherwise, and as to those who spend so much energy in defending the British empire, it is only natural to think that they would still be subject to it.

I should be interested to hear them explain their position a little better than they did on that occasion.

Mr. MacNICOL: I must say that the hon. member who has just taken his seat is always very kind to myself and to others.

Mr. POULIOT: Everybody is, and the hon. member deserves it.

Mr. MacNICOL: But I do not like to hear hon. members on this side of the house described as noisy or bitter. I do not believe that any hon. member who has spoken in this debate has had any bitterness in his heart. Hon. members may have been a little loud in their expression, but I certainly spoke without bitterness. When the minister spoke the other day he was a little warm, and perhaps he had reason to be. I have no fault to find with the minister, because he is one of the men whom I admire. I recognize his ability and the success he has made in life, which has been an example for others to follow. At the beginning of his remarks the other day he spoke of certain hon. members as being of one of two classes. I presume he was referring to me, because I had been speaking.

Mr. MARTIN: I was not referring to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am glad to hear that. I know the minister is always very kind in any reference he makes to myself; but I want to dissociate myself from either of the classes referred to by the minister as being extreme. I am only speaking for myself; others can speak for themselves. I am not one of the class of extremists, because I took the stand the other day that the five-year period was much too long to impose on a Britisher coming into this country to live. I want to address my remarks to the minister, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTIN: I am following the hon. member.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. May I ask all hon. members to address the Chair, so that all hon. members may hear what is being said.

Mr. MacNICOL: I was at the point of saying that I did not want to be placed in the class of an extremist. Personally I always try to look fairly and broadly at any matter that comes before me. Speaking the other day the minister said, as reported at page 1053 of *Hansard:*

> At one end of the scale there is the desire to reduce the qualification and procedure for non-Canadian British subjects to the minimum and to emphasize as much as possible the status of British subjects for Canadian citizens. At the other end of the scale the position is that no privileges whatever should be given to British subjects; that they should be aliens in the sight of our law and that the status of British subjects should be eliminated with regard to Canadian citizens.

Then the minister added:

> These are extreme points of view.

Because I expressed an opinion somewhat in accordance with the first point of view mentioned, I hope I am not an extremist. I am happy to see the minister shaking his head, because words do not always convey the same meaning to everybody. When the minister was speaking I felt that I was being put in with the body of extremists, and I am anything but that in anything pertaining to life.

I want a little more elucidation. I was pleased to hear the minister say what he said to-day, because it was a concession to people coming to Canada from the British Commonwealth as immigrants, namely, that they would not have to go before a judge to swear to their British allegiance, traditions and so forth. Since that remark was made I have been wondering what position they would be in if they did not take out their papers at the expiration of five years. The minister said that they would still be able to obtain old age pensions, to run for parliament and to hold office under the crown.

Mr. MARTIN: Every right they have now.

Mr. MacNICOL: Therefore they would be in the same position as I am. I cannot see how I can have any opposition to that position; it is the one they occupy to-day.

Mr. MARTIN: That is what I have been arguing all along. The hon. gentleman has stated the case quite correctly.

Mr. MacNICOL: In every way they will be in the position in which they are to-day? If I may refer to the Minister of Mines and Resources, who spoke the other evening, when he came here and had been in Canada one year he could vote, provided he had been in the riding for the stated time, two months—

Mr. MARTIN: Two months.

Mr. MacNICOL: He could run for parliament, as he did later, and could hold any office under the crown. Is that the meaning of the proposed amendment?

Mr. MARTIN: No, the amendment does not mean that. The amendment did not need to be introduced to effect that, because that is the situation regardless of the amendment I have announced.

Mr. MacNICOL: Then what does the amendment imply?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman has approached this question very constructively, and I will explain it again. First of all this bill does not change one iota the rights which British subjects have enjoyed in this country for more than twenty-seven years. That is the first point. The amendment I have introduced will simply mean that a British subject applying for a certificate of citizenship, that is documentary proof of his status for use abroad or elsewhere, will not have to go before a court to obtain that certificate except in such cases as the department may want to refer to the courts, such doubtful cases as may arise from time to time. The hon. gentleman will appreciate that many British subjects come to this country who were not necessarily born in the old country. Many come from elsewhere, such as British Honduras and so on, and it is necessary and desirable, as my hon. friend and all hon. members will recognize, that such cases should be gone into; but such cases are the exception.

Mr. MacNICOL: Suppose an immigrant from the old country, remains here for a year or two and then desires to visit the old country again, with the intention of returning to Canada. Does he have to be registered in Canada as a citizen before he can get his passport?

Mr. MARTIN: He would not get a Canadian passport at that point. He would have a British subject passport.

Mr. MacNICOL: And he could go back and forth?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: But if he wanted to go away as a Canadian citizen he would have to be registered as such, and he could not do that until the expiration of five years?

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. MacNICOL: When the minister was speaking I hoped he would go a step farther, because I do not see any difference between the position of a British subject as outlined in this bill and the position as it existed when the Minister of Mines and Resources came here. It remains the very same. What would be the advantage to the Minister of Mines and Resources, if he were to come here now, in taking out his Canadian papers at all?

Mr. MARTIN: There would be every advantage in the world. As I pointed out in my statement on second reading, and perhaps in my reply, thousands of persons come here from various parts of the commonwealth and remain for many years, but with no documentary proof whatever as to their status. As an example of what I had in mind I mentioned the daughter of a missionary in China. This gentleman was himself a Canadian citizen. He had been born in Scotland and had lived in Canada for some eight years. He was a well known clergyman in the city of Toronto, and I have no doubt is well known to the hon. member. His daughter had never lived in Canada. Under the laws of China she was a citizen of that country. Under the laws of Canada she would have been entitled to entry here like anyone else. She went to the United States to study and was taken off the train in the middle of the night with no means of proving her national status. When this bill is passed we shall be able to give her a certificate, but at present we cannot do so.

Living at the border as I do I have had not only departmental but personal experience of cases involving British subjects who lived in Canada for a long time and then went to the United States. For some reason or other they have been deported from the United States. In one case I have in mind the deportation occurred after the person had been in Canada for seventeen years. He developed a disease which made him inadmissible under the Immigration Act, and he was deported to the old country, where he had not been for something like forty-eight years. He had no documentary proof whatsoever of his status. We have business men who were born in the old country, who have come here and become part of our life, and who are then engaged to work in foreign countries. Right now in the department we have a case of a man who was born in Wales, lived in this country for about fifteen years, voted here like anyone else, and became part of the Canadian community. Under the laws of a particular South American country, because he has no documentary proof of his national status—and he has none—he is not able to stay there. One could go on giving case after case. My deputy is in front of me, and I think I can say that in our department I know of over 3,800 such cases that have occurred since 1925. In the interests of justice as well as of personal convenience it is highly desirable that these people should have documentary proof of their status, and they will now get it.

Mr. MacNICOL: I supported that principle of the bill from the time I first read it. I think it is quite right and quite in order that Canadians should have documentary proof. I was just going to say to the com-

mittee a moment ago that when the minister suggested his amendment I hoped he would go a step farther and not ask the British subject to be here five years before being able to get those papers. I just do not grasp why that is necessary. I remember what was said the other evening by the Minister of Mines and Resources about people with diseases and people not right in the head, and all that, but they can all be deported under the Immigration Act.

Mr. MARTIN: Just as an indication of what the Minister of Mines and Resources had in mind the other evening, Hon. Mr. Calder was Minister of Immigration in the government of Sir Robert Borden in 1919. Before 1910 the period was two years. In 1910 it became three years, at the request of the provinces, who have to maintain many of these institutions in which mental cases are cared for. They requested that the period be extended from two years to three, because they could not possibly cope with the problem. Then they asked the government of Sir Robert Borden to increase the period from three to five years, the period we are maintaining now. In giving an explanation Mr. Calder said, in volume II of *Hansard* for 1919, at page 1872:

> It is the intention to extend to five years, as is the case in the United States, the time during which undesirables who may get into the country, or who may prove to be undesirable after they have entered, may be deported. Heretofore the period has been only three years, but I am sure the house will agree that the extension is proper. We are going to adopt that five-year period here, not because they have it in the United States, but simply because we think it is necessary that there should be a longer period than three years in which to ascertain whether or not many of these people who get into the country are desirable.

That is the only reason we are continuing it. We are not doing anything that has not being done previously; we are simply continuing that principle. I would only point out, as the Minister of Mines and Resources pointed out so ably the other evening, that many individuals come here with diseases that are not ascertained at the time, and which medical people say cannot be ascertained. We feel that these people who have spent most of their lives elsewhere should not be saddled on our provincial institutions simply because they have been here for two, three or four years. That is the only reason for the period of five years. I can only repeat that it does not interfere with the privileges they have enjoyed up to now.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not want to worry the minister.

Mr. MARTIN: You are not worrying me.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am heartily in accord with the provision which I believe is now in the Immigration Act, that anyone coming into this country can be deported within five years if he develops a disease which if it had been observable when he made application to come here would have prevented his coming in. But I just do not grasp why this provision should be in a citizenship bill. At the time of Sir Robert Borden there was no such thing as a citizenship certificate. I am in accord with the necessity of having a citizenship paper, but I keep asking myself why the period of five years should be made applicable to Britishers by the citizenship bill. That provision is still in the Immigration Act, and I imagine it will remain there. I do not see why a man who develops a disease after five years which is attributable to some condition which existed before he came here, should have indefinite protection. As the minister has stated so well, things like this have cast a great burden upon the country. People have been admitted who should never have been admitted.

As the section is at present, as far as the five year period is concerned the Britisher is in the same position as a non-Britisher. Otherwise he is in a somewhat better position in that he does not have to go before a judge. To all intents and purposes he is a citizen, but he is not a registered citizen. I can see this section passing immediately if the period be reduced. This question of deportation is covered by the Immigration Act; I cannot understand why it is in the citizenship bill.

Mr. MARTIN: I will explain why. We regard, and I am sure the hon. member does likewise, evidence of citizenship as being a very important matter. I think it would be the most un-British thing in the world, and I am saying that with all sincerity, to say to a person, "We will give you a certificate of citizenship, but if you develop tuberculosis we are going to send you back." That is the sort of thing certain dictators have done. Once a man is given citizenship it seems to me that he should be deported only for disloyalty to the crown, fraud and other similar reasons. Once you have given a man evidence of citizenship, once you have given him a certificate which he can show to the whole world, I do not think you should be in position to deport him because of one of those things. It has been suggested that no change should be made in the Immigration Act. Under that act the causes for deportation include becoming a public charge. I know my hon. friend

would be the last in the world to suggest that we should say to a British subject, "Here is a certificate of citizenship, but if you do any one of the things provided for by the Immigration Act you can be deported in five years." To use his own words, I think that would be monstrous; it would be contrary to the whole spirit of what we call British institutions. I know that he for one would not want to subscribe to that.

There is another reason which I mentioned at the outset. Many British subjects come to this country or to Australia from outside. I am not saying that these people are not as good, because I do not believe in the superiority of races, but many who come to this country as British subjects were not born in the commonwealth. They go to England, become citizens of the United Kingdom, and then come to us later on as British subjects. Are we going to create a situation that would not only make deportation provocative but would at the same time render a man stateless? That is one of the things we have to try to avoid. There is nothing worse than a stateless individual. Unfortunately there are many of them in the world and a lot of them in this country. We hope we can rectify that.

When we come to section 21 I propose to suggest an amendment which I think will prove consistent with what I have just said. This would provide that the revocation of certificates of citizenship would be based on the strictest grounds. This should apply to all people. I have listened to this debate and I should like to say that I do not think that people who come from outside, British subjects, regard themselves as members of a superior race.

What we should try to do is to have all potential Canadian citizens on the same plane. Let them feel that if they are good enough for citizenship in this great country they should be prepared to regard themselves as being on the same level. I think that is the only way we can build up the country. I mentioned being present the other day at a ceremony in Toronto. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to commend me publicly for having gone to it. It was a ceremony at which thirty-five individuals became Canadian citizens, and I should like to give hon. members a picture of what happened. Two of them who took part in the ceremony are among the outstanding men in the medical world. One was born in Czechoslovakia. He is a graduate of Oxford university, of the university of Czechoslovakia and of Columbia university. He is one of the outstanding medical men of this country. When he became a citizen of Canada he took his place alongside thirty-four other people who also became Canadian citizens. The ceremony did not take place in a courtroom—the ceremonies we propose to hold will not take place in courtrooms—but rather in a room which was conducive to giving the applicants an impression of the kind of responsibilities and opportunities they are acquiring. That man was an eminent scientist, one of the world's eminent people who had come to this country.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is the kind we want to come here.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. I do not think there was anything belittling in that man taking his place with the others. It was an impressive thing. They were all doing the same thing, they were all taking part in the same ceremony. I should think that is preferable to encouraging the suggestion that there should be discrimination between one national group and another. That is the purpose we had behind this measure. I know when it becomes law and we are given a chance to administer it, it will do a great deal to make all potential citizens happier and perhaps more responsive to and more impressed by the opportunities and responsibilities to be found in this country.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I ask two more questions?

The CHAIRMAN: May I remind the committee that we are now considering an amendment to section 10, subsection (c). It occurred to me that it might be well to try to dispose of that amendment before continuing a general discussion on the whole section.

Mr. HACKETT: I intended to ask the minister—

The CHAIRMAN: It might expedite the proceedings of the committee if we could dispose of the amendment before continuing a general discussion on the whole section.

Mr. MacNICOL: I have two questions.

Mr. FLEMING: I take it that the point you have just raised, Mr. Chairman, is a point of order. I have the strongest possible exception to the suggestion that this amendment ought to be disposed of without discussion. The essence of the amendment is to avoid the position created by the section as it now stands, which to all intents and purposes puts the British subject from another part of the commonwealth in precisely the same position as an alien coming here and applying for citizenship. This discussion is

germane to the amendment, and I strongly urge that there should be no suggestion about disposing of the amendment in the light of the current discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member for Eglinton misunderstood me. I intended to suggest that the speeches should be with respect to the amendment in order that the amendment may be disposed of, not that we should dispose of the amendment at this minute. I was suggesting that all speeches be directed to the amendment rather than generally to the section.

Mr. CHURCH: I am very much surprised at the minister, who comes from a city in Ontario, bringing in a bill like this, with this most mischievous section 10(1). I believe it will cause more widespread disunity than anything else I know of, not only amongst the British citizens referred to in 10(1)(a) but amongst other immigrants coming here from other countries. I doubt whether the minister who has talked so much about the bill understands it himself. The minister and his officials seem to think they should be something like Mr. Byrnes in Washington, with a large department, spending money like water. And on what? On citizenship. I believe that under the British North America Act part of this bill is ultra vires, because it concerns provincial matters which cannot be changed without the consent of the province.

On the second reading of the bill I referred to a legal opinion which had been given by the privy council, under which 10(1)(a) would be declared ultra vires. It was made clear in the case of Williams v. Howarth that there is only one king ruling over the empire and not a separate king for each dominion, which this bill sets up. That case was referred to by Lord Bennett in the House of Lords, where he stated that nothing in the Statute of Westminster alters the law made clear in the case of Williams v. Howarth that there is only one king ruling over the empire. This bill attempts to alter the law regarding that and the status of a British subject. A British subject is one by origin, or by domicile, or by later choice. This bill alters the whole principle of British citizenship, and it is brought down just on the eve of an election—for don't forget, we are going to have an election next July over the dominion-provincial conference—as to who is right on it. Coming events cast their shadows before.

This bill should have gone to a committee. The flag question was sent to the committee; why was not this bill sent to a committee? As I said on the second reading of the bill, I believe section 10(1)(a) would be declared ultra vires of this parliament. This is no time to bring in such a bill. It is putting the cart before the horse. We have no mandate for passing such a bill. We should first decide on our immigration policy. When did the minister get a mandate from his constituency to bring in this bill? Who is asking for it? Are the soldiers who fought for the mother country asking for it? No. This bill is much misunderstood, it is so complex and involved. If passed it will throw a load of work on the county court judge, and ten times the number of judges will have to be appointed to deal with nothing else but citizenship.

Who is worrying about citizenship? One newspaper said it was the Orange order. I belong to that order myself, and our principles are: equal rights to all and special privileges to none. Shades of Clarke Wallace and McCarthy and John Ross Robertson and other stalwarts occupying the Conservative benches in the olden days—to think of an Ontario minister bringing in a bill like this! The people are beginning to wake up to the meaning of this bill. The largest number of those in Ontario came from Great Britain. Many of them fought and died in the defence of our country. We have also a large number of fine citizens who have come here under the law permitting aliens to enter Canada.

I would like to see this bill given the six months' hoist. Let it wait until next year. It is an insult to the British soldiers. I want to give the government credit for having done well in granting a loan to Britain. That was most admirable and they have done a good deal of good work in that connection. I want to be fair and say that. But this bill is not timely. We are now in the eighth week of the session and six weeks have been spent on secondary matters—the flag, change of status, isolationism. One hon. gentleman has told the house that those who come here from the British isles are aliens, but I can tell you this, that but for our soldiers standing by the side of the mother country at Dunkirk not only the maritime provinces but Quebec and Ontario would have been overrun by the Germans. Section 10(1) (a) is an insult to the soldiers who served overseas. I am beginning to get a little doubtful of some of our Conservative friends when I hear them talking status, autonomy, isolationism and the change of anthem and flag. One or two newspapers are referring to the Orange order, of which Sir John A. Macdonald was a member. All we see of the Orange order now on parliament hill is around the east block where compartments are marked off on the pavements with orange

paint, "Reserved—No. 1," "Reserved—No. 2," "Reserved—No. 3", indicating parking areas for east block officials.

I have seen what some of the British newspapers are saying about section 10(1) (a). It is an insult to the British people coming to this country. This particular section is of no more value than some of the other clauses. Section 10(1) encircles, so to speak, every other section in the bill. It is a sort of omnibus section. In my opinion it is a gesture to certain influences, to the foreign-born against the British-born. It is, of course, a political bill and is designed as such. In my opinion it is also a most mischievous bill, and has caused a lot of discussion in the old land. It puts us as Canadians in much the same position as when, in 1887, in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's day, we were first in the diamond jubilee procession and the last dominion to send a contingent to the South African war. That movement was opposed on all sorts of grounds. It was said to be against the British North America Act, against the constitution, perhaps against the Immigration Act. But these arguments did not appeal to the loyal people of this country, who, fortunately, are not all in one political party. They decided this particular issue once and for all, as Sir John Macdonald expressed it years ago.

I may tell the government that I felt some annoyance, although my feeling was more of sorrow than of anger, against the minister for inserting in his bill a section like this one. Consider the effect of this and other sections referred to by the hon. member for Marquette, the Minister of Mines and Resources, who is responsible for immigration. It is an impossible bill. It is a political bill, an election bill.

In the period between the two great wars, according to a return presented to the house nearly a million of our citizens had to leave Canada and go to the United States to get employment in a new country—among them many soldiers who fought for us at the hazard of their lives.

The more I consider this bill the less I am in favour of it. Here is the return indicating the public interest in this legislation. Nobody is asking for it. I have looked through this small return and I can find no evidence that any religious denomination is in favour of it. Why is such a bill brought forward, to the exclusion of measures relating to fuel and housing and other matters of primary importance? Who is concerning himself about citizenship? The subject is largely a provincial one, although the federal power has jurisdiction over naturalization and immigration laws.

This bill should go to a committee, as the flag bill did. We hear all about citizenship on a public holiday, but hon. members seem to be afraid of it. Civic holiday is set aside in nearly all the provinces to discuss citizenship and the elements which make a good citizen.

I am very much surprised at the principle of the bill. It will do untold harm. Section 10 is an illustration of putting the cart before the horse. The first thing to do before having any citizenship bill is to decide by an immigration policy who shall come to the country now that the war is over. The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, in an admirable speech the other day, alluded to opinions on all sides of the house as to what constitutes a good Canadian. As regards hon. members, they are all good Canadians or they would not be elected to the House of Commons.

I say to the government that this bill should be withdrawn, or it should stand over for a year. The government has no mandate to pass one section of the bill. It was not discussed in the last election, either in my constituency or in any other so far as I know. Why should it be sprung on the house at the present time, when so many pressing questions are before us?

Finally, it seems to me that this matter is one for the dominion-provincial conference. It deals with perhaps the most important matter which can come before them, namely immigration. What is the sort of citizenship they want? Whom do they want in this country?

This bill will do untold harm in the old country. I have talked with hundreds of soldiers returning from the present war, and that is their opinion. People from the old land will go as immigrants to Australia, or to New Zealand, to countries where they will be welcomed. We are told what South Africa is doing. But what have we to do with South Africa? The South African union will not even give the black man a vote, and what they want is a republic; they are for isolation and separation. Are we to imitate a dominion like that?

Under the law, once a British subject always a British subject, but the whole policy under international law affecting domicile will have to be rewritten in the light of this bill. The law regarding domicile of origin, domicile of choice and the rest, all the law books and all the case law will have to be reviewed and revised. This measure is another of the offspring of that mischievous empire-wrecking act known as the statute of Westminster. In New Zealand and Australia they recognized the Statute of Westminster only in part; they were exempted from

several clauses of it. They would not assent to the measure, and if they have signed it, they have done so only recently.

What I have to say about this clause is generally applicable to all other sections of the bill. If a six months' hoist is proposed I will vote for it. I certainly will not agree that the opposition throw out a lifeline to the government all the time. It is the duty of the opposition to give constructive criticism, but I should be the last to throw out any more lifelines to the present government on a policy of isolationism, of separatism, and the rest. I can tell you, nobody is worrying about this sort of legislation at the present time. It is not status, sovereignty, or autonomy that people are interested in. The soldiers are looking for jobs, houses and fuel; yet here we are, spending days and days on this particular bill. I protest against it. I believe the whole bill should go to a committee and be given the six months' hoist, if it does go to those in another place. It would give them a chance to stage a comeback. While ordinarily they do very little work, they have here a chance to stage a come-back by throwing three or four bills of this kind out the window and the front door.

Mr. BROWN: I should like to add another note to this chorus, and I am sure it will not cause any discord. Section 10, subsection 1 (f) requires the court to satisfy itself of the knowledge of applicants of the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship. This can be read in conjunction with sections 37 and 38, where it is provided that certain facilities are to be set up to instruct applicants in the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship. In the United States provision is made for such ceremonies and instruction. I should like to pay tribute to His Honour A. J. Gordon, of the city of Windsor, who for some time has been making provision for such ceremonies on the admission to citizenship of persons making application for it. In addition to this, being from Windsor, where probably we are a little more advanced than some other parts, because Windsor is in the constituency of Essex West—

Mr. MacNICOL: A large part of it is in Essex East.

Mr. BROWN: No, I am sorry: Essex West is not in Essex East.

Mr. MARTIN: Essex East is the governing factor.

Mr. BROWN: Essex East, I quite agree is the governing factor—in Essex East. But to get back to my theme. We have there classes of instruction, and I should like to pay a tribute to Mrs. Lois E. Hamilton, who is a member of Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire. She has compiled a book which is used in giving instruction. In the United States there is provision for instruction, and a textbook is provided. One book I have in my hand gives in very simple story and outline certain phases of government. Mrs. Hamilton has compiled a book known as the Citizenship Textbook.

Mr. MARTIN: A very good one, too.

Mr. BROWN: It was compiled for the Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire, and in that book, by picture, by map, by story, by question and answer, given in a readable, simple and understandable way, she has conveyed to her readers the fundamentals of our citizenship. By profession Mrs. Hamilton is a nurse, but as a public service she has compiled this book. They hold classes for applicants for citizenship. These classes convene once a week for two hours and are under the supervision of accredited public school teachers. At present there are about thirty-five in each class.

There is one part of that textbook which I think would be applicable not only to those who are applying for naturalization and Canadian citizenship but to those who now say they have citizenship, those who were born in this country or who have been naturalized. May I give to the house and to the people of Canada a short resume of what is set forth in that book. Let me quote from page 11:

> A citizen in a democracy has both duties and responsibilities. He must not sit down quietly and allow the affairs of state to go on without feeling that he has a duty to perform.
>
> The first duty of a citizen is to try to understand as well as he can our system of government, and to keep himself informed as to all the important acts of those who are in authority. Just as an engineer must know and understand the machinery under his control, so a Canadian, to be a good citizen, must know and understand the government under which he lives. Citizenship is not a condition into which a person is born, but is like a profession or a trade which must be learned.
>
> Secondly, to be a good Canadian citizen, you must not only be obedient to the laws of the country, but must actively participate in the governing of the country by voting intelligently and wisely,—

Probably Liberally.

> —and by knowing and appreciating the work and methods of government. Laws affect each and every individual, but each and every individual has a share in choosing what laws shall be made, and only by voting intelligently and wisely can the individual meet the heavy responsibilities which democratic government imposes on him.
>
> A third duty incumbent on you as a citizen is to be ready to assist, as far as you are able, all good causes. Never oppose them by speaking ill

of them, or by making them objects of ridicule. One of these causes is the thorough education of all citizens. It is the common every-day people that make the governments, good or bad. The most important of all causes, which you should support, is that of religion. A nation that scoffs at religion is in grave peril. Nothing can be found to take its place in the life of the people.

The last duty of a citizen is to endeavour to lessen the cruelty of our civilization. It would be well, if each day, everyone would think of the cruel things they have seen done, or that they themselves have done and then try to discover how much of the suffering thus caused might have been prevented. If such a course were followed, there is no doubt, we should soon have a bright and happy world.

I commend that not only to those who are attending classes to be instructed in citizenship, but to the members of this house and to the people of Canada generally.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Chairman, may I thank the two hon. members who have applauded. I intervene in this debate for the first time to occupy only five or six minutes. Perhaps I should make an exception to that, because I very rudely interrupted the minister the other night, and therefore I should make allowance for that.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman's interruption was not rude.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Thank you. I have been trying to find out just what all this is about, and if I interpret the minister's remarks correctly, leaving aside for the moment the use of the words "Canadian citizen", it is nothing more than the formalizing of an existing state of law which we have had for twenty-seven years. That is my interpretation of what he has said, and may I say that my view coincides with his in that regard.

The fact, though, that something has been in existence for twenty-seven years does not make it sacrosanct or anything like that, because evolution is change, and laws change. Laws occasionally should be changed. Somebody tells me that governments, too, change. I am not very good at wishful thinking, but perhaps there is something in that.

I turn to the one thing which I think seems to have been dividing us, and it is this question of the treatment of British subjects from other places in the British commonwealth of nations. Looking at that, I am quite unable to see the validity of the objection to the suggestion we make. Remember, that is not said critically, and I am not going to be that way. I am hoping to make a suggestion which may be of some value.

It is a fact of law and of moral conduct that we treat our partners rather better than we treat persons who have not that relationship with us. The basis of the whole law of partnership is mutual trust, and I am not suggesting that as among these nations it would go so far as to permit an individual to do something which would be a contract for the whole. But we have all been proud of this partnership. We have talked about it; we have talked about the invisible bonds, and so on, that have kept us together; and it does seem to me that in that very idea of partnership, which we have all of us acclaimed, there is reason for somewhat different treatment of persons coming to our shores from other parts of the commonwealth from the treatment we accord those who are aliens to begin with.

I am pleased to congratulate the minister on what he granted at the opening of the discussion to-day, and it is in that same spirit that I congratulate the hon. member for Eglinton on his speech the other day, which I have just read, in which he conceded, as he should have done, that after a period of five years' deportation might take place. In answering the hon. member for Davenport a moment ago the minister thought it was not inconceivable, and copying my hon. friend's large word, that it might be interpreted as monstrous. I tried to examine that. What does it mean? It simply means that a person gets a certificate of citizenship, which he had not in a formal document but which he had in fact in times gone by, because after a year's residence here a British subject voted and was entitled to appointment to the civil service. In fact I can think of no right whatever he did not have that I have, for example, and I was born in this country. I may be wrong about that, but I do not think so. I am quite prepared to join the club which the hon. member for Broadview spanked a few moments ago. I am quite prepared to join the club of spankees. I thoroughly believe that that as men of an earlier day said *civis Romanus sum*, so *civis Canadensis sum* is worth saying and worth believing. If ever a bill should come before this House of Commons with the unanimous consent of its members, it is this one. When we in this chamber presume to make these words mean something, presume to give people certificates so that they can say: "This is what I am in this world," we should do all we can, even more than we think we can, to try to find unanimity. If we cannot find unity in this matter how can we expect persons not of this gathering to find unity when we preach it to them? I say this to the minister, in the best spirit I know: Maintain your provisions in the Immigration Act. They are sound.

It is obvious that no inquiring body, no police force, if you like, can check up and find in one year the necessary history of all those who have been criminals or have criminal tendencies. It may well be that at the ports our doctors miss some illnesses and diseases, and certainly time is required to make inquiries. What I am asking from the minister, in the spirit of compromise, is that, to use his own words, we continue what we have always had with the people from the different parts of the commonwealth; to permit them to formalize themselves with us as Canadian citizens at the end of one year.

I cannot understand why the suggestion is opposed. It is taking nothing from anybody, not a single thing. I am one of those who believe in no hyphens. Surely the association with countries speaking the same language, with similar institutions and so forth, would permit the minister and the government, and I hope all members of this house to say: "Yes, this we will do." Then indeed we can go out and say that we have done something for this country. Then indeed we can have pride in our citizenship. We can say: "Here is my certificate; I am a Canadian citizen."

Mr. GARDINER: I have not so far taken any part in this discussion, and I do not think I should do so now were it not that I should like to make a similar appeal to that which has just been made by the hon. member for Calgary West.

First of all I should like to say a word in reply to one suggestion made by the hon. member for Broadview, to the effect that we have no mandate to be discussing this question at the present time. At the beginning of last session, the first session following the last election, I made it plain that so far as I was concerned I had a mandate on this question. One who has a majority so small as mine can probably speak in terms of a mandate with much greater authority than one who has a larger majority. I am quite sure there were more than fourteen people in my constituency who voted for me on the understanding that I believed that a person born in Canada, or one who had lived in Canada for a certain period of time and had been naturalized, should be in a position to call himself a Canadian citizen and have legal authority for so doing. Therefore, on that point I think it will be agreed that I at least have a mandate to come before this committee and say that a bill of this kind ought to be passed.

I recall that when I made that statement on the address in reply to the speech from the throne at the last session, the remark was more loudly applauded from all sides of the house than any other remark I have made in this house during the last two sessions.

The statement was made that when a person goes into court or anywhere else and is asked what country he is a citizen of, or what his nationality is, he ought to be in a position to say that he is a Canadian, and should not be compelled to go any farther in stating his nationality. That, I say, was applauded on all sides of the house; therefore I think we can all assume that we have a mandate to discuss this question at this particular time and to express our views on a bill of this kind. To me it is just as important as some of the other matters which were referred to by the hon. member for Broadview.

May I now come back to the point I had in mind, that of British citizenship or British subject. I have found it rather difficult to determine in my own mind—and I have not yet been convinced that it is correct—that any British subject had to be in this country a year before he became a Canadian. My understanding is a British subject has always been a Canadian on arrival in this country. He became a Canadian on the day he arrived. For that reason I cannot see any difference in principle between the amendment which says that a man should remain here a year, and the bill itself which says that a man should remain here for five years before he obtains a certificate. The principle is the same in both cases. It is simply a matter of time, and it does not affect his rights as a Canadian citizen. In order to emphasize that point may I read paragraph (c) of section 29 of the elections act:

> 29. Save as in this act otherwise provided, every person, male or female, shall be qualified to vote at the election of a member, who, not being an Indian ordinarily resident on an Indian reservation,
>
> (c) has ordinarily resided in Canada for at least twelve months and in the electoral district wherein such person seeks to vote for at least two months immediately preceding the issue of the writ of election.

That applies to me as a native born Canadian just as much as it applies to a British subject born in Britain. If I go out of this country and remain away for two years or five years and then come back, I must reside in the constituency for the twelve months immediately preceding the election before I can vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Two months.

Mr. GARDINER: In Canada for twelve months and in the constituency for the two months immediately preceding the election.

That is, I must reside in this country, whether in that constituency or somewhere else, for twelve months, and in the constituency for two months before I can vote. In other words when I, a native-born Canadian, return I am in exactly the same position as the British subject coming here for the first time.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): If the minister will permit a question, I noticed that all the lawyers here agreed with him, but I do not. I think, and in fact I am sure, that you can go away for a year or two years, but if that absence is temporary your domicile remains right where it was, and you do not need to spend a year in Canada after you come back in order to vote in an election. Otherwise how would any of our students at universities be able to vote?

Mr. GARDINER: Let us take the case of a man who is known by everyone in this house. I refer to Mr. Weston, who was a Canadian-born British subject and who went to Britain where he ran for the British House of Commons.

Mr. HACKETT: And he became domiciled there.

Mr. GARDINER: He became a member of the British House of Commons, and then came back to this country. I take it he must live here for twelve months before he can vote in an election.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Quite right, because he changed his domicile.

Mr. GARDINER: I am assuming I get a job and go to Britain where I intend to stay, but that after five years I do not like it and come back to this country. I have to live here for a year before I can vote, and the British subject is in exactly the same position. In other words, as soon as a man comes here from another part of the British empire and settles in this country he has all the rights I have as a Canadian; he has to simply live out his domicile in a certain area in order to attain certain rights, just as I would have to do. If I transfer my residence from the province of Saskatchewan to the province of Ontario I must live here for a certain length of time before I can assume the ordinary rights of citizenship in this province, and the same thing is true throughout the empire. So I repeat that in principle if we say in this bill that a man must be here for twelve months we are doing the same as if we say that he must be here for five years before he can get a certificate of citizenship, and it is simply a matter of time. In the one case you do not get your certificate for five years, and in the other case you do not get it for one year. But there is no difference within the five years as to what you can do as a citizen.

Having said that, may I say that I would have been inclined to agree with some of the arguments put forth, particularly by the hon. member for Vancouver South, in regard to the section as it was originally drafted, in connection with the provision that a British subject must go before a court in order to obtain his certificate. To my mind that would have been changing the principle that has applied in the past to British subjects coming to this country. But since the minister has indicated his willingness and his desire to bring in an amendment eliminating that procedure, it seems to me the only thing now involved in the question under discussion is the point raised by the amendment in regard to the granting of a certificate at the end of one year, as opposed to the five-year provision contained in the bill itself. On that question I think the point raised the other evening by the Minister of Mines and Resources, in his capacity as administrator of the Immigration Act, is well taken, namely that the five-year period is necessary in order to determine certain matters in relation to sending people out of this country I do not like to use the term "deportation" in connection with British subjects, any more than I would care to use it in connection with a person who is sent from one province to another. If I go from the province of Saskatchewan to the province of Ontario, and within a certain period of time become a public charge or have to be sent to a provincial institution, I am liable to be sent back to the province of Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, even within a province we make arrangements to send people back to their original municipalities when they become public charges. So I do not see that it affects a man's citizenship as a British subject if he is required to go back to Britain, or to Australia, because when he came here he had certain shortcomings or certain physical deficiencies which made it necessary for him to be looked after by the state in which he is or from which he came.

As I understand the remarks of the hon. member for Eglinton and the hon. member for Calgary West, they have no objection to the five-year term being applied in such cases. If I read and interpret the bill properly it simply means now, that a British subject is not required to go before a court in order to establish his right to a certificate, that he is given an absolute right to a certificate if he applies for it at the end of five years, and

that this section simply places a definite limitation on the time within which he can be sent back to Great Britain or Australia or whereever he may have come from. After he has come here he has only to prove that he has been here for five years; then he gets his certificate, and any attempt to deport him or send him out of the country after that time is met by the fact that he has established by certificate his position as a Canadian, and that therefore no one has any right to send him out of the country.

With the amendment that has been moved this afternoon I think we can all get together. I agree with the hon. member for Calgary West that there will be no measure before this house in connection with which it would be more important that we should have unanimity than this measure. For a long time in Canada we have had discussions with regard to citizenship. Those discussions have caused divisions among us. If we could put through this house in a manner satisfactory to all a bill dealing with matters that are of importance to us, it would be to the benefit of this country and would greatly improve our postion in future. With so little difference between us, as to whether a man should wait until the end of the five-year period before it would be impossible for him to be sent back to the country from which he came for treatment or because of anything he had done before coming here, I should think we might agree and have this bill go through unanimously. I do not think there is enough difference to warrant pressing the amendment. I would hope that in the light of the amendment which it has been suggested the Secretary of State will move to follow the passage of this section it might be possible to withdraw the amendment of the hon. member for Eglinton.

There has been a helpful discussion of the whole issue, and if it is desired to discuss it farther it might be discussed from different points of view, but I think it would be wise in the interests of all concerned that the amendment to this section should not be voted upon. After having had a discussion and after having had the amendment which has been proposed and which really takes the substance out of any criticism there was before, I think we could accept the section unanimously and go on to the next.

Mr. HANSELL: I was pleased to hear the minister make the announcement that he was going to propose an amendment. It has not been presented to us yet and we do not know the wording.

Mr. GARDINER: I understood the amendment was read by the minister.

Mr. MARTIN: I did not read the amendment; I stated what was in it.

Mr. HANSELL: I was pleased with the minister's explanation because it overcomes any objections that I have. I am wondering if it would not be well, now that we are talking about procedure, if we let the present section stand so that we can go forward with the bill and have the minister's amendment. We could then come back to the section and perhaps there would not be any trouble in disposing of it then. I am making that suggestion.

I am quite satisfied with the minister's explanation. As the section would have stood I pictured British people coming into this country and having the embarrassment of having to go before courts the same as those who are becoming naturalized. I can think of cases where that would involve considerable embarrassment. One particular case is that of a family who came to this country many years ago and who in turn raised a family here. The mother and father went back to England just after the first great war. The father died and the mother expects to return. I can see considerable embarrassment to that lady when she returns to Canada to be with her family if she has to go before a court of law in order to be declared a Canadian citizen. According to the minister's explanation, that would not be necessary. I believe that the government should reserve the right, if upon application certain documentary evidence is not satisfactory, of conducting a further investigation, even to the point of having the party appear before a judge. I make the suggestion that it might speed up things a little if we allowed the section to stand until the minister could present his amendment.

Mr. MARTIN: Although it is not strictly in accordance with the rules, I think I had better read the amendment to the committee so that we can have it before us. We have had a lot of discussion and I do not think a postponement of the section would help greatly. I am suggesting that section 10 be amended, first, by inserting a new subsection 2 which would read as follows—

Mr. HACKETT: Does that replace the subsection 2 that is in already?

Mr. MARTIN: The present subsection 2 would become subsection 3. The new subsection I am introducing would take the place of subsection 2.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I think we should deal with the amendment that is before the committee. The minister's amendment is really a later amendment.

Mr. GRAYDON: He is not moving it.

Mr. MARTIN: It is not strictly in accordance with the rules and that is why I did not read it earlier. It might facilitate the discussion and the passage of the section if I gave the details of the new subsection. I am in part following the constructive suggestion of the hon. member for Macleod. It is as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection one of this section, the minister may grant a certificate of Canadian citizenship to any person who is not a Canadian citizen but who is a British subject and who makes to the minister a declaration that he desires such certificate and who satisfies the minister that he possesses the qualifications prescribed; provided that in any case where, in the opinion of the minister, there is doubt as to whether the applicant possesses the said qualifications, the minister before granting such certificate may refer the declaration and the material in support thereof to the court in the judicial district in which the declarant resides, and it shall thereupon be dealt with as an application under subsection one of this section.

I think that meets the point to which my hon. friend referred.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I rise to make a brief comment on the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture, but in particular to reecho what was said by the hon. member for Calgary West, and indeed also by the Minister of Agriculture. This bill at its inception had every chance of being carried unanimously and our whole purpose has been to try to eradicate differences in order that there may be a common feeling of unanimity. That is most desirable.

First of all, I should like to comment upon one remark made by the Minister of Agriculture who said that it was just a matter of time. Time is an important element, and I might tell a story that I heard the other day about a professor of geology who was asked to make a speech before the inmates of a penitentiary I believe at Stony Mountain, for their edification. He dealt with his own profession and described the geological formation of the Churchill river and how it had changed through the years. He said that these changes had taken some hundreds of years, but that in the contemplation of geologists a thousand years were really no more than one day. A vote of thanks was moved by one of the convicts who said that he was certainly glad that the judge who sentenced him was not a geologist who would think of a thousand years as being just one day.

I submit to the Minister of Agriculture that time is important in this matter. However, the thing I really rose to say was not that at all. The hon. member for Calgary West has expressed my views so well that I want merely to underline what he said. There is one point I should like to add and I believe this is an important point.

The Minister of Agriculture wisely and eloquently emphasized his belief in the need for unanimity. I think he felt, as we so often feel, that if we are to have unanimity other people will have to change their views. I am going to suggest that that is not true in this case. The hon. member for Eglinton has agreed with the provisions of the Immigration Act and we raise no question as to deportation. Besides, there is another section in this bill which also contemplates deportation.

Therefore, as I see it, the position is simply this: However much hon. gentlemen opposite, or some of them, may disagree with us in attaching importance to this, I think they realize that we are sincere. If that is so, then I put this to them, and again I am echoing what the hon. member for Calgary West has said, does this derogate in any way, however small, from the citizenship of any one who is going to be affected by the terms of the bill? If it does not, as I think it does not, then I suggest that here is a case where, by generosity or cooperation or what you will, people who have different views can accept the view which we sincerely believe to be of some importance.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I should like to say a word as one of those people about whom some of my hon. friends to my right are perturbed. I never felt that it was any hardship at all for me to wait for five years before I could be a Canadian, even though I could not then call myself a Canadian citizen. I came to this country to get a better chance than that the old world offered me. I do not see why we should not have to serve an apprenticeship in this country to show ourselves qualified and fit to become Canadians, a designation which I think stands very high in this world. I can see no reason at all why immigrants to Canada, no matter where they come from, should not all be treated on the same basis. I do not see why a person born in Scotland, the Ukraine, Germany or France should be put on a different level so far as citizenship is concerned. A knowledge and an appreciation of democracy are not confined to the people of the United Kingdom. We know that during the war certain people over there had such a poor concept of democracy that they were hanged by the neck as an object lesson to others. Democracy is not the prerogative of any one

group or nation, and I think that those who come to this country should be treated on exactly the same basis without any distinction or differentiation being made between them.

The other day I took exception to some remarks made by the hon. member for Kamloops. Speaking of the Japanese on Tuesday in this debate he said something which I admired very much. It is on page 1082 of *Hansard:*

> If, then, they stay in the country, my position would be that they must be given full rights to citizenship, much as I may disagree with the original decision to allow them to remain in the country.

That was an honest and forthright statement, especially from one who holds the views he does. But he mentioned something else, on which I should like a little enlightenment. Discussing a British subject, and the hope of arriving at a concept of world citizenship, he said:

> We have an approach to it in the concept of a British subject . . . It is a brotherhood which is shared by all the members of the empire.

We are talking about the immigration of British subjects to this country. Are hon. gentlemen to my right willing to grant to British subjects coming here from Hong Kong or India the same rights as human beings coming from the United Kingdom? If they are, they will be logical, which would be a change for them, although I would still disagree with them on this amendment.

Mr. REID: Arising out of the remarks just made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North, may I, as one coming from the old country, say a word on behalf of the British subject. I come to this parliament from the province of British Columbia, a territory which was taken over one hundred years ago by the British people. No other race in this country had anything to do with the development of British Columbia from its early days.

May I point out why we from British Columbia think as we do? When I left Scotland to better my position in life—and I am pleased and proud to say that I did benefit myself by coming to Canada, and I am proud to be a Canadian—I brought with me a love of Scotland which I still have. But this thought must be kept in mind by those who are inclined to ridicule the British stock, that were it not for the British people this country would not be a confederation and I doubt whether we would be sitting here to-day. In British Columbia, eighty per cent of the people come from the British race. They took over that territory in the first place and they have developed it all the way along with the help of British people. Hence you can understand that the people who come from that province and whose forefathers developed it think that in this year 1946 some little further consideration should be given to the British people in the matter of citizenship.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I have spoken in the long debate on this bill. I had hoped to speak on the second reading but unforeseen circumstances prevented me.

I am in a little different position from that of the two last speakers, the hon. member for Winnipeg North and the hon. member for New Westminster. I was born a Canadian, but that was purely an accident so far as I was concerned. I think the way it happened was that a certain duke in the Highlands of Scotland wanted to get his tenants off the land and start raising sheep. So that my people had no other course open to them than to go somewhere else to better their condition. They came to this country, and I imagine that they did better their condition, although they passed through some hard times.

The point I rose to make was that I do not agree with the point of view put forward by my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North. The people of the British commonwealth, a term I would rather use than the British empire, have something in common with the people of Canada because we are all a part of the British commonwealth. Consequently when people from other parts of the British commonwealth come here they come here not as foreigners from alien lands. This does not mean that they are any better than the people who come here from any other country. It is simply a recognition that they are in a different position from immigrants from countries outside the commonwealth, because in the commonwealth we all have allegiance to the same king and we are all members of the one family as it were. I see no reason in the world why we should try to alter that position. I do not think it would help us as a nation to do so, nor do I think it would be beneficial to the world in its present state.

Let me say again that I am not boasting of the fact that I am a Canadian or a British subject or anything like that because that was something with which I had nothing to do. I can only consider it my good fortune that it did happen in that way. But there are certain factors, intangible perhaps, that are important. I do not know whether the point has been made but I think it is a good one that the status of a person coming to

Canada from another part of the British commonwealth should depend upon whether, after entering this country and being here for a certain period of time, he intended to maintain domicile here and become a citizen of Canada. In that case I do not think he should necessarily have to wait for five years before being accepted into full citizenship.

Another point I wish to make is that I do not believe in the revocation of naturalization certificates. I think that when we give Canadian citizenship he or she should remain a Canadian citizen for keeps. If he breaks the law he should be treated as any other Canadian citizen who breaks the law and should be punished just as any other Canadian would be punished. To revoke his citizenship and send him back to where he came from is not the proper thing to do, in my opinion, in this enlightened age. We are here trying to create a Canadian citizenship, and I am all for that. I think the minister is to be commended for bringing in this measure so soon after taking office. I would much rather, when I visit other countries, that I visit them as a Canadian than as a British subject. Let me say again that I am casting no reflections on those who are British subjects. We should try to build up reciprocal relations between ourselves and the other parts of the British commonwealth. There are certain rights and privileges which British subjects have in Canada and which Canadians have in other parts of the commonwealth, I do not want to see them curtailed in any respect whatsoever.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): We have an amendment to section 10 (1):

That section 10 (1) (c) be amended by inserting after the word "war" in line 25, the following words:

"or is a British subject within the meaning of section 28."

Mr. GRAYDON: I desire to ask the minister some questions, and I am rather surprised, Mr. Chairman, that you are reading the amendment, because I do not think the debate is quite concluded. Unfortunately I have not been able to be here all the afternoon, and perhaps the Minister of Mines and Resources has carried out the undertaking he gave me the day before yesterday to place upon *Hansard* for each year the immigration figures from the United Kingdom to Canada. Would he mind doing that now if he has the information available?

Mr. GLEN: The hon. member for Peel asked me the other day if I could state the number of admissions during the fifteen years which I quoted, and the number of deportations during that period. I have here the statistics of immigration to Canada of British subjects from April 1, 1930, to March 31, 1945:

Immigration to Canada of British Subjects, from April 1, 1930, to March 31, 1945.

Fiscal year	From overseas	From U.S.A.	Totals
1930-31	28,144	2,938	31,082
1931-32	7,332	1,815	9,147
1932-33	3,283	1,806	5,089
1933-34	2,454	1,032	3,486
1934-35	2,408	769	3,177
1935-36	2,264	709	2,973
1936-37	2,521	742	3,263
1937-38	3,351	852	4,203
1938-39	3,831	917	4,748
1939-40	3,962	1,234	5,196
1940-41	3,428	2,064	5,492
1941-42	2,353	1,180	3,533
1942-43	2,524	1,344	3,868
1943-44	4,519	1,101	5,620
1944-45	10,564	907	11,471
Totals	82,938	19,410	102,348

Mr. GRAYDON: That is the period in which the fourteen thousand were deported?

Mr. GLEN: Yes. May I add a few remarks while I am on my feet? When I was listening to the hon. member for Calgary West, I was struck of course with the manner of his presentation; as a matter of fact, with the manner in which all hon. members have presented their views; but it also seemed to me that, in dealing with the subject from the immigration point of view, the committee has not exactly appreciated what would happen if this period of five years were abolished. Suppose it happened that an immigrant from the British isles, having all the requisite qualifications to enable him to come to this country, was admitted, and stayed for a year; if the amendment moved by the hon. member for Eglinton became the law of the land this man would be entitled to a certificate of permanent landing and citizenship. Suppose that later on, say in another two or three years, it was found that he was a criminal or otherwise came within the prohibitions of the Immigration Act and therefore liable to deportation, and suppose that then the immigration officials proposed to deport him and took the necessary proceedings; he would be able to claim, in view of the citizenship law as amended by the motion of the hon. member for Eglinton, that he could not be deported because by the latest act of the parliament of Canada he had the right of citizenship one year or so after his arrival, and that he had received his certificate, and the immigration authorities would be deprived of the power of deportation which is now contained in the Immigration Act. I think the committee will realize that in such an event a certificate of citizenship, given at

the end of one year, would need to be revoked. In many cases such as I gave in the list submitted to the committee, there was eminent reason why the persons involved should be deported because, as I pointed out, the effects on the country of procreation by persons mentally unstable created problems with which we would have to deal. Again, if a person who had been here a year was recommended for deportation, he would be in the position of not having a state elsewhere.

Mr. GREEN: Would he not still be a British subject?

Mr. GLEN: He has acquired Canadian citizenship.

Mr. GREEN: He is still a British subject.

Mr. GLEN: He is still a British subject, of course, but that does not give him the same privileges of going back to Britain as he had before.

Mr. GREEN: It does, under present British law.

Mr. GLEN: If he had Canadian citizenship and he went back to Britain he would have to comply with the requirements of the law with regard to immigrants.

Mr. GRAYDON: Has not the minister now touched upon the very point which has been raised on this side time after time, that the giving of Canadian citizenship does interfere and may sometimes derogate from the position of a British subject?

Mr. GLEN: The point I am making is that if a man who comes here is given a certificate after one year, and if the immigration authorities find him unacceptable under the provisions of the immigration law and want to deport him, they cannot do so, assuming the hon. member's amendment is passed. We would have two laws in conflict. The hon. member for Eglinton does not think it will be necessary to alter the provisions of the immigration law, but the law officers and the officers of the department are convinced that if this amendment should pass we shall have to alter the immigration law to accord with it.

Mr. FLEMING: Let us do so.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. member said he did not want that.

Mr. FLEMING: I said I did not think it was necessary, but if it is, we are all of one mind, surely.

Mr. GLEN: The hon. member has been discussing the matter from one point of view, but I am discussing it from another. I am discussing it from the point of view of immigration, and I wish to reserve and preserve the provision of the Immigration Act whereunder we can deal with undesirable citizens who come to this country, for the reasons which I have given, and which I think are satisfactory to all hon. members. But by this amendment we would be giving absolute citizenship to all immigrants after one year, and that citizenship would have to be revoked in order that they could be deported to their country of origin.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister have any objection if a provision were inserted in this bill to enable the Department of Immigration to deport, up to a period of five years, people who should be deported?

Mr. GLEN: Then what is the use of the alteration?

Mr. GREEN: Would he have objection if that were done?

Mr. GLEN: The point is that all these laws should be related. We cannot have conflict between two laws—the Immigration Act enabling men to enter the country, and another law saying we cannot deport them.

Mr. GREEN: If that provision were inserted in the citizenship bill we could still deport them.

Mr. GLEN: I do not see the necessity for it at all. I believe the bill as now framed gives exactly the same rights and privileges to a British subject as he has had for twenty-seven years. As the Minister of Agriculture has pointed out, any immigrant to this country from the British isles can obtain the privilege of voting or of being nominated to any office in the country after one year, but he has not absolute citizenship until the lapse of five years, during which time his record may be investigated and he would be subject to deportation if he had not conformed with our immigration laws during that period of five years. This law does no more than that. It takes nothing away from a citizen coming from the old country; he is in exactly the same position as he was in before. The only difference is on the question of procedure and the fact that he can now obtain documentary evidence of his citizenship, whereas before he did not. I take a strong position in this matter, because naturally I shall be faced with the duty of dealing with immigrants coming to this country and if the powers of the immigration law are removed by the bill we are now discussing, by virtue of an amendment such as is proposed by the hon. member for Eglinton we shall defeat the very purposes of

the immigration law and create difficulties which it will be hard to surmount. That, I suggest, would be harmful to the country.

Mr. McMASTER: The whole basis of the argument put forward by the Minister of Mines and Resources has been that we must wait for five years to find out whether a man should be deported for some defect or because of some crime which could not be discovered at the time he came in. The minister gave figures the other day of the number of deportations from 1930 to 1945 and yet, when asked for the number of immigrants that had come in, he gave only the number that came in between the same years, 1930 and 1945. In other words, he overlooked the very basis of his own argument that anyone here for five years should be deported for certain reasons. Why did he not give the number of immigrants who came from Britain in the five years preceding 1930? We know that immigration fell off largely from 1930 on because of conditions that prevailed in this country. I find that there came to Canada from the British isles in 1926, which would be within the five-year period, 48,000; in 1927, 52,000; in 1928, 55,000; in 1929, 66,000; in 1930, which may have been included in the minister's figures, 31,000; the next year, 7,000; and down to as low as three thousand.

No fair comparison can be made as between the number of immigrants who came in and those who were deported unless we go back to 1925, particularly in view of the fact that that is the very basis of the argument the minister used. The fact is that over 225,000 came from the British isles from 1926 to 1930. Adding that to the 80,000 mentioned by the minister, you will find that over 300,000 Britishers came in, and the total sent back for crimes was, using the figure the minister gave, about 1,740. That would be less than two per cent of those who came in; in fact, far less than one per cent.

What about the rest of Canada? Was the rest of Canada good during all that time? I agree with the hon. member from Vancouver East who said that if you make a man a Canadian citizen you should take him for better or for worse, just as you do if you marry a woman, and these people should not be sent back for crimes committed a considerable time after they came here. The minister mentioned 1,740 crimes committed by these 300,000 Britishers. What about all Canadians? I find that in 1930, when we deported several hundred Britishers because they had committed crimes—I am referring to indictable crimes and not the lesser offences —there were indictable crimes committed in Canada to the extent of 34,000; in 1931, 36,000; in 1932, 36,000—and all this time, remember, we were sending Britishers back because they committed crimes—in 1934, 38,000; in 1935, 37,000; and in 1936, 41,000. In other words, it did not stop crime in Canada. In 1937 there were 42,000 such crimes; in 1938, 48,000; in 1939, 53,000.

After all, I do not think these Britishers were so bad. They might be said to be at least the equal of those who were here. As a matter of fact, in computing the number of crimes committed throughout Canada, in the ten years I have spoken of, I find they amounted to three per cent for the whole period, whereas the number committed by Britishers was much less than two per cent; in fact, less than one per cent.

The Minister of Labour in half-hesitating way put his finger on the cause of deportation when he said that during that time many Britishers asked to be deported. I live in a good district of Toronto, in fact, the best district, but on our borders are a large number of people who lived in moderate circumstances—tradesmen, men working on buildings and so on—and many of them lost their jobs. I know many of those people who asked to be deported. They came to my office and said they wanted to go back to England where some of them had friends who would provide for them. At their own request they were seeking a return to the old country and at that time it was suggested that some of them were going back to take the dole. We used to use the word "dole" in those days in reference to unemployment insurance, and those people would be quite indignant when the word was used in their hearing. They would get angry and say, "It is not a dole but unemployment insurance." In fact, it was unemployment insurance such as this government introduced into this country during the last few years.

Therefore we have no reason to say that these people were unsatisfactory citizens, though the conditions here were unsatisfactory to them at that time. The present government, and also perhaps our own prior Conservative government, were to blame. People with a child of six would receive, in addition to what milk was put on their doorstep, the sum of eighty-one cents a week to support the sixth child. These men had, therefore, reason to be dissatisfied with Canada and to ask to be deported.

I really cannot understand the position taken against the amendment by the people who themselves came from the old country. I can only assume that in every walk of life, there are those who are most severe against their own people and take a contrary attitude

when they get away from their old traditions. But we who claim to be of the third or fourth generation believe that these people are good people and we want to give them a chance. If we had given them a chance they would have been good citizens. I agree with the hon. member who suggested that we might safely adopt British citizens after one year, for better or for worse.

Mr. GLEN: The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has almost intimated that I might have some prejudice against Britishers coming to this country. I have no prejudices, as he can understand, and as the committee will appreciate. We shall be glad to have them. But I take the position that any immigrant coming to Canada must be in exactly the same position as I was in. I was subject to the laws of the country, and if I were not a suitable immigrant that country had the power to deport me to Scotland. In other words, the immigration law deals with the individual and not with the race, and if the individual has the qualifications necessary he will be welcomed to the country. I hope the hon. gentleman will not seek to convey the idea that I would be against immigration from Britain, because we have many inquiries and I shall be glad to see them here myself.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not believe the minister's attitude in this matter is any different from my own. We are both of British stock. Would he, however, care to place on the record the number of deportations of British subjects that were sent back at their own request? Perhaps the department does not have that detailed information, but I am sure it would be appreciated by the committee if we could get it.

Mr. GLEN: I do not know if the information is available in that form. I shall make inquiries, and if it is available I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. BENTLEY: I have one or two questions on which I should like to get some information. I would be in sympathy with the amendment if it were confined and could be confined to the people who are in the minds of those who wish to see the amendment go through, namely, the people from the British isles; but the amendment reads as follows:

> That section 10 (1) (c) be amended by inserting after the word "war" in line 25, the following words:
>
> "or is a British subject within the meaning of section 28."

Turning to section 28 we find this:

> A person, who has acquired the status of British subject by birth or naturalization under the laws of any country of the British commonwealth other than Canada to which he was subject at the time of his birth or naturalization, shall be recognized in Canada as a British subject.

I am not too certain that the people in British Guiana are of the same state of mind or educational advancement with regard to democracy as we think we are in Canada. If I read contemporary history correctly I am not too sure that the Dutch Boers and the negro population of South Africa and some of the people down there who came from Great Britain have the same conception of democracy as we have. I do not know whether the native population of Australia may be called British subjects. I do not know to what extent the many generations of civil servants who originally came from Britain and their descendants whose blood in some cases may be mixed with the British subjects of India, are in exactly the same position as we are in regard to the development of democratic institutions. I am not saying this to detract from any values they have.

It has been argued that by admitting these people under this amendment we would be admitting people who would be in the same state of development with regard to democracy as we are. I do not think the argument holds good when we take into consideration those who are described in section 28. Unless I have assurance on that one way or the other, I shall have to vote against the amendment.

There is something else to which I should like to refer, and I wish my hon. friends opposite to take these remarks in the same spirit in which I am trying to use them. I am a native of Canada, and come from many generations who were natives of Canada. My blood contains blood from all of the original immigrants to the maritimes with the exception of French. In this country we have almost three and a half million people of French descent. Why not add to this amendment the words, "people from France"? There is an affiliation there. Unless an amendment of this kind is clearly defined, some of us who are trying to be honest and fair about this matter, and who have not too much training in legal technicalities, are being put in an impossible position.

I am giving the Secretary of State credit for having given consideration to all these factors. When I spoke on this matter earlier I indicated that this was one time that a minister of this government had done something which pleased me. I have not yet seen any reason why I should change that statement. I like the bill the way it is. I

shall have to vote for it the way it is unless somebody brings forward something better than has been offered up to date.

Mr. FULTON: I realize that the committee is anxious to come to a vote on this subject, but possibly an opportunity should be given to the hon. member for Temiscouata to bring another definition before the committee.

I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Swift Current because I think he will receive his answer. It is contained within the bill. Further than that, I understand that he will receive his answer from the hon. member for Eglinton. At that time I shall be interested in seeing which way he votes on this amendment.

Judging from the remarks of the last few speakers, I believe it is generally agreed that if we could arrive at an agreement as to the importance of this amendment, then we might achieve unanimity either in adopting or rejecting it. As the arguments developed it became apparent to my mind that hon. gentlemen opposite felt that we had failed to make out a case to show that if the section carries as it stands unamended, then the condition of the British subject coming to Canada in the future will be in no way prejudiced. I should like to revert to that question for a moment. If we were convinced that the lot of the non-Canadian British subject coming into Canada in the future were not to be changed by the section, if we were convinced after all that has been said as to the desirability of unanimity in this connection, we would most certainly not prolong our advocacy of this amendment; but we are not convinced.

I should like to refer the Secretary of State to his words as they appear on page 503 of *Hansard,* which he used on introducing the bill for second reading. He said:

> Under this bill we are seeking to establish clearly a basic and definite Canadian citizenship which will be the fundamental status upon which the rights and privileges of Canadians will depend.

I referred to these words two nights ago and asked the minister to explain them in view of his later statement that this bill will make no difference to the rights of the British subject coming into Canada. The minister said that I was trying to put an interpretation on his words. I do not think that is strictly accurate. I merely quoted his words and asked him to explain them. I repeat my request to the Secretary of State. I ask him what he means by "rights and privileges of Canadians"? It seems to me that these words, as he used them, can only mean that the rights and privileges of Canadians will depend upon the acquisition of Canadian citizenship.

[Mr. Bentley.]

In the debate so far it has been generally agreed that up until the time this bill becomes law the British subject coming to Canada has all the rights and privileges of other Canadians, at least within a year, and probably has them when he lands. Now, however, his rights and privileges are to be dependent upon the acquisition of citizenship, and that is going to take him five years. The minister does not agree. I can see that we are still not at one on this question.

Mr. MARTIN: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to state the situation again? Let it be clearly understood so that there will be no question about it. Under this bill every right, every privilege which the British subject had and has to-day will continue. Need there be any more affirmation on that point?

Mr. GREEN: It is not quite that simple.

Mr. MARTIN: Will the hon. gentleman show me what right or privilege the British subject will lose after the passage of this bill?

Mr. FULTON: Mere constant repetition does not constitute proof. The minister has stated that over and over again. He has stated that under this bill the British subject is not losing a right. On one occasion I agreed with him. I said: "Not under this bill." This bill does not take anything away from the British subject now in the country, but it does impose an obstacle on British subjects coming into the country in the future.

Some hon. MEMBERS: What obstacle?

Mr. FULTON: That obstacle is that they will have to wait for five years before they can acquire Canadian citizenship. It is generally agreed that at present, to all intents and purposes, they acquire it the day they land or, at the most, after having established domicile for one year.

This five-year provision will have an effect the moment an act is passed making any of these fundamental rights and duties dependent upon Canadian citizenship. We have been assured it is not the intention of this government to pass such an act, but many of the rights and duties which Canadians enjoy are dependent upon provincial statutes. Personally I think it would be quite right, once having defined the status of Canadian citizenship, to make the rights and duties of Canadians dependent upon the acquisition of that status. I think that would be a right and proper thing to do. The avowed purpose of this bill, in the words of the minister, is to

define the status and to make the acquisition of rights dependent upon the acquisition of that status. Therefore, if you place an obstacle, whether it be a temporal obstacle or a physical obstacle such as actual restriction, in the way of the acquisition of the status, then you impose that obstacle in the way of the acquisition of those rights and duties.

I am not going to repeat the arguments which have been advanced as to the desirability of maintaining a uniform status of British subjects throughout the commonwealth. I think we have seen a great deal of unanimity this afternoon as to that point. Therefore what I am trying to say is that we have good grounds for our contention that by this bill we in Canada are discriminating against the British subject as no other part of the empire has so far done. I realize that is not a pleasant thing to say about a bill introduced by this government, and I did say the other evening that I thought it was done inadvertently. But in support of my contention that so far Canada alone is imposing this restriction, this obstacle to British subjects, I should like to read a newspaper article I came across the other day, in order to contrast our attitude and our actions with those of the United Kingdom government. In the Victorian *Daily Colonist* of February 1, under the date line of London, England, January 31, appears a report that Mr. E. Thurtle, labour member at Westminster, asked whether the British government intended to continue admitting citizens of Eire to the British civil service. His question was asked in view of the recent announcement by Mr. De Valera that citizens of Eire were not British subjects. The report in the *Colonist* continued:

> Glanvil Hall, financial secretary to the treasury, in a written reply said: "According to the law of the United Kingdom, citizens of Eire, with few exceptions, are British subjects and His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom does not propose to discriminate against them in making appointments to the civil service."

There I think you have a definite distinction between the attitudes adopted by the two governments. You have the one country, Eire, going so far as to say her citizens are not British subjects; yet you still have the government of the United Kingdom saying that because they are British subjects they will not discriminate against them, that all they have to do is come to the United Kingdom and they may become civil servants immediately. I submit that no one could criticize any government for making appointment to the civil service, for instance, dependent upon the acquisition of Canadian citizenship. The moment that is done it means that a British subject coming from the United Kingdom cannot be appointed to the civil service for a period of five years. Without for the moment entering into the question of whether that is a good or bad thing, it means that a British subject coming to this country from any other part of the commonwealth must wait for five years before he can receive that appointment. Then it is quite logical to assume that the bar society of British Columbia, for instance, may restrict the enrolment of students to those who are Canadian citizens. Then a British subject from Australia, New Zealand or the United Kingdom would have to wait for five years after coming to this country before he could be enrolled as a law student. There are many ways in which it would be quite possible for this bill to be made the basis of discrimination against British subjects, as compared with the rights they now enjoy. As I have said, at the present time a citizen of Eire, whose government has said it does not regard its people as British subjects, may become a civil servant as soon as he arrives in the United Kingdom.

That being the case, I suggest that we in Canada in justice can do no less than the same thing that is being done in the United Kingdom and all the other parts of the empire; that is, to continue to give British subjects their right to acquire citizenship on entry. No one on this side of the house, and I imagine no one in any part of the house, would have any objection to requiring a British subject to file a formal declaration of intention. I think it would be perfectly proper to require him to declare his intention of residing in Canada for the necessary period, but I submit it is inescapable that as long as we retain the five-year clause in this bill and make it apply to British subjects just as it applies to emigrants from other parts of the world, then we in Canada are open to the charge that we have been derogating from the status of a British subject.

One objection advanced by the Minister of Mines and Resources was that he requires this five-year period because he must be able to deport undesirable immigrants. That objection, I believe, can be met in section 21 of the present bill. The minister has said that if a person is allowed to become a citizen at the end of a year, that right is irrevocable. I would point out that under section 21 there is provision for the revocation of a certificate of naturalization.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose at six o'clock I was in the process of discussing the objections of the Minister of Mines and Resources to the present amendment. As far as I could understand, they were largely a repetition of what he said last night. My answer must be, as it was last night, that if he foresees in the present amendment danger to his powers under the Immigration Act, then under section 21 of the present bill as it now stands there is preserved to the Secretary of State all the powers necessary to protect this country against the danger, largely fancied I think, of the undesirable British subject who may be an immigrant to this country. I can only repeat what I said on a previous occasion that if the Minister of Mines and Resources has any specific fears on that score and if he does not feel that there exists ample power under section 21 it would be within the rights of this parliament to amend that section to give him all the powers he requires.

That being the case, and in view of the fact that there was such a large degree of unanimity this afternoon as to the desirability of preserving the present status of British subjects in this dominion, I would close simply by repeating my request to the Secretary of State that he explain to the committee the meaning of his words which are to be found on page 503 of *Hansard:*

> Under this bill we are seeking to establish clearly a basic and definite Canadian citizenship which will be the fundamental status upon which the rights and privileges of Canadians will depend.

I ask him to explain how those words can be reconciled with his subsequent statement that a British subject from any part of the empire coming to this country must wait for five years before he acquires the status of a Canadian citizen.

Mr. GREEN: There are one or two points I should like to mention this evening. The Secretary of State said on Monday, as reported on page 1015 of *Hansard*:

> . . . the bill will not and does not remove one iota of the rights and privileges that are now enjoyed by British subjects in Canada.

He has repeated that at different times, both in his remarks and by way of interjection when other members were speaking. I think he is not correct. In the first place, as the bill was originally presented a British subject had to appear in the naturalization court. That certainly changed his rights; it changed his position and was a detriment. The government has admitted that by withdrawing the provision and providing that he need not appear in naturalization court. Then there are other rights and privileges at stake, and I refer you, Mr. Chairman, and the ministers concerned to the election act which was passed last year by the province of Quebec. This is chapter 15 of the statutes of that province. Section 47 sets out the qualifications of electors, which are as follows:

> 1. Has been domiciled in the province for at least twelve months immediately preceding the date fixed for the enumeration;
> 2. Is domiciled in a polling subdivision on the first day fixed for the enumeration;
> 3. Is of the full age of twenty-one years on or before the polling day;
> 4. Is of Canadian nationality;
> 5. Is not affected by any disqualification from voting contemplated by this act.

I understand that before that the provision was that an elector must be a British subject. Here is one provincial government that has the qualification that a voter must be of Canadian nationality. There is a distinct loss of rights if the citizenship bill now before the committee goes through in its present form. I realize that the Dominion Elections Act contains the qualification that a voter must be a British subject and we have had the asurance of the minister that that act will not be changed. However, the minister is not in a position to say that provincial election acts will not be changed.

Mr. MARTIN: We have no power.

Mr. GREEN: Here is one instance where a change has been made less than a year ago and I have no doubt that a similar change will be made in Saskatchewan. It will probably be only a matter of time before changes will be made in other provinces or in other legislation. For example, there is the old age pension legislation in which a change may be made. The minister is stretching a point when he says that no rights or privileges are being taken away by this bill.

We have asked in this amendment that there be a distinction made between the British subject and the alien. The basic reason for that request is that the person coming here from a partner nation in the commonwealth has had training in our British institutions, in our parliamentary government, and has the same general outlook. I do not think there is a person on the government side of the house who would deny that a person coming from another British nation is better qualified to become a Canadian citizen because of his experience and background than the person who comes from another country such as Russia or China. We are asking that that difference be acknowledged by this bill.

As far as I can see, the only reason put forth by the government for not making that distinction is that it will complicate the administration of the Immigration Act. The defence put forward is based on the Immigration Act and that is not a proper answer to our submission. Surely the position is the same with the Immigration Act. In the partner nations of the commonwealth we have Canadian facilities for examining immigrants to make sure that a person is not allowed to come to Canada who will not be able to establish a permanent citizenship here. The Immigration Department has far better facilities for making the necessary investigations and doing the necessary checking in Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand than it has in Holland or Russia. I do not think anyone would contend to the contrary. Therefore I submit that one way out of this difficulty would be to have the Immigration Act amended so that a British subject from one of the partner nations of the commonwealth should not be deported after a shorter period than five years, should not be deported, say after three years. It should be possible to check up on a person from another British nation within three years if it takes five years to check up on a person coming from outside the commonwealth. I put that suggestion before the ministers concerned because I think it is one way out of the difficulty.

But if they do not feel free to accept that suggestion, why not provide in this citizenship bill itself that there be power to deport up to five years, although citizenship be granted to such a British subject in a shorter time? In other words, retain the power to deport up to five years. These people will not be stateless; they are still British subjects and that status is carefully preserved for them under the bill as drawn. I think you can get around the difficulty, leaving the Immigration Act as it is, if the government will not cut down the time under that act to three years for a British subject, and yet providing in this bill that a person entering Canada from a partner British nation can get citizenship within a shorter time than persons coming from, say Russia or China. I would ask the two ministers concerned to give these suggestions serious consideration because, if something like that were done, I do not think there would be reason for much controversy over the other provisions of this bill and we might be able to get it through practically unanimously.

Mr. KNIGHT: I asked the minister a question which is recorded on page 1003 of *Hansard,* and the same subject was mentioned this afternoon in connection with section 28, which has a distinct bearing on the section before us. Section 28 states:

A person, who has acquired the status of British subject by birth . . .

As the hon. member for Kamloops has pointed out, most of the citizens of the Irish Free State were born British subjects but they have renounced the status of a British subject. Is the minister now prepared to answer the question I asked at that time?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar asked the same question and it was agreed that we would discuss it under the pertinent section, section 28.

Mr. FLEMING: I should like to say a brief word to clear up several problems that seem to have arisen during the course of the discussion.

The hon. member for Swift Current raised the question of the position of British subjects coming from lands outside the self-governing nations of the commonwealth. It will have been observed that my amendment confines the privilege which I suggest ought to be given to those within the scope of section 28. Section 28 refers to:

A person, who has acquired the status of British subject by birth or naturalization under the laws of any country of the British commonwealth other than Canada.

Section 2(g) defines "country of the British commonwealth" as "a country listed in the first schedule to this act," and the first schedule to the act embraces only the self-governing nations of the commonwealth. So that we are not concerned in this amendment, with persons coming to this country from other than self-governing nations of the commonwealth.

The Secretary of State indicated that he would present an amendment to section 10. The house will welcome that amendment. But it does not touch the point I raised in my amendment. There is no escape from the issue raised there.

Someone has spoken of the desirability of unanimity on this bill, and I endorse that sentiment completely. No one would have been happier than I to see complete unanimity, and the minister will bear me out when I say I had hoped that we might approach this bill with unanimity, but apparently that has not been possible.

The immigration regulations really have no part in the debate on this amendment. I made it clear in everything I said in support of the amendment that I am assuming the provisions of the Immigration Act will remain inviolate. If there is the slightest doubt in the mind of the Minister of Mines and Resources it would

be very simple for him to introduce the requisite amendment to make that perfectly plain beyond the shadow of doubt. So let us not have this question confused by raising these points about immigration.

As I followed the remarks of the Secretary of State to-day, he said that one reason why he could not give support to this amendment was the problem raised by the Immigration Act. If we are to amend the provisions of the Immigration Act, there cannot be any objection in principle to my amendment.

The one point remaining is that raised by the Secretary of State as to deporting someone to whom a certificate of citizenship has already been granted. We have had it from the Secretary of State himself that, after all, no change is made by this bill in the status of a British subject coming to this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We heard the opposite from the hon. member for Kamloops just before six o'clock, because he said that the rights and privileges of Canadians were absolutely destroyed by this bill.

Mr. FLEMING: I do not know what the Minister is referring to. I am dealing with the statement made by the Secretary of State.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. member for Kamloops said before six o'clock that the rights and privileges of Canadians were taken away by this bill.

Mr. FLEMING: I am dealing now with the point raised by the Secretary of State, the question of deporting those now enjoying the rights of citizenship. The right of deportation at the present time is being exercised in the case of those who, according to the argument of the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon and on the reasoning of the two ministers are to-day citizens in the eyes of our law.

On the next question which has been advanced, the Secretary of State, I suggest, has raised for himself a dilemma in the course of the argument on the bill. He has said that it is in effect the same citizenship as now exists. He has said that in substance we are only legislating what is the practice. If that is the case; if the rights of citizenship are in effect, continuing the right of franchise as heretofore, the only difference created by the bill is the grant of a certificate. Why make that exception in the position of the British subject for that one mere trifle? If that is the only difference the bill is making, why raise this distinction against British subjects in the bill?

The other horn of the dilemma is—and this is the basis on which I understood the bill was first put before the house—that this was said to be a measure of far-reaching importance, that it would make a substantial change, that it was something of a new advent in legislation in this country. If that is the case—and I think the earlier contributions to the debate from the other side were in that vein rather than in the vein in which later remarks have been made—this new possession, this new citizenship, is not to be enjoyed by British subjects coming to this country from other parts of the commonwealth, except on substantially the same basis as aliens.

We have one new point, and I welcome it, because it led me to hope that we might arrive at some unanimity with respect to the question raised by the amendment. The ministers who spoke—particularly, in this respect, the Secretary of State and the Minister of Agriculture—indicated this afternoon a desire to preserve what they regarded and described as the present status of the British subject resident in this country, his present citizenship. That is precisely the desire to which this amendment seeks to give legislative effect. It has been assumed by the ministers that no other changes are to be made in existing legislation, whether federal or provincial, and that no practical difference will arise between the Canadian citizen as he will be created under this bill and the man who has enjoyed the right to call himself a citizen heretofore, the man who has had all the rights of citizenship, as we are told, namely a British subject resident in this country for a lesser period than five years.

I say that we now are in agreement that it is desirable that the full rights of citizenship now enjoyed by the British citizen from another part of the commonwealth who is in this country during the five-year period should be preserved to him. There is no argument left against this amendment of the bill, because a British subject of the kind I have mentioned will lose something under this bill; he will lose the right to call himself a citizen of this country, because once this bill becomes law the position is inescapable that there are only three classes of persons within the scope of this present discussion. There is the Canadian citizen; there is the alien; there is the British subject resident in this country who is waiting for the expiration of five years in order to qualify himself for citizenship. The man who is a British subject from another part of the commonwealth after taking up domicile here is no citizen; he has no right to call himself a citizen. This bill deprives such a person, compared with people who came to the country prior to the enactment

of this bill, of the right to call himself a citizen, and we have it from the minister that that man is a citizen to-day. That is what this bill takes away from him.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What is it?

Mr. FLEMING: The right to call himself a citizen of Canada. Do I have to repeat it?

Mr. MACKENZIE: How?

Mr. FLEMING: If the minister cannot see it on reading the bill I shall go over it again. There is, for this purpose, the citizen under the bill; there is the alien coming to this land, and there is the British subject from other parts of the commonwealth coming here. During the five-year period which must elapse while he enjoys the franchise under the elections act as it is at present, and has the right, we are told, to stand for election to parliament, nevertheless he is not under this bill a Canadian citizen; and that is the status which this bill, if adopted, takes from him. If we are at one in the professed desire of the ministry to preserve the present status of citizenship of the British subject from other parts of the commonwealth acquired either immediately, as the Minister of Agriculture said this afternoon, or at the end of the one-year period—which is the test under the elections act—then the only way to express it is to adopt the amendment proposed.

Mr. MacNICOL: This afternoon I had intended to ask two further questions when I was interrogating the minister, but I did not get a chance to finish. I should therefore like to ask now two short questions. Section 10, subsection 1 (c) reads, at line 23:

. . . except where the applicant has served outside of Canada in the armed forces of Canada during time of war . . .

If, say a Polish citizen, one of the many races whose refugees fled to England after war broke out, joined while there a Canadian regiment and served on the continent of Europe, if he comes to Canada and remains here one year, will he then be able to qualify?

Mr. MARTIN: If he fought for Canada, yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: If a United States citizen came to Canada to train in any of our camps, remained here a year, proceeded overseas with some unit of our forces and returns to Canada, would he be eligible for Canadian citizenship in one year?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes, if he fought for Canada outside Canada.

Mr. MacNICOL: What I have been wondering is this. Take the case of a non-British citizen from Europe who served in a Canadian regiment. He marches into Holland alongside a British regiment, because our battalions and the British battalions were together under General Sir Bernard Montgomery. Would the British soldier who fought alongside the Polish soldier, if he came to Canada, have to be here for five years before he has full citizenship? I was just wondering if the minister had taken that distinction into consideration.

Mr. MARTIN: The soldier in that case is identified with the country. The point is that he served in the armed forces of Canada and fought with the Canadian forces overseas, and that gives him citizenship.

Mr. MacNICOL: The non-British soldier would get citizenship in one year, but the British soldier fighting alongside of him would not get it under five years?

Mr. MARTIN: If he came in he would, of course, have the right to vote and do everything as a British subject. He is a British subject. He could come to Canada and have the privileges of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. MacNICOL: But he would not get his full citizenship until five years had expired?

Mr. MARTIN: He would not get his certificate.

Mr. MacNICOL: The other day the hon. member for High Park asked the minister a question. He took a hypothetical case. He asked: Assume that the bill comes into force on June 1 and suppose that on June 2 a Canadian soldier overseas marries an English girl; would she become a Canadian citizen? The minister answered that she would not be a Canadian citizen.

Mr. MARTIN: Under this bill all war brides will automatically become Canadian citizens. But in the case put to me, it was the day after this bill comes into force. In that case that British subject woman would have to wait for one year.

Mr. MacNICOL: She would have to wait for only one year?

Mr. BENTLEY: This afternoon I was discussing some parts of the British world not likely to come within the scope of the requirements as suggested by the amendment. The amendment is predicated on people from certain parts of Britain, the self-governing colonies or dominions, or nations as described in section 28. I wish, however, to mention another country, which I did not refer to this afternoon, more for courtesy's sake than for any other reason. If we want to put some

people in a preferred position—and I do not think there should be any change in the bill—and we look to a country where the people have always exercised the kind of democratic procedure we have, then we could not possibly apply the present amendment to them. I refer to the little island of Newfoundland. The people there have submitted to government by a commission, and I cannot foresee any situation arising in Canada in which Canadians would submit to rule by commission. I would rather have a Tory government than that.

Mr. FULTON: Certain references have been made in the last few minutes by the Minister of Veterans Affairs to what I said this afternoon. He said that I stated that as a result of this bill the rights and privileges of Canadian citizens were being abrogated. What I said this evening before six o'clock was that under this bill as it stands the rights and privileges as Canadian citizens of British subjects who have so far been admitted to Canada are not being abrogated but that the rights and privileges of British subjects who may hereafter seek admission to Canada will be prejudiced; and that, inasmuch as that is the case, Canada, if the bill is adopted—

Mr. MACKENZIE: How are they prejudiced?

Mr. FULTON: Canada, as the bill stands, by unilaterally derogating from the rights and privileges of British subjects, is inviting similar derogation on the part of other empire countries. That was my whole point.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman but I should like to ask him a simple question. I believe my hon. friend before six o'clock made a differentiation between rights and privileges of the British subject in Canada and such rights and privileges as they might have under the citizenship of Canada. Is that correct?

Mr. FULTON: It is not correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is my memory of it.

Mr. FULTON: I am unable to obtain a proof of the statement I made, but my point was that the rights and privileges of British subjects who hereafter seek admission will be different.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Why?

Mr. FULTON: I made the point here in my speech this afternoon.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. FULTON: Then I shall be glad to say it again if the committee wishes.

[Mr. Bentley.]

An hon. MEMBER: No, not that.

Mr. FULTON: Speaking on April 2, the Secretary of State said, with reference to this bill:

> Under this bill we are seeking to establish clearly a basic and definite Canadian citizenship which will be the fundamental status upon which the rights and privileges of Canadians will depend.

With that statement I have no quarrel; no member on this side has any quarrel. That is a very proper statement to make. But implicit in that statement is the declaration that any person coming to the country and seeking rights and privileges which we as Canadians enjoy, which everyone of the twelve million people here now enjoys, will be required to assume to himself and to acquire the status of a Canadian citizen. I think that is a very proper position. We have all agreed that this bill is in principle a good one inasmuch as it attempts. and its object is, to set up and define the position of Canadian citizen and to give to a Canadian the right in law to say, "I am a Canadian citizen." If we are agreed on that, I fail to see how we can disagree when we say that the person who is unable to say, "I am a Canadian citizen," will have fewer rights and privileges than we have now, and therefore the person who is denied for five years—

Mr. MACKENZIE: What is the difference?

Mr. FULTON: —the right to say, "I am a Canadian citizen", will not share the same rights and privileges which the Minister of Veterans Affairs and I have now and which will be the status of the British subject coming to this country the day after this bill as it stands is law.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Nonsense.

Mr. FULTON: The minister says, "nonsense".

Mr. MACKENIE: Yes, absolutely, and I meant it too.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is not parliamentary.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Then I say it is not correct.

Mr. FULTON: I am perfectly willing to have the minister point out to me where I am wrong. We are striving for unanimity—

Mr. MACKENZIE: I shall be glad to point out to the hon. member where he is wrong, but I would rather have the committee point out to him that he is not right.

Mr. FULTON: All I can say to the Minister of Veterans Affairs is that on occasion his lack of understanding passes comprehen-

sion. We have been striving, we are told, after unanimity, but if in order to achieve unanimity it is necessary to substitute a set of brains in the minister's head for what he has now, we shall never achieve it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Another red herring.

Mr. GILLIS: I have no intention of delaying the committee on this matter. We have sat here for weeks and weeks now discussing the question of citizenship and my impression this evening is that some of the lawyers in this house should go and get a legal opinion on it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: From you?

Mr. GILLIS: You can consult a good firm. We have listened to at least a dozen lawyers and the interpretation which each places on this very simple matter is different. They lack either intelligence or expert legal training and that is why I say they should go and consult some good lawyer and find out where they stand. I am going to be frank about this matter. I have read this clause carefully and I cannot find anything wrong with it. I think this simple amendment injected into it is merely a matter of giving some free legal training to some young aspiring lawyers; and, taking advantage of the fact that the Secretary of State is an old practising lawyer, we are getting some pointers on this, because there is no doubt that some of them in the future, under this bill, will be extracting some pretty nice fees. After they have the necessary expert advice from the Secretary of State they will be able to use it to good advantage. Personally I believe we are wasting a great deal of valuable time. Someone is trying to make a lot of cheap political capital out of this. I see no reason in the world why we should change the bill from what it is. I suggest that we get down to business and take a vote on this matter, so that we can begin to deal with matters which are of more importance.

Mr. McGREGOR: Well, sit down.

Mr. GILLIS: In the nine weeks that my Tory friends have been rising in their places making cheap political capital out of this measure—

Mr. McGREGOR: The hon. member has done his share.

Mr. GILLIS: This is the first time that I have risen to say anything on the subject.

Mr. BROOKS: The hon. member is a good judge of cheap political capital.

Mr. GILLIS: I would not have taken part in this debate at this time were it not that I have become disgusted with the line of chatter that has come from my right. I am sure that if the people of the country read the press and think of the many matters that are of pressing importance in Canada at the present time, such as employment, taxes and all these things that affect them directly, they must think that this House of Commons is becoming merely a debating society, that we lack common sense and that we are wasting too much time on the subject matter of this bill.

In my opinion the amendment is irrelevant. It is unnecessary; it is a lot of nonsense, and it is about time that we got down to business and voted.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the amendment carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the amendment will please say, "yea".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yea.

The CHAIRMAN: Those opposed will please say, "nay".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion the "nays" have it. The amendment is lost.

Mr. HLYNKA: I should like to bring up two matters in connection with paragraph (d) of subsection 1 of section 10, and paragraph (f) of subsection 1 of the same section. These are matters in regard to which I should like to obtain some information from the minister. My first point has to do with applicants who apply for naturalization certificates and who unfortunately at one time or another happened to have been on relief. From personal knowledge I know that in Edmonton a number of people, through no fault of their own, were forced to go on relief in the thirties. They were refused naturalization certificates when they applied because there was an outstanding relief debt marked against them.

A resident of Canada who is a good citizen should not be penalized or discriminated against when it comes to a matter such as relief. I have personal knowledge of a number of these cases. I tried to see that these people got fair treatment. I endeavoured to assist them in whatever way I could, and yet in practically every case the judge would refuse to grant an application unless the applicant wiped out the outstanding relief payments which he had drawn. I know there is nothing in the bill requiring an applicant to repay the debt, but the judges take it

upon themselves to order these people to repay the debt. I have known families with two, three or even more children who in the thirties became deeply indebted in the matter of relief. It seems unreasonable now to demand that these people repay $1,000, $1,500 or $2,000 of this relief money. If they are asked to repay it, why should not the Canadian-born do the same? It is not their fault that the governments of the day failed to give them an opportunity to make a living. Therefore I appeal to the minister to request the judges to grant certificates to these people so that they may be treated the same as Canadian-born persons when it comes to a matter of relief money.

The other matter upon which I should like to touch briefly deals with a particular case which I have in mind, but it covers a certain principle which has been overlooked, disregarded or ignored, not by the applicant but by the government. The care and the amount of work the minister and his advisers have put into the preparation of this bill are a good indication that various sections which have been included in the bill are important and should be observed. These sections are embodied in the bill for a definite purpose and they should be followed. At least the government should set an example in this regard. But I desire to draw the attention of hon. members as a matter of principle to the case of Sam Carr, who until recently lived in Toronto, and who obtained his certificate of citizenship within the last two years or so in spite of his anti-Canadian attitude.

Mr. MacINNIS: He was a Liberal pal in those days.

Mr. HLYNKA: That may be so. I am not dealing particularly with Mr. Carr, but with the principle which is involved. According to the information which I have, Mr. Carr came to Canada in 1924. In 1929 he went to Moscow to study at the Lenin Institute and returned to Canada in 1931. He was arrested for internment in September, 1942, and was released conditionally by the present government, and yet some time prior to the Grey North by-election and the general election Mr. Carr was granted a citizenship certificate. I should like the minister, not necessarily to-day, but to-morrow or the day after, to answer five questions in regard to this matter. It is not that I particularly desire to have these answers myself, but I think the people of this country should know what happened in this case. I am not reflecting in any way upon the present minister or his predecessors. The Secretary of State is a conscientious minister, and this happened before he took over the department. But I want some information on this matter, because we cannot afford to be so lax as to grant naturalization to individuals who during the first part of the war held a definite view against the interests of Canada. It seems to me there is something wrong here. It does not matter what party is in power; no bargains should be made with any individual or group of individuals when it comes to matters of this sort. I do not know if this were done, but it will be up to the minister to give this house the information I seek. These are the questions:

1. On what date did Mr. Sam Carr of Toronto make his first application for a naturalization certificate?

2. Were any of his applications turned down? If so, on what grounds, and by whom?

3. On what date was Mr. Carr's application approved, and who was the presiding judge?

4. Who investigated the facts concerning Mr. Carr's eligibility to become a Canadian citizen?

5. Upon whose recommendation was Mr. Carr's application approved? What are the names, occupations and addresses of those persons?

Mr. MARTIN: First, may I say that I fully concur in what the hon. gentleman has said, that no one should be deprived of the right to Canadian citizenship under this bill, or for that matter under the existing Naturalization Act, on the mere ground that he owes somebody else some money. Poverty is not and should not be in any way a disqualification from a right that should be open to everyone in this country regardless of economic position, regardless of race, religion or any of these matters. I may assure the hon. gentleman with all the force at my command that in the administration of this measure and the regulations which will be passed pursuant to the authority given under it, some of the abuses that have existed heretofore will not be allowed to continue, in so far as I have any power to prevent them.

The hon. member for Rosthern brought to my attention last fall an instance where in a certain part of western Canada a particular judge had refused two individuals the right to become naturalized on the mere ground that one owed a fairly large debt and the other owed a smaller debt. That judge, to the extent of the powers then existing, was told that he had acted contrary to the spirit of the act, and I can only say that in the

regulations which will be developed under this measure that sort of thing will not be allowed to happen again.

Mr. GRAYDON: Was that the only ground in each case?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes, that was the only ground given in the report of the judge. I may add that was not the first complaint in that particular community, but it will not happen again.

With regard to the questions concerning this individual, Mr. Carr, I cannot give the answers to-day because I was not in the department; I was not the minister when he was naturalized, and I have not the information. However, I shall make inquiries, and to the extent that I can find the answers I shall give them to the hon. gentleman at the first opportunity.

Mr. REID: I should like to direct a question to the minister in regard to section 10 (1) (a). Perhaps if I read it in layman's language I may give it a clearer interpretation than it is given in the bill itself. I read it in this way: "The minister may grant a certificate of Canadian citizenship to any person who is not a Canadian citizen, and who makes application for that purpose and satisfies the court that he has filed in the office of the clerk of the court for the judicial district in which he resides a declaration of intention to become a Canadian citizen not less than one or more than five years prior to the date of his application." My question to the minister is, does that debar a person who comes to this country from applying for citizenship six years, seven years or even ten years later? As I read this, it would seem that he must make his application or at least his declaration of intention between one and five years after coming to this country.

Mr. MARTIN: No. The section means there cannot be a gap of more than five years between the time notice of intention is given and the application is made; and of course this provision does not apply to British subjects.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I have not participated in this debate to any extent, but have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments coming from both sides, particularly in reference to this section. I must say that I find myself largely in sympathy with the point of view expressed by hon. members to my right on this side of the house. I do not think they have been dealing with a matter of light significance. I am one of those who believe we should give serious consideration to the fact that we are common citizens of the British commonwealth of nations. I am bound to say that in this bill I believe it should be possible for us to reconcile our two points of view. I believe in this bill we should recognize British citizenship as a whole because unless we recognize it, we will not preserve it. I am not going to repeat the arguments that have been advanced many times during this debate, because I do not intend to speak for very long, but those people for whom we are asking special consideration on a principle, the principle being our common citizenship in the British commonwealth, have some particular qualifications. First of all, they are British subjects and as such come here already as subjects of the king. Second, they have a knowledge of the workings of democracy under British institutions. Third, the great majority have a knowledge of one of the two official languages.

I listened with considerable interest to the objections raised by the Minister of Mines and Resources, as the one who has to administer the immigration laws of this country, and I quite appreciate his arguments and the force of his objections. But in an effort to reconcile the two points of view which I fully appreciate, I move the following amendment:

That section 10 (1) (c) be amended by inserting after the word "application" in line 29 the following words: "except that in the case of a British subject, two years shall suffice."

Mr. GREEN: Are the ministers not going to make any statement with regard to this amendment?

Amendment (Mr. Herridge) negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: Does section 10, subsection 1, carry?

Mr. GREEN: I should like to ask the Secretary of State about three different points which arise in connection with this section. The first has to do with the wife of a Canadian, which is covered by paragraph (c) which states in part:

. . . where the applicant is the wife of and resides in Canada with a Canadian citizen . . .

Is that to be interpreted that unless and until that wife comes to Canada she cannot acquire Canadian citizenship?

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. GREEN: If a war bride from Holland comes to Canada after this bill becomes law, will it be necessary for her to appear in naturalization court?

Mr. MARTIN: Not if she married before the bill came into effect.

Mr. GREEN: It is the time she is married that governs?

Mr. MARTIN: If she comes in before the bill is in effect, she comes in under section 9 (c).

Mr. GREEN: But if she comes in after the bill comes into effect?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: She would have to appear in naturalization court?

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. GREEN: Paragraph (e) reads:

(e) he has an adequate knowledge of either the English or the French language, or, if he has not such adequate knowledge, he has resided continuously in Canada for more than twenty years.

Some suggestion was made during the debate that there should be an age limit in that paragraph, that it should apply, for example, to the person who was fifty years of age or over rather than to everyone. As I read this paragraph, a young man who comes here at the age of ten years could qualify at the age of thirty years under this twenty-year provision even though he could not then speak either English or French. I take it that the intention was to cover only those people who are now so old that it is difficult for them to learn one of the official languages. If that is the purpose of the section, would it not be wise to word it in that way?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. member has referred to the case of a boy who comes to Canada at the age of ten years and then applies twenty years later at the age of thirty. In the first place, the subsection is purely permissive; it does not state that a certificate must be granted to such a person. A discretion is maintained. As I said the other day, I was much impressed with the number of cases that had come to my attention. One notable one which I mentioned was that of a woman, over fifty years of age it is true, who came here from Europe. She had a number of children, all of them a credit to this country and to her. Two of those children fought with the armed services, one son being killed at Dieppe and the other being awarded the D.F.C. She had been turned down for citizenship and I had no answer to give that woman. That was one reason why, when I collaborated with my officers and with others, I thought this kind of section should go in. Many hon. members from all sides of the house, particularly those from the western provinces, have told me of like cases.

It is not possible to envisage every case and there might be one such as the hon. gentleman mentioned. But I think in that case the judge and the minister, exercising the discretion that is permitted to them, would be on their guard about admitting to citizenship someone who had spent twenty years in this country, after having entered at the age of ten years, without having learned one of the official languages. I hope there will be no more wars, and so does the hon. gentleman, but I do not think any minister administering this measure should be put in the position of receiving requests such as the one I have mentioned and not being able to accede to it. I think the case to which my hon. friend refers is one that is unlikely to come up. Surely it is not conceivable that a boy would come to this country at the age of ten years and then twenty years theerafter not have an adequate knowledge within the meaning of the bill.

Mr. GREEN: As the subsection reads it will apply to any one who comes here in the future?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: He may come next year, stay here for twenty years, not learn either English or French, and then apply for naturalization?

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. GREEN: That is the effect of this subsection?

Mr. MARTIN: That is the effect.

Mr. GREEN: My final question has to do with the subject of an enemy state, for example, subjects of Germany or Japan. I see nothing in the bill referring to such people and apparently they are to be treated in the same way as people coming from any other part of the world. As the minister knows, after the last war special provision was made for the subjects of enemy countries

Mr. MARTIN: Would the hon. member mind waiting until we come to section 21 before discussing that?

Mr. GREEN: Is it the intention to put something in the bill to cover that matter?

Mr. MARTIN: That question properly should be asked under section 21.

Subsection 1 agreed to.

On subsection 2—Special certificate to minor children.

Mr. MARTIN: I wish to propose an amendment which I will ask my colleague, the Minister of Veterans Affairs to move. The amendment reads as follows:

That section 10 be amended.

1. By inserting a new subsection (2), as follows:

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection one of this section, the minister may grant a certificate of Canadian citizenship to any person who is a British subject and who makes to the minister a declaration that he desires such certificate and who satisfies the minister that he possesses the qualifications prescribed by paragraphs (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) of subsection one of this section; provided that in any case where, in the opinion of the minister, there is doubt as to whether the applicant possesses the said qualifications, the minister before granting such a certificate may refer the declaration and the material in support thereof to the court in the judicial district in which the declarant resides, and the declaration shall thereupon be dealt with as an application under subsection one of this section."

2. By renumbering the present subsection (2) as subsection (3).

3. By renumbering the present subsection (3) as subsection (4) and inserting after the words "subsection one" in line six thereof the words "and subsection two."

4. By renumbering the present subsection (4) as subsection (5) and substituting for the words "for the purpose of subsection one of this section" in line five thereof the words "for the purposes of subsection one and subsection two of this section."

Mr. MACKENZIE: I so move.

Mr. BRACKEN: I understand that the minister proposed this amendment as a result of the discussion this afternoon and earlier.

Mr. MARTIN: I can say that the discussion from all sides has been very helpful, but I might add that for some time we have had the matter in mind but did not know exactly what should be done until we had heard the discussion in the house.

Mr. BRACKEN: That is not the point I wished to make. It is this, that while a few members of the house, my own supporters, have seen and, I understand, approved this amendment, I would respectfully suggest to the minister that since all the members of the house have not seen it and since the amendment is long and complicated it might be left over for consideration to-morrow when all hon. members will be able to see it in *Hansard*.

Mr. MARTIN: With that understanding we shall let the section stand and come back to it.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask one question with regard to this amendment? As I understand it, its purpose is to meet our objection that the British subject should not be required to appear in a naturalization court. This amendment provides that a certificate shall be granted to him without that appearance except in the rare case where there is some doubt whether he meets the requirements of the bill, in which rare case the minister will ask that he go before a naturalization court. Is it or is it not the intention of the government that the great majority of cases will be covered by this amendment and that the great majority of British subjects applying for Canadian citizenship will not have to appear in a naturalization court?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman in the last sentence is quite correct. It will be only in very rare special instances that that will be required. The amendment came into being as a result not only of suggestions made from all sides of the house but following consideration by officials of my own department and myself, who have been giving these matters a good deal of thought for the last seven months. My hon. friend has made some valuable contributions; as has also the hon. member for New Westminster who has had some intimate discussion with me on this matter, also the hon. member for Spadina. Every member has been very helpful, as I feel we all must be in this matter, and we are only too glad to get the opinions of all hon. members.

Mr. GREEN: I am very glad that the minister has made the change.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Before we proceed to section 11, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to propose as subsection 6 of section 10 and I think I should put it before the minister and the committee now in order that consideration may be given to it before the entire section comes before the committee to-morrow, so that the minister will be in a position to decide whether he will be prepared to accept it.

This proposed amendment arises out of certain remarks which have been made by myself and by other members of the house from time to time regarding the necessity of assuring that a certificate of citizenship should carry with it certain inalienable rights.

Under section 10(1)(f) a step has been taken in the right direction whereby the minister intends to ensure that an adequate knowledge of the responsibility and privileges of Canadian citizenship shall be conveyed to applicants for citizenship. I do not intend to go into details in that regard, but the system adopted in the United States of America is such that I am sure that, subject to the necessary changes, it could be incorporated into our regulations here, namely, the adoption of a text-book on citizenship and the setting up of schools for citizenship to the end that our citizens may have a greater appreciation and knowledge of what citizenship actually means, for only in recent weeks the Gallup polls have demonstrated

that Canadian citizens in too many cases have little knowledge and appreciation of our system of government, or of those who govern us and of our constitution.

The subsection I propose is designed to provide that the citizen to be shall receive an adequate knowledge of the privileges of citizenship. When I spoke on April 2, following the speech of the minister, I said, as reported at page 513 of *Hansard,* and I ask the indulgence of the committee in referring to what I then said:

> Having established the basis of Canadian citizenship and having given a new unity to this country, I suggest that citizenship, if it is to mean what our citizenship does mean, requires that at this time—I referred to this incidentally the other day—we should consider the adoption by Canada of a Bill of Rights.

May I say that my hon. friend the member for Winnipeg North introduced a resolution in the house which did not arrive, I think, at the point where it was discussed.

Mr. STEWART: I dropped it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Then I went on to say:

> There have been recent infringements upon citizenship by this government which have been a denial of the heritage that is ours.

I pointed out a little later:

> The British North America Act contains no personal safeguards against unwise or discriminatory legislation that might be passed by federal governments.

Great Britain has a Bill of Rights, and has had one for generations. I have before me "Selected Documents of English Constitutional History", wherein are set forth the rights that are inalienable under British citizenship; the first is the Petition of Right of 1628; the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679, and the Bill of Rights itself of 1689. All these acts setting forth the rights of British citizenship are part of the law of Britain and, as such, signify and set forth the rights of British citizens. The United States of America has a Bill of Rights, although it is not incorporated in the original constitution. Their Bill of Rights was passed in 1791 by way of amendments to the constitution.

I suggest this, that if citizenship is to mean what we hope it will mean, and what it does mean to us, freedom must flow from it. Freedom itself is immutable, although as conditions change ideas of freedom change. In this country—I am not at the moment raising an issue but am speaking in a spirit of cooperation—there has been continuing over a period of time since 1914 a series of gradual invasions and infringements of citizenship as epitomized in the Bill of Rights,

in habeas corpus, in the Petition of Right and of other rights that are traditional. In this country in recent months there have been invasions of the rights of Canadian citizens which do not require to be discussed at this time. I refrain from discussing them in detail, but these invasions must be guarded against for the future. There has been a trend against freedom for the individual, going back to 1914, when the War Measures Act was passed, which act remained unrepealed. I think the time has come for a declaration on the part of parliament that Canadians possess certain rights under their citizenship; that these rights should not be unfairly or unjustly interfered with, and that, above all, there shall be no suspension, abrogation or temporary diminution or removal of those rights excepting by parliament, to the end that Canadian citizenship will imply and will carry into actuality equality without regard to race, religion or colour. I suggest that Canadian citizenship can be assured of these freedoms and their maintenance only by the incorporation into this measure of certain inalienable rights which have characterized British citizenship throughout the generations.

Without going into further detail in that connection and threshing old straw, the words of my amendment will convey the ideas I have in mind, the rights which should be protected, the rights which, in my opinion, should not be alienated other than by parliament itself, and certainly not by the executive. I therefore move, sir—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member should give notice of the amendment, because there is one amendment now before the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE: By consent.

Mr. MARTIN: He just wants to give it to us so that we can read it over.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kamloops:

> That the following words be added to the section as subsection 6: "Such certificate of citizenship shall be deemed to include a Bill of Rights as follows:
>
> 1. Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the right to peaceable assembly are assured.
>
> 2. Habeas corpus shall not be suspended except by parliament.
>
> 3. No one shall be required to give evidence before any tribunal or commission at any time if denied counsel or other constitutional safeguards."

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 10 stand?

Section stands.

On section 11—Grant of certificate of citizenship in certain cases.

Mr. GREEN: In paragraph (c) of section 11 we find the word "alien." Apparently there is no definition of "alien" in the bill, although it is defined in our present Naturalization Act and in our Immigration Act as meaning a person who is not a British subject. Why is no definition of that word inserted in this bill?

Mr. MARTIN: The reason it was left out is that there is no doubt concerning the legal connotation of the word and it was felt unnecessary to define it. "Canadian citizen" and "British subject" are defined in this bill, and in the case of other parts of the commonwealth which are recognized in section 28 of this bill. All other persons are aliens; "British subjects" are characterized in sections 26 and 28; and it was felt that we should follow the practice of recent legislation, based particularly on the treatise on nationality by Professor Hudson, to which I referred. Other countries have no such provisions. But we wanted to single out "Canadian citizen" and "British subject", which are characterized.

Mr. GREEN: What is the definition of "British subject"?

Mr. MARTIN: A person who owes allegiance to a common king.

Mr. GREEN: That is not set out in the bill?

Mr. MARTIN: But surely we know that. That is set out in the proceedings of the imperial conferences of 1930 and 1937.

Mr. FULTON: Would the minister by way of amplication tell us what sort of case is contemplated in section 11, subparagraph (b)?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. In the administration of the measure it has been found useful in cases of adoption of an alien child or a child of doubtful antecedents, and it really is a most essential clause. Adoption, as the hon. gentleman knows, cannot of itself confer national status. The consequence is that many families in Canada who have adopted children who happen to have been born in the United States or elsewhere found that the child when approaching maturity cannot, for example, obtain a schoolteacher's certificate, cannot enrol for certain professions, because the child cannot establish that he is a British subject. We have many such cases, and it is to deal with that kind of problem, which up to now we have been wholly unable to deal with, simply because we had no authority.

Section agreed to.

On section 12—Certificate not effective till oath of allegiance taken.

Mr. GREEN: Will the minister explain what the plan is with regard to the way in which the oath of allegiance is to be taken?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. member is now talking about other than British subjects?

Mr. GREEN: Explain it for both British subjects and non-British subjects.

Mr. MARTIN: In the case of British subjects there will be a regular form which contains at the bottom the words which appear in the second schedule of this bill, and they will simply sign their names underneath. In the case of others who will go before a judge, the intention is to have a ceremony. It will not be possible to maintain the ritual in all communities, because of considerations of the size of community and convenience and so on, but the ceremony as far as the oath is concerned will be somewhat as follows. Just before the applicants are presented with the certificate there will be an address, by the judge, we hope in most communities by the mayor, perhaps by visiting dignitaries of the various churches, and so on.

Mr. FLEMING: A member of parliament?

Mr. GREEN: The Secretary of State?

Mr. MARTIN: The Secretary of State has gone to a number of these, and proposes to go to others if he can. While the present Secretary of State does not personally add very much to the proceedings, I think his office does.

Mr. MacNICOL: Humility exalteth a nation.

Mr. MARTIN: Just before the certificate is presented they will be asked to rise, and the judge will administer the oath in a formal ceremony which we hope will be both impressive and memorable.

Mr. GREEN: A British subject can take the oath before anyone empowered to administer an oath?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. REID: When applicants come before the various judges of the nine provinces, are they to be asked questions as to their knowledge of the responsibilities of citizenship and so on, and is it proposed to have the series of questions similar for the whole of Canada?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. Up to now that has not been done. The hon. member for Lake Centre was speaking a while ago about a certain manual which we hope to get from

certain educational institutions and which will set out in factual form certain well-known facts concerning Canadian life, and we shall have a series of questions prepared, which need not be exclusive but will be suggested to the person in charge of the ceremony. As the hon. member for Essex West said, Mrs. Hamilton of Windsor has written a wonderful textbook which will be widely used throughout this province and in which there are certain questions that she puts in a hypothetical way. In answer to the hon. member for New Westminster I may say that, so far as we can, we shall formulate a series of uniform questions seeking to convey to the potential Canadian citizen facts which I am sure all of us regard as necessary in such an application.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: With reference to section 12, in the case of an infant under fourteen years of age, is there any provision for its being required to take the oath of allegiance on reaching the age of twenty-one, where the father was naturalized?

Mr. MARTIN: No, there is not. What is intended in the case of a child of fourteen who cannot take the oath is to have the schoolteacher in the particular community impress upon that child the nature of the obligation, and so on. That is all that is contemplated.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The child is automatically naturalized and becomes a Canadian citizen and remains such?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 13—Certificate not to be granted to persons under a disability.

Mr. McKAY: How inclusive is the term "disability"?

Mr. MARTIN: It means incapacity of a minor, lunatic or idiot. The hon. gentleman will recall perhaps that under the heading disability in the interpretation section of the old act women were included. Under this bill—and little reference has been made to the fact, although in many commentaries on the bill in other countries, in journals on international law, much is made of it—we take the lead in giving to women the control of their national status. As I have said, at long last they are taken out of the disabled class as they should have been, and I am glad to make that statement to-night in the presence of the distinguished woman member of the house.

Section agreed to.

On section 14—Rehearing.

Mr. GREEN: Is this a new clause?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Will the minister explain it.

Mr. MARTIN: Hon. members who have compared this bill with the old act will note that there has been a considerable diminution in some of the discretionary powers given the Secretary of State. I felt as soon as I became Secretary of State that I was doing many things that I should not have the power to do, and I have reduced to a minimum the discretionary powers exercised heretofore by secretaries of state. This section is new and provides in subsection 2 that the minister, in a case where a certificate has been granted, may order a rehearing. The purpose is to enable a rehearing to be required in cases where we are not satisfied that the proceedings have been properly conducted, or when all the evidence has not been produced or examined, or where for any other reason another examination of the case seems desirable. Once the rehearing takes place, the decision will be final. It does not apply, of course, when the court has rejected the application but only in cases of approval, where the minister has occasion for doubt.

If the committee wishes other reasons I can give them because there have been instances where in one place on one occasion no fewer than twenty-two certificates were granted. If we had had this power, I suggest that no one in this house would have granted those certificates. It is felt that there are cases where, because of lack of interest on the judge's part, the examination is so perfunctory that it cannot be said to have involved either a proper ceremony or the laying of a foundation for determining whether the application should be granted. The intention is to cover embarrassing situations that may develop.

Mr. GREEN: Is the judge given wider discretion than he is under the present regulations? At the present time his powers are limited by regulation 16, which reads:

> At the conclusion of the hearing of the application by the judge, the said judge shall endorse upon the petition his decision in the case as to (a) residence qualification, (b) good character, (c) adequate knowledge of English or French, (d) intention to reside in His Majesty's dominions and (e) no disability under section 2 (f) . . .

Which simply defines what is a disability. Judges have told me they are very much handicapped in putting in the report because their instructions are that they must report on nothing except these points I have read,

and they do not feel free to write out a general report. That perhaps should be the key point in deciding whether or not the applicant should receive citizenship. Is it the intention to give the judges wider discretion than at the present time?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: What discretion?

Mr. MARTIN: We are going to put in the regulations a general clause providing that if the judge feels these do not cover the particular situation he is free to report on that situation as he sees fit; in other words, to give the department a true picture of what happens. There is a real handicap which we intend to remove.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—New application allowed.

Mr. MacNICOL: If the application has been rejected by the court on a hearing or rehearing the applicant may make another application under section 10 of the bill after the expiration of a period of two years from the date of such rejection. If the application has been rejected for some major reason, is the applicant allowed to remain in the country for the two years?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. The fact that the applicant is turned down does not mean that he has to leave the country.

Mr. MacNICOL: I said, for some major reason.

Mr. MARTIN: It all depends. If it were disloyalty to the crown involving an act of treason that might be altogether different. The hon. member for Vegreville mentioned certain applicants who had been turned down because of certain obligations they owed. There is no way of dealing with such a case and the intention is to cover situations like that.

Section agreed to.

On section 16—On acquisition of other nationality.

Mr. GREEN: The minister should explain this in detail. This is the only way in which a Canadian citizen who is natural-born can lose his citizenship, and apparently he can lose it only when he is outside Canada and acquires a nationality or citizenship of some other country. We should be very careful about a section of this type. Take, for example, the case of a Canadian-born Japanese who served in the Japanese forces against us. One such was one of the main torturers of Canadians in Hong Kong. As I read the section, that man still retains his Canadian citizenship. There should be some way in which the citizenship could be taken away from a man like that, and I suggest to the minister that he give consideration to having a test as to whether or not the person has become disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty. Certainly a person who is born in Canada and who serves in an enemy force should lose his Canadian citizenship, and lose it fast. Yet under this section he does not.

Mr. MARTIN: I point out to the hon. gentleman that what he says is substantially correct, except that he has not covered the question of dual nationality covered by section 17 to which we shall make reference when we come to it. Perhaps I should read this section again:

> A Canadian citizen who, when outside of Canada and not under a disability, by any voluntary and formal act other than marriage, acquires the nationality or citizenship of a country other than Canada shall thereupon cease to be a Canadian citizen.

In all of the nationality acts of the commonwealth this provision exists. Citizenship is derived from two classes of people: those who were natural-born and those who acquired citizenship through other than natural-born methods. In the case of a natural-born person citizenship is something which, if taken away, would easily lead to a condition of statelessness. I am not thinking particularly of the group of people to whom my hon. friend is referring, but one of the difficulties in the administration of nationality acts is the question of trying to avoid statelessness. If you take away the citizenship of a natural-born person, unless he has another state to which he can go—I am not referring to the cases my hon. friend had in mind, but to illustrate the principle—he has no place to which he can be deported. It is to avoid that kind of situation that you have to tread with great care.

Mr. REID: Would the minister mind answering a question? What would happen in the case of a man who had two citizenships and you took away his Canadian citizenship? Would he be stateless?

Mr. MARTIN: It all depends on the circumstances. If by some voluntary act the man acquires the nationality of another country, then of course the consequences are as stated in the section. I am not admitting that it is not without difficulty, but the committee will recall what we are trying to do. Here we are dealing with natural-born people who have no other nationality. If you take away their nationality they have no other country to which they owe allegiance.

Mr. GREEN: You do that under section 21.

Mr. MARTIN: That is a different situation. These are not natural-born people. This deals with natural-born citizens. The way to deal with the case to which my hon. friend has referred is through the courts of justice. They should be dealt with vigorously in that way. That is the proper way to do it. I am not saying this to be flippant, and I am sure my hon. friend will recognize that. That is the British way. Everyone in this committee will recall the case which came up in Great Britain recently of a certain person—I do not want to identify him. He was the son of a well-known public figure who had committed a serious crime against the crown. That person was a natural-born citizen of the United Kingdom. His citizenship was not taken away from him in spite of his act; but he was dealt with effectively and completely by the courts. That is the only way, in my opinion, to deal with this matter. I do not know of any other way. We have thought of this problem and given it a great deal of attention. We talked about the very situation that my hon. friend has in mind and argued about it. We discussed this matter in relation to the nationality laws of the commonwealth. I think in only two countries of the world will it be found that there is a provision by which the citizenship of natural-born people can be taken away from them.

Mr. GREEN: The United States do it.

Mr. MARTIN: No, they do not do it. They do it in one small country; I think it is San Salvador.

Mr. HACKETT: Does any country do it when the citizen is in his own country?

Mr. MARTIN: No, except the two countries I have in mind.

Mr. HACKETT: Do they take the man's citizenship from him when he is in the country?

Mr. MARTIN: No; only when he is out.

Mr. REID: I wonder whether the minister is correct. I hold in my hand a section of the United States act entitled, "Chapter IV, loss of nationality." Section 401 reads:

> A person who is a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization shall lose his nationality . . .

Then there is a whole page in which reasons for loss of nationality are outlined, whether born in the United States or not.

Mr. MARTIN: What are the reasons?

[Mr. Martin.]

Mr. REID: One is voting at a political election in this country. If he does that they take away his citizenship and forbid him to enter.

Mr. MARTIN: We do the same thing under section 16 which reads:

> A Canadian citizen who, when outside of Canada and not under a disability, by any voluntary and formal act other than marriage, acquires the nationality or citizenship of a country other than Canada shall thereupon cease to be a Canadian citizen.

Mr. REID: That is not a natural-born person.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: Outside of Canada.

Mr. GREEN: This section refers to Canadian-born persons outside of Canada. Surely the minister does not contend that a Canadian-born person who serves in the army of our enemy should retain his citizenship?

Mr. MARTIN: That is a case of treason on a par with the case I referred to in England.

Mr. GREEN: Here is a man who served in the Japanese army.

Mr. MARTIN: He may have acquired foreign nationality.

Mr. GREEN: Why should he have any right to retain Canadian citizenship?

Mr. MARTIN: Because there is an effective way of dealing with such natural-born people, the way they do it in Great Britain. The hon. gentleman will recall the case to which I refer. The question was put to the Home Secretary in the British house. I wish I had his reply here. I should have brought it down. Recognizing the difficulty, he said in substance that the main purpose of the provision was to avoid the danger of people becoming stateless. If a Canadian citizen or a natural-born Canadian citizen does something along the lines referred to by my hon. friend it seems to me the effective way to deal with the situation is to bring him before the courts, and, if he is found guilty, give him the justice and ignominy which he deserves. That is the British system and I think it is the system we must follow.

Mr. GREEN: What about Canadian-born persons who go to Japan in peace time and take military training in the Japanese army? Hundreds of them did that, and then applied to come back to Canada as British subjects. What happens in cases like that? I want an answer to my question.

Mr. MacINNIS: I can add a little to the discussion and the minister can give his answer then. If a Canadian citizen helps a foreign enemy, it does not make any difference if he does it in this country or outside, he has committed treason, and if he is in this country the law of the land applies to him. If he is out of the country, the moment he returns the law of the land applies to him as well. Surely we should not do things on a racial basis just because a person happens to do a certain thing in one country. There is a law to apply in this case, and if we apply the law rigidly, fairly and justly in every case we shall take care of every case. Therefore, in my opinion, the points raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South do not really exist as difficult points. They are questions of application of the law, as the law stands; and if we apply the law, then the situation is met.

Mr. REID: Of course many of us differ with the views of the last speaker—

Mr. MacINNIS: All right; you also differ with the views of the Secretary of State.

Mr. REID: All the hon. gentleman says may be true, but we are speaking now particularly of persons in this country, whether Japanese or others, who are sitting here holding two citizenships. My whole public fight has been against this. I realize that a child has no control over what its parents may do, but I say when that child reaches the age of twenty-one years, if he is a registered citizen of Japan and looked upon by that country as a citizen, then that person should take some steps to renounce his foreign allegiance, if he really is a Canadian and has been born in this country. Our anxiety under the bill is this. Many Japanese have left this country and then returned making no bones about where their loyalty and their support lie.

Mr. MARTIN: Is that person a natural-born Canadian?

Mr. REID: Yes; I am speaking about a natural-born Canadian. I have here a return brought down in this house concerning one man, and this is not an isolated case. It deals with one Noboru Yamamoto, who was born in this country, who then spent fifteen years in Japan and finally returned to this country while we were at war. When the war was at its toughest he was asked by this government to do some work. He refused, and his letter to the Minister of Labour was most astounding. I am going to read it; it is dated May 22, 1944:

To the Honourable the Minister of Labour:

I am sorry to interrupt your precious time for stating my concerns—

I am reading this letter just as it was written.

—but I think you will be kind enough to listen and judge to what I state under the following order.

Now I am already 21 years old. Speaking from this standpoint I must be working or otherwise, be serving in the armed forces in this country, however, as I came here from Japan just before the war, 1940, after being educated 11 years school course there; I have no desire to be working for this country especially in this war time because such work would be considered as though I were helping this country to win the war against Japan.

I feel very sorry to Japan if I do work, as you might have been already noted that the Japanese have very strong patriotism to their mothers country, especially in the war time; they are willing to offer everything that they have to their country even their life if they asked to do so.

There is no exception in my case to this conclusion particularly as I have been under the military training while in the school course there.

I know that there is left only two ways by which I can keep my living in this country. The first and best thing is to keep my studying until the end of the war. By doing so, I would neither hurt Canada nor Japan. The next thing is to be interned or imprisoned until the end of the war however this would hurt Canada.

Although I have no intention to hurt this country, there is no alternative course left for me, but to be interned or imprisoned if the selective service or commission (B.C. security commission) would force me to work.

I here professed my suggestion so that there will be left nothing indefinite between us.

Will you be kind enough to tell me if there is left any chance by which I could keep my study in the east? I hope to receive your answer as early as possible.

Mr. FULTON: What happened to him?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): He was not shot, anyway.

Mr. REID: I really cannot tell the hon. member what happened. I do not think anything very startling happened to him, but he kept on writing letters to Ottawa. I notice that in one letter to the selective service authorities he says, "I also have stated my reason fully to the general Spanish consul." Here was a man born in this country, and he is only one of many. At his birth he was registered in Japan; his parents saw to that. Then he and others went to that country, to which they owed allegiance. There they are registered as Japanese nationals and Japanese citizens, and the government of Japan intimated that it would do its utmost to protect them in this country. Then he comes back, and this is the kind of letter he writes to the minister.

We who have been taking this stand realize that it is particularly directed against the Japanese, but I do not know of any other race of people who are sitting in this country holding two citizenships. I have challenged all those who have come out in opposition to my views in regard to this matter. Last year the Japanese newspaper printed the remarks I made in this house; they made the statement, "Mr. Reid says we have dual citizenship and are non-assimilable", but they did not attempt to contradict my statement. Why? Not one of the 22,000 Japanese has said, "We have nothing to do with Japan. I am a Canadian citizen." Many of us who have carried on this fight all the way through have been unjustly accused of having an attitude of racial hatred, but we have simply taken the stand that no person in this country should be allowed to possess Canadian citizenship if he holds allegiance to some other country, be it Japan or any other. That is our fight, and in this bill we want to see something done about that class of citizen, whether he comes from Japan, Yugoslavia, Russia, Germany or any other country.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the section carry?

Mr. GREEN: The minister has not answered my question.

Mr. MARTIN: In the case to which the hon. gentleman has referred, that young man went back and took military service under the government of Japan.

Mr. GREEN: In peace time.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. If, by doing so, he acquired Japanese nationality, under this section he is out.

Mr. GREEN: Would it not be wise to put that right in our bill, that if a man serves in the armed forces of any other country he loses his Canadian citizenship? What is the objection to putting that in the section?

Mr. MARTIN: You cannot cover cases like that. It would include service, for instance, in the forces of the United States and other countries. If you start to draw lines in that way you get into tremendous difficulties. In that case, if by going to Japan and serving in the military forces of the Japanese government that man thereby acquired Japanese nationality, he ceases to be a Canadian citizen.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Just to follow that thought, section 401 of the United States act, which the hon. member for New Westminster is talking about, expressly states that American citizens who serve in the armies of foreign countries are going to lose their American citizenship, whether they are natural-born or naturalized. A little further down they have another interesting provision, that any man who deserts the military or naval service of the United States in time of war shall also lose his American citizenship, something which certainly should be in our bill. Then the hon. member for Vancouver East suggested that if a man served in the Japanese military forces he should be tried as a traitor if he returned to Canada. But these Japanese, with dual citizenship, cannot be loyal to both Canada and Japan when the two countries are at war. How could you legally try a man who has dual citizenship for being disloyal to either country when at the same time he was loyal to the other? That is the whole nub of the case of the British Columbia members, other than the C.C.F. members, against the Japanese. They are dual citizens; they are not, cannot be and do not want to be Canadians.

Mr. MacINNIS: But that is not the case. Japanese Canadians by the hundred wanted to demonstrate their citizenship by service in the Canadian army, and they were not allowed to do so until Great Britain made application for their services. That application was turned down but later it was accepted, under some compulsion or another.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Nonsense.

Mr. MacINNIS: The way to allow people to show their citizenship is first to give them full citizenship and then let them discharge all the duties and obligations that go with it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): To both countries?

Mr. MacINNIS: No. The statement was made by the hon. member for New Westminster that all the 22,000 Canadian-born persons of Japanese origin in Canada had dual citizenship. I say that that is not correct. I know of dozens of them who revoked their citizenship in Japan, or it was done by their parents. They were given no encouragement to do that. As some one has said, the nub of the question is their loyalty, and the nub of their loyalty is their willingness to serve in the Canadian armed forces. They served in the armed forces of the United States, and their record in Italy is that their section of the army was the most decorated section in the United States army. There is no doubt that if they had been given the same opportunity to serve in the Canadian

army they would have given the same service. Before we ask for loyalty we must provide opportunity.

Mr. REID: That may be so far as it goes, but the fact still remains that the Japanese born in this country whose births were registered in Japan and who are now twenty-one years of age have a dual citizenship. Japan looks upon them as citizens of Japan. They are so much under the control of Japan that even when they die in this country both their birth and death certificates must be sent to Japan.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And their ashes as well.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is true of other orientals.

Mr. REID: Japan recognizes these people and that is why so many of them went back to do military duty there. To the best of my knowledge, 1,600 of them left just prior to 1939. They were born here and they went to Japan to serve in the army. They can now come back to this country and say, "We are Canadian citizens." There is no law such as has been spoken of by the hon. member for Vancouver East that would touch them. I do not know of any law that can touch them. Should we open the door to those 1,600 who went to Japan to do military duty and then stayed there at the request of Japan? Should they be allowed to come back to this country and claim Canadian citizenship?

Mr. MacINNIS: Surely if the Canadian government has information that 1,600 persons born of Japanese parents in Canada went to Japan and served in the Japanese army, when those 1,600 return to Canada they can be picked up as having been disloyal to Canada and punished according to Canadian law.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: How can they?

Mr. MacINNIS: You know the crime they committed, or whatever you may call it. I do not know why you could not do that. Take the case mentioned by the Secretary of State that occurred in Great Britain. That case had to do with Germany.

Mr. FULTON: He was not a citizen of Germany.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is true he was a citizen of Great Britain, but the claim is that these persons are also citizens of Canada. We are dealing with them not because they are citizens of Japan but because they are citizens of Canada. We can do the same thing as was done by the British government in connection with that case.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: How are we to tell which are Canadian citizens and which are not? Will the hon. member state what allegiance is owed by the two Japanese who were in the galleries and who must have been introduced there by members of only one party?

An hon. MEMBER: Were they in the government gallery?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They were in the members' gallery and no Liberal or Conservative brought them in.

Mr. MacINNIS: As the members' gallery we would put them in is on that side of the chamber, the hon. member will have to ask his hon. friends on his side of the house.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No hon. member on this side brought them in. I have my own ideas as to who entertained them at lunch and who brought them in here.

Mr. KNIGHT: I respectfully suggest that we are getting away from the subject.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No, we are not.

Mr. KNIGHT: This debate seems to have developed into another debate on the Japanese question. I heard enough of that during the last session and I do not want to hear any more.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You know nothing about it.

Mr. MacINNIS: There are two who do not know anything about it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You should know it all because you have dealt with them long enough.

Mr. MacINNIS: Certainly I know it all.

Mr. KNIGHT: I think we as Canadians should accept responsibility for the bringing up of our own Canadian-born citizens. That is why I referred to the case raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South. He was not in the house when I spoke, as reported on page 1001 of *Hansard*. If we bring boys up in this country after having accepted their parents, if we put them through our schools then I am afraid we shall have to accept responsibility, and if they get into trouble we shall have to punish them as Canadians. We cannot dodge our responsibility by saying to a young German or a young Czech or a young Englishman or a young what have you, "We do not want you; we have brought you up in this country; we gave you your education, but we do not like you and you

will have to go back to France, to Japan, to Germany or somewhere else." I am afraid we shall have to accept that responsibility. If these people commit crimes they will have to be punished as Canadian citizens. We cannot deprive them of their only nationality because there is no other country prepared to take these criminals. We must deal with them ourselves. I hope hon. members do not think I am talking about the Japanese because I am not. They are quite far from my thoughts at the present time.

Mr. FULTON: With due respect to all hon. members I think we should try to discuss this matter without heat. I have asked continually that the members from British Columbia be given a fair opportunity to state their case against the Japanese in order that this parliament of Canada may decide the matter on principles of justice. There is this distinction to be drawn between the Japanese referred to by the hon. member for New Westminster and by the hon. member for Vancouver East and the case referred to by the Secretary of State. I think 1,600 was the figure given by the hon. member for New Westminster. Those persons acquired Japanese nationality by virtue of the registration of their births in Canada. Therefore I think they are in a different category; from their point of view they were citizens of Japan.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Are they not citizens of Canada?

Mr. FULTON: These people are not desirable Canadian citizens because, according to their own light, they are Japanese citizens. Later, when section 17 is being considered, I shall have something more to say. However, I just wanted to draw a distinction between these cases, because in my submission these people in their own minds are not Canadians; they are Japanese and they should be so regarded and so treated.

Mr. McMASTER: I thought the debate on this particular phase of the matter had ended. If it has not, perhaps my remarks should be left until it has. However, since I am on my feet perhaps I might offer a suggestion about this clause which is general in its application. The Secretary of State has referred to stateless persons; but I have always thought that no one could be stateless, that is, that domicile or nationality is something that is cast upon a person by his birth. If you drive him out of one state and he is not a subject of another state, by international law, which says that a man comes back to his original domicile or original state, he immediately bounces back.

Mr. GREEN: It is quite amusing, but not very helpful, to hear the hon. member for Saskatoon City talk about welcoming back these Japanese. His province has been quite successful in keeping away from having many Japanese settle in its territory. They are really not in a very good position to talk about the Japanese question.

Mr. KNIGHT: Did the hon. gentleman say that I had welcomed back the Japanese?

Mr. GREEN: He is suggesting that this Japanese torturer should be brought back to Canada and tried.

Mr. KNIGHT: The hon. gentleman should withdraw what he has said because I said no such thing.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Your province did.

Mr. GREEN: That was the inference.

Mr. KNIGHT: Will the hon. gentleman withdraw that?

Mr. GREEN: No; I will not withdraw it.

Mr. KNIGHT: I appeal to the Chair. The hon. member has said that I said something which I did not say.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He said your province said it.

Mr. KNIGHT: I appeal to the chair.

Mr. BOUCHER: Let the record speak.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I must confess that I did not hear what the hon. member said.

Mr. GREEN: I forget what I said myself. However, as I understood the suggestion of the hon. member it was that cases such as this torturer should be brought back to Canada to be tried; that he should be brought back to Canada to be tried and any other Japanese who served in the Japanese forces should be brought back here and we should accept the blame for them being as they are. That is what I understood from his remarks and I think that is what he meant. I suggest to the minister that he allow this section to stand with section 10, because I think that in bringing in a section of this type the minister is not facing realities. This question must be faced. This question of dual nationality cannot be sidetracked. We must be protected against happenings such as have taken place during the last few years.

There is no provision in this section for a man renouncing his Canadian citizenship; he cannot renounce his Canadian citizenship. There are cases where a person in Canada may wish to renounce his citizenship and certainly should be allowed to do so, but there is no provision for that.

I repeat again that a Canadian-born person who serves in the armed forces of any other nation should lose his citizenship by so doing. Let us not be carried away and be too free in giving our right of citizenship. We must be careful to draw the line somewhere. People who serve in the armed forces of another country are not entitled to retain their Canadian citizenship. I would ask the minister to let this section stand.

Mr. MARTIN: I suggest that we let section 17 stand, that is the section which concerns dual nationality; and let section 16 pass.

Mr. GREEN: Section 16 also concerns dual nationality.

Mr. MARTIN: No.

Mr. GREEN: Oh yes, it does, and it concerns this question of serving in the armed forces of another nation.

Mr. MARTIN: Section 17 is the one, if my hon. friend will look at it carefully.

Mr. REID: I think section 17 covers that.

Mr. MARTIN: I have no doubt of that, and I am willing to let section 17 stand if we can pass section 16.

Mr. GREEN: Section 17 applies only to a minor.

Mr. MARTIN: Section 17 applies to a man of the full age of twenty-one years.

Mr. GREEN: Section 17 applies only to a person who during his minority becomes a citizen of another country, and section 16 applies to a person who has attained his majority and goes abroad.

Mr. MARTIN: If he acquires another nationality after his majority he loses his Canadian citizenship under section 16. Section 17 is the one.

Mr. GREEN: No; section 17 applies only where he gets dual nationality as a minor.

Mr. MARTIN: A person under this bill cannot get dual nationality until after attaining his majority. You have to elect under this bill.

Mr. GREEN: I suggest that the two sections are tied up together and that both should be allowed to stand for further consideration.

Mr. MARTIN: I am prepared to let section 17 stand, but I do not think section 16 applies to the problem.

Mr. GREEN: The minister should not try to force through section 16 without giving further consideration to the suggestions that have been made.

Mr. MARTIN: I have given very full consideration to section 16. I am prepared to let section 17 stand. I am satisfied beyond any doubt that section 17 applies and I am prepared to give further consideration to it. I shall have to consider what should be done in the case of persons who serve in the armed forces of another country when Canada is at war. I do not think section 17 covers the point my hon. friend has in mind. If we let section 17 stand, before I undertake to say what I shall do about it, I would want to say something after we pass section 16.

Mr. GREEN: One question that arises under section 16 is the right of a person in Canada to renounce his citizenship. There is no provision in this bill for the renouncing of citizenship, and there should be.

Mr. MARTIN: That is dealt with in section 16.

Mr. GREEN: That only concerns a person outside of Canada.

Mr. MARTIN: The persons the hon. member is talking about are outside of Canada.

Mr. GREEN: There should be a provision whereby a person within Canada can renounce his citizenship.

Mr. MARTIN: I cannot agree to that.

Mr. GREEN: There is a provision of that kind in the United States.

Mr. MARTIN: That does not make it right. I know that the United States has such a provision, but you will not find that provision in any country in the British commonwealth. The United States have had considerable difficulty with this whole question of men serving in the armed forces of another country. As I told the house the other night we have had discussions with United States officials and authorities on this very subject both here in Ottawa and elsewhere, discussions in which I along with some of my officials participated. As a member of the government I naturally hesitate to say certain things in public, but I will go this far and say that the United States have had very considerable difficulty with this provision. For instance,

Americans served in the armed forces of Canada and that has placed United States citizens in an extremely difficult position. I do not want to go too far on that. Perhaps the committee will understand to what I refer. Numbers of Americans did serve in the armed forces of Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): May I ask what happened to Canadian citizens who served in the Spanish republican army in 1936?

Mr. MARTIN: I do not really know, I shall have to give an answer to-morrow.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Is the minister aware that United States citizens who served in the R.C.A.F. did not take the oath of allegiance.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes, because special action was taken in that case. I have to be careful in commenting on difficulties other countries have had. They have had to use other methods. I should like to be able to say exactly what they have told us about their difficulties in the United States. They had difficulties not only in the last war but in the first great war because certain countries which fought against the United States this time were their allies last time. That creates all sorts of difficulties, and one has to be extremely careful.

In Australia—we have been in touch with Australia—they have had the same problem and they are dealing with this problem as I think we should deal with it, in the British way. Take the case of Captain Baillie Stewart. He was a citizen of Great Britain and was convicted of aiding a foreign power, was discharged from the British army and imprisoned. Later he went to Germany. Nothing further was done until he was recaptured after the war. Then he was tried and convicted of giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. FULTON: Was it proven or alleged that he had acquired German citizenship or nationality?

Mr. MARTIN: I really do not know.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is an important question.

Mr. MARTIN: It is in one sense, but not as far as the principle is concerned. In other words, Britain regards citizenship once obtained through natural-born process as a thing which can be dealt with in the case of disloyalty in the most effective and the most humiliating way possible, and that is by disposition at the hands of the courts.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Will the minister permit a question?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He mentioned the fact that Britain considers that of the utmost importance. Has he any reason to believe that Japan does not also consider it of the utmost importance?

Mr. MARTIN: I may say in answer to that that my hon. friend knows that we are not, or certainly I hope we are not, to be governed in this parliament or this country by the methods—the diabolical methods—of our enemies.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Oh, no, that is no answer at all.

Mr. FULTON: I asked that question because I have been informed that, in the hearing of the case, it was held that Baillie Stewart had not completed the formalities of acquiring German citizenship and nationality, and it was for that reason that he was dealt with as a British subject and a traitor to Great Britain.

Mr. MARTIN: What about the case of "Lord Haw-Haw"? There have been many others, and Britain has dealt with them in the effective way I mentioned.

Mr. FULTON: We should look up the record, but I think that "Haw-Haw", or William Joyce, was dealt with on the same basis.

Mr. MARTIN: You are quite right. I am wrong in that case. "Lord Haw-Haw" was declared to be a United States citizen. I suggest that we let section 16 pass, and I will hold section 17 over and give it consideration.

Mr. GREEN: What about section 16?

Mr. MARTIN: I think we should allow section 16 to pass. I do not think it covers the issue.

Mr. GREEN: In the ordinary course, in this house, where the suggestion is made in good faith that a section stand over, the practice is for the government to let it stand over and not try to force it through.

Mr. MARTIN: I will agree to let them both stand over, so that we can get on. I know that from now on I can expect complete cooperation.

Mr. GREEN: The Prime Minister at the session last fall made a statement outlining the policy of the government on this Japanese question. Will the minister assure the committee that if this bill becomes law it will in no way affect the carrying out of that policy?

Mr. MARTIN: All I can say is that this bill has nothing to do one way or the other with these orders. The responsible minister in connection with that matter will have to answer on behalf of the government. I am not particularly charged with that matter, but this bill does not affect one way or the other that situation. This bill stands by itself.

Mr. GREEN: The minister has not given the assurance for which I asked. Will the Minister of Veterans Affairs, who is leading the house at the moment, give that assurance?

Mr. MACKENZIE: My understanding is that the measure now being considered by this committee will not and cannot alter in any way the policy of the government with respect to the issue raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. MARTIN: This bill was introduced long before these orders were passed.

An hon. MEMBER: In that case it will have been passed after the event.

Mr. MacINNIS: In view of certain matters which were raised in connection with this bill, the question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver South is certainly a most amazing one. The hon. member for Lake Centre attacked and slashed the government in a really fine way over certain orders in council by which a few individuals were picked up and confined and later brought to trial, and then over one case of a man who had deserted from the Canadian army, where there was an order passed getting him under control. I imagine that the hon. member for Lake Centre was talking for the Progressive Conservative party when he denounced—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Would the hon. member forgive me for rising on a point of order. I understand that the minister in charge agreed, at the suggestion of the hon. member for Vancouver South, to have sections 16 and 17 stand over for further discussion. So that I think we might possibly postpone the discussion of this issue to another occasion.

Mr. MacINNIS: I do not think it is quite fair to ask me to postpone my discussion.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We could not hope for it.

Mr. MacINNIS: I listened to the hon. member for Lake Centre dealing with one question, and to the hon. members for Vancouver South, Kamloops, Vancouver-Burrard and Nanaimo dealing with a definitely opposite principle. One of these principles is right. Either orders in council which take away the liberty of the Canadian citizen are wrong, or orders in council which take away the freedom of Canadian citizens are right.

Mr. FULTON: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he define the difference between these principles?

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I think there was agreement that sections 16 and 17 would stand for further consideration.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I object to that ruling, although I bow to it. The point I made is this. If I am wrong, then the hon. member for Vancouver South should not be allowed to ask his questions. As a matter of fact, for days and days the whole discussion on this point was out of order, because it had nothing to do with the question. I was anticipating that, the moment I would rise to speak on it, I would say things and then I would be out of order. So it has turned out. But before this is finished I am going to have my say on this question, and I am going to show the contradictions in the policies of my hon. friends to my right.

Mr. GRAYDON: Meanwhile you are wasting a lot of time.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am not wasting any time. I do not waste any time.

Sections 16 and 17 stand.

On section 18—Child of parent ceasing to be a Canadian citizen. Declaration for resuming Canadian citizenship.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister explain this section?

Mr. MARTIN: This is not new; it has been in the act for thirty-one years.

Section agreed to.

On section 19—When loss of Canadian citizenship involves loss of British nationality.

Mr. REID: May I ask the minister if we have the right to declare that a person "thereupon ceases to be a British subject"? The minister might explain that. Have we the right to take away the status of a British subject if a person takes out foreign citizen-

ship? Under this section, if a person takes out foreign citizenship we assume the right to declare that he is not a British subject.

Mr. CASE: We cannot do that.

Mr. MARTIN: These people acquire Canadian citizenship under Canadian law. Of course we have the power. They have the status of a British subject. But if they become nationals of another country—

An hon. MEMBER: British subjects?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. Australia has acted thus and South Africa has done so. There is no doubt about that. They are British subjects by virtue of naturalization in Canada.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Did I understand the Secretary of State to say that we had the right to take away British citizenship? I believe we have no power to do so. This is absolutely unconstitutional. We cannot invade the field of legislating as to the citizenship of another country. At least I do not know how that can be done. Besides this, I would ask another question: if a person ceases to be a British subject, does he cease to be a Canadian citizen?

Mr. MARTIN: There is no doubt about the first question. I did not hear the hon. member's second question.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I wish to know if a person ceases to be a British citizen if he ceases to be a Canadian citizen?

Mr. HACKETT: British subject.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): Yes, British subject.

Mr. MARTIN: If he is a Canadian citizen. A person who lives in South Africa would cease to be a British subject if he goes to live, let us say, in Yugoslavia as a citizen of that country.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I understand section 19 provides that when a person ceases to be a Canadian citizen he thereupon ceases to be a British subject. Is it reciprocal? If a person ceases to be a British subject, does he cease to be a Canadian citizen?

Mr. MARTIN: If he is a Canadian citizen, certainly. The two are joined together.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Lapriarie): I just want to remind the minister of a discussion which took place in 1921 on the subject of Canadian nationality.

Mr. MARTIN: All Canadian citizens are British subjects. Surely that should help the hon. gentleman in understanding the nature of my reply.

[Mr. Reid.]

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): That means that we have dual nationality.

Mr. MARTIN: No, it does not. It means that under this bill we are citizens of Canada, at the same time enjoying the common status of loyalty to a common king.

Mr. REID: Suppose a man leaves some continental country, France we will say for the sake of argument, resides in Great Britain for a few years, becoming a British subject, then comes to this country and after five years takes out Canadian citizenship papers. Following that, he returns to the continental country and takes out papers there. I am questioning the right of this country to declare that he is not a British subject in view of the fact that he might have had that status in the first instance when he came to Canada.

Mr. CASE: I have listened to the minister's explanation and what I have in mind is this. A man comes as a British subject when he arrives and then becomes a Canadian citizen. If he renounces his Canadian citizenship, does the minister mean to say that we can declare that he is no longer a British subject?

Mr. MARTIN: The section says that where one ceases to be a Canadian citizen as provided in certain sections, if he is at such time or thereupon becomes a national or citizen of a country other than a country of the British commonwealth he thereby ceases to be a British subject. He does under this law, under the law of New Zealand, and of all the dominions. He joins another country. Should we allow him to continue to be a British subject?

Section agreed to.

On section 20—By residence outside of Canada for six years.

Mr. GREEN: Was consideration given to inserting a provision such as there is in the United States law to the effect that if a citizen other than a natural-born citizen returns to his country of origin and becomes domiciled there, the time of residence is only two years, or is a shorter time than if he goes to a third country? I have the report of Professor W. P. M. Kennedy, published in 1943.

Mr. MARTIN: I may say that we have not adopted the suggestion.

Mr. GREEN: At page 18 the following remarks appear:

If after naturalization and the acquisition of Canadian domicile, they return to the country of their origin and remain there for two years,

this ought to be presumptive evidence that they have abandoned Canadian domicile, and such is in fact the law of the United States.

Has that been considered?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: What are the reasons for not following it?

Mr. MARTIN: After canvassing the whole situation we thought six years was the proper time.

Mr. HACKETT: Must these six years be consecutive?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. HACKETT: They are not cumulative?

Mr. MARTIN: No, they are consecutive.

Mr. HACKETT: Why, then, is that word not inserted? As it stands, it does not say so. As the section now reads, if the man were out of the country two years ten years ago—

Mr. MARTIN: I have no objection to saying six consecutive years.

Mr. HACKETT: I so move.

Mr. FULTON: Will the Secretary of State explain what is contemplated in section 20, paragraph (e)? I do not understand the purpose.

Mr. MARTIN: We are not excluding a person if the wife goes and lives with her husband who is engaged in one of the privileged occupations, outside the country, enumerated from (a) to (f).

Mr. FULTON: This contemplates the husband inasmuch as it says "he".

Mr. MARTIN: "He" under the interpretation act means he or she.

Mr. FULTON: Does it contemplate the case of a man married to a C.W.A.C.?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): There is an amendment by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) that the word "consecutive" be added in line 12 after the word six. It would then read "at least six consecutive years".

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 21—By revocation of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. MARTIN: I told the house that I intended to ask my colleague the Minister of Veterans Affairs to move that subsection 1 (c) be deleted and (d) and (e) be relettered (c) and (d).

Mr. MACKENZIE: I so move.

Mr. REID: I wish to direct the attention of the committee to this point. There appears later on in the bill a provision that a Canadian subject naturalized has equal status with a natural-born citizen. Some time ago we were speaking about natural-born persons and the Japanese race was mentioned. My objection is that a naturalized citizen will lose his citizenship by the commission of certain acts, whereas the natural-born citizen will not, and I am propounding this question to the minister: How can we give like status to the naturalized citizen if we make a differentiation not only in section 21 but in other sections?

Mr. MARTIN: The only answer is the sound principle that one is natural-born and has no country to go to while the other is a national of Canada who has had another national status to which he has apparently a greater national affinity. We can deal with his case more effectively than with that of the natural-born person.

Mr. REID: That answer is not satisfactory; at any rate it is not satisfactory to me, because the bill then is not sound. Later on, it says that the two of them have like status, but they have not and the country should be informed that they have not. We have been talking for weeks about citizenship, about everyone throwing racial pride to the winds, and all meeting on an equal plane, and now we are saying that if certain persons like myself do certain acts they lose their citizenship, whereas if the son of such a person, born in this country, does the same thing the case is different. There is no like status there and I call the attention of the committee to the fact. I suggest that this section should be held over for consideration.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Stand.

Mr. MARTIN: I will agree to let section 16 and 17 stand because of the principle involved, but I do not think there is any necessity to have this one stand, with great respect to my hon. friend. He will find no country in the world where the suggestion he is now making is followed, except in the two I have mentioned.

Mr. REID: Then section 27 is not true. There is no like status as between the two classes.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Golding): There is an amendment moved by Mr. Mackenzie that paragraph (c) of section 21 be deleted and the subsequent paragraphs be relettered accordingly.

Mr. GREEN: Earlier in the evening I asked the minister a question as to what was to be done in connection with nationals of an enemy country and he requested me to repeat the question on section 21. Will he give an answer now?

Mr. MARTIN: There is nothing I can say on that. Perhaps I did not quite understand the question. It is obviously a matter for the courts if I understand what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. GREEN: After the last war a special amendment was introduced into the Naturalization Act putting a restriction on applications for naturalization by subjects of enemy countries for a certain length of time—ten years, I believe.

Mr. MARTIN: I know.

Mr. GREEN: Subsequently, when that period expired the provision was repealed. I can find nothing in this bill which deals with enemy nationals. Has the minister given consideration to inserting a provision of that kind? If not, why not?

Mr. MARTIN: That provision was inserted and shortly after it was removed. It was felt to have no value. We shall have to deal with that situation when it arises.

Mr. GREEN: Does that mean that a citizen of Germany has the same right of Canadian naturalization as a citizen of France?

Mr. MARTIN: If he is a deserving person, certainly. If he is not, no. All I can say is there are many being turned down and many being granted because there are many good German citizens in this country. Professor Einstein in the United States is an illustration. We have to deal with these cases in an *ad hoc* manner, and we are dealing with them carefully.

Mr. FLEMING: I should like to commend the amendment proposed by the minister. To say the least, I think it would have been a grave misfortune if this section had passed with paragraph (c) in it. I do not need to elaborate what I said about it the other day. Before we deal finally with the amendment, would the minister explain what meaning he attaches to certain words in paragraph (d) which, under the amendment, will be relettered paragraph (c)?

Mr. MARTIN: Could we deal with the amendment first?

Mr. FLEMING: My question has to do with paragraph (d) which is being relettered. If the Chairman would leave the question open I do not mind waiting.

[The Acting Chairman.]

Mr. MARTIN: Let us deal with the amendment first.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I do not like this section. I do not think there is any doubt that it is discriminatory.

Mr. FLEMING: My question has to do with the concluding words in paragraph (d). In the course of administration of this bill I should like to know what meaning the minister proposes to attach to these concluding words: "and has not maintained substantial connection with Canada." Take the case of a Canadian citizen who leaves this country and is absent for six years; let us say, he takes up ordinary residence outside Canada and has not maintained substantial connection here. What meaning is to be attached to these words? There is nothing in the bill that gives any clue to the meaning of them.

Mr. MARTIN: My hon. friend knows that the section substantially means exactly what it says, and the courts will so interpret it.

Mr. FLEMING: This is not a court; this is the governor in council.

Mr. MARTIN: I will give the reason, and the courts may easily construe it in construing the action of the governor in council. First of all, the period has been reduced from seven years to six. In the existing act it is seven years. Since Canadian citizenship will hereafter give a right of entry, whereas status as a British subject does not at present, it was thought desirable to shorten the period that a person could be abroad. This provision is needed because there may be cases where revocation of naturalization is desirable even though a person is not subject to automatic loss. For example, a person may be abroad for years with a purely nominal agency from a Canadian company. This agency would protect him from automatic loss. However, if it were merely a deliberate blind or shield, it would be desirable to be able to revoke his naturalization if he has maintained no substantial connection with Canada.

We have had a number of cases of individuals who left Canada prior to the war and went to Germany. They were away beyond the prescribed period. These people alleged that they had connection with Canada and that they were acting for certain companies. We were able to find out that these companies were blinds, that they were just fictitious agencies. In fact they were not really employed by them at all. Certainly that is no

substantial connection with Canada, and it is hoped we shall be able to deal with that kind of case.

Mr. FLEMING: Suppose a man is not representing an agency, but some members of his family may be here. For reasons of health he may be compelled to take up residence abroad. Suppose a man goes to California and for reasons of health he takes up ordinary residence there and corresponds with his family. Would that be considered substantial connection?

Mr. MARTIN: There is no doubt about that. He could not have a more substantial connection than having a family in Canada.

Mr. FLEMING: Suppose he has no family?

Mr. MARTIN: He might have some other connection.

Mr. FLEMING: Suppose he has property. Suppose he is a former minister of the crown and is a bachelor?

Mr. MARTIN: That is a doubtful case. Take a case of substance.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): Would the minister explain exactly what is meant by what was subparagraph (e) of paragraph 1, of section 21, which reads as follows:

. . . has shown himself by act or speech to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. I want to take the committee into my confidence. When we came to deal with that paragraph it gave us a great deal of trouble. The hon. gentleman knows me well enough to know that I would not want to have any measure in the bill which could be unscrupulously used by an individual to deport an alleged undesirable person.

Mr. HACKETT: Is that the language of the subparagraph taken from the criminal code?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. I do not wish to refer to existing cases, but there are many instances. I forget the exact number we had before the war, but there were Canadian citizens who went to Germany between 1934 and 1936, many of whom took part in the activities of the German army. Others, if they did not take part, did other things which were obviously disloyal, and certainly could come within the characterization of being by act or speech disloyal to the crown. We must have some provision to deal with these people. These people acquired naturalization. They were not natural-born people. They came into this country and we took them for people who would give their loyalty to Canada. They did not. They being naturalized persons, we felt that we should have the right to deal with such people in this way. I am not denying that with people who have no responsibility this sort of thing could be open to abuse; but we have to trust whoever holds the office of Secretary of State, whoever serves in the government of this country, that they will not act lightly in a matter like this. That is the only effective reply I can give to the hon. gentleman, but it is a powerful reply. I do not think there has been any abuse of it, and I see no occasion to suspect that there will be.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I am quite willing to accept the Secretary of State's word that he would not abuse it. I believe that implicitly, but there may be other secretaries of state following him. To some extent it has been abused in the past. I remember the history of the 1919 strike when undoubtedly men who afterwards achieved eminence of position in legislatures were arrested and virtually charged with treason and sedition. The founder of this political party, of which I am a member was arrested and incarcerated for four days, I think, because he quoted Isaiah in the streets of Winnipeg. We are not always going to get men in the position of the Secretary of State who are liberals in the best sense of the word. To my mind this section gives undue power to a minister, and I do not like to see that no matter how good the minister may be. I should like to move in amendment that what is now section 21(1)(d) be stricken out.

Mr. MARTIN: That is paragraph (e) as it appears in the bill?

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): Yes.

Mr. PINARD: I should like to add a few words to what was said by a previous speaker. I think paragraph (e), which was just referred to, is a very general provision. It says that a person will cease to be a Canadian citizen and will lose his citizenship if he shows himself to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty. On that point I think this paragraph should be clarified and explained, because "disloyalty" has been defined in the criminal code. I think sections 74 to 87 describe the treasonable offences, but I believe here we should better explain what we believe would be disloyalty to His Majesty. For instance, I do not think it should be considered disloyal to His Majesty if one did not approve a measure which was ratified by the king on the advice of his South African or Australian ministers or, as another example, that a man would be disloyal if he did not approve the policy followed by His Majesty

in India. For these reasons I think this section should be clarified, and that after the words "His Majesty", we should add the words "as king of Canada". Otherwise there would be a great deal of confusion, and some injustice might be done. So that we might add after the words "His Majesty" the words "in the right of Canada".

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): May I amend my own amendment?

Mr. MACKENZIE: By unanimous consent.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): If the hon. member wishes to do so he may withdraw his amendment by unanimous consent.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): Then, if I may have consent to withdraw it I should like to substitute the following for the present paragraph:

has been convicted of treason or sedition by a court of competent jurisdiction under the law of Canada.

Mr. MARTIN: That would not cover the cases I have mentioned, of people who have not committed treason. We have suspicions, or perhaps more than suspicions, but they have not committed treason. They have done things that come close to treason, but under the law they are not characterized as such. That is so, for example, in connection with some of those people who went to Germany. The words, "by act or speech to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty" have been in the present act since 1914. They are in all the corresponding acts throughout the commonwealth. They were in the Naturalization Act prior to 1914. They have caused no difficulty, and regretfully I must say that I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If I may ask a question, did I understand the minister to say that the Secretary of State would have the power, to be used in his discretion?

Mr. MARTIN: The governor in council.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What I am afraid of is that if we should be so unfortunate as to have the C.C.F. party get into power, they might be able to cancel my citizenship.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): We shall preserve you.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: At this hour I am not going to get into another controversy regarding orders in council. I think we shall have an interesting debate on that, from the warning given by the hon. member for Vancouver East. But there is a question which should be settled by an opinion from the law officers of the crown. It deals generally with the question of orders in council. Earlier this evening it was stated than an order in council passed prior to this bill becoming law, of an import contrary to the statute itself, would be effectual as against this statute when it becomes law.

Mr. MARTIN: I will see that what my hon. friend suggests is done; but if my hon. friend does not mind my saying so, I do not think that comes under this section. However, I shall note the point. I am rather anxious to have this section passed, if I can; and since I did something which provoked the observation that I would be receiving excessive co-operation, perhaps I might ask for that consideration.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not want to go into the question at the moment, because I do not think this particular section will pass this evening, but this is just another of these sections which will result in the setting up of more of these inquiries and commissions, to which we have been raising strong objection in recent days. I thought I would join a discussion of this section with a request to the minister that he secure an opinion from the law officers of the crown supporting the view expressed this evening by himself and by the Minister of Veterans Affairs—

Mr. MARTIN: I shall.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:—that when this statute is passed and becomes the law of the country it is going to take second place to an order in council passed before this statute came into effect. If that is so, then we have arrived at a state of affairs in this country that is not to be found anywhere else. To me it is a most amazing proposition, that in May, 1946, we pass a statute in this parliament, and that when in reference to an order in council previously passed we import into the statute conditions, terms and qualifications different from the order in council, the order in council takes precedence over this statute. To me that is an incomprehensible view, and I do not think it has even been supported in any court of law.

Mr. MARTIN: Of course this act, as an act of parliament, has priority over anything.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: All right; this act of parliament has priority over anything. That being so, this act of parliament, granting as it does rights to Canadian citizens, will not be subject to any interpretation on the basis of an order in council passed last fall. I think it is a matter of great importance, be-

cause we are going to find ourselves in this position. The order in council respecting the Japanese is now before the courts for interpretation. While that is the case parliament passes a citizenship bill which in part goes contrary to the provisions of the order in council. If the statement made by my hon. friend is correct, with which I agree, that the act of parliament is superior to the order in council—

Mr. MARTIN: It does not affect the order in council. They are two separate matters.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, no. The order in council affects citizens of this country, and we are now passing an act of parliament granting rights to citizens different from those provided under the order in council. I think it is a matter which deserves serious consideration and on which an opinion of the law officers of the crown should be secured. If my view is correct, and it is supported by my hon. friend the Secretary of State, then we are going to find ourselves in a most peculiar position.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I wonder if we could deal with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North, that section 21(1)(d) be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

has been convicted of treason or sedition by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Eleven o'clock.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

END OF VOLUME I